







5  
boll

THE  
WORKS

OF

JOHN JEWEL, D. D.

BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

EDITED BY

RICHARD WILLIAM JELF, D.D.

CANON OF CHRIST CHURCH,  
AND PRINCIPAL OF KING'S COLLEGE LONDON;  
FORMERLY FELLOW OF ORIEL COLLEGE.

---

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.

VOL. VI.

---

OXFORD,  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

MDCCCXLVIII.

32311



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2008 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation

THE  
DEFENCE OF THE APOLOGY  
OF THE  
CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

---

PART V.

---

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

**B**UT here, I look, they will say, though they have not the *scriptures*, yet it may chance they have the *ancient doctors*, and the *holy fathers* with them. For this is a high brag they have ever made, how that all *antiquity*, and a *continual consent* of all ages, doth make on their side: and that all our cases be but *new*, and yesterday's work; and until these few late years were never heard of. Questionless, there can nothing be more spitefully spoken against the religion of God, than to accuse it of *novelty*, as a matter lately found out. For as there can be no change in God himself, so ought there to be no change in his religion.

Yet nevertheless, we wot not by what means, but we have ever seen it come so to pass from the first beginning, that as often as God did give but some light, and did open his truth unto men, though the truth were not only of greatest antiquity, but also from everlasting, yet of wicked men and of the adversaries it was called *newfangled*, and of late

devised. That ungracious and bloodthirsty Haman, when he sought to procure the king Ahasuerus' displeasure against the Jews, used this accusation against them: "*Thou hast here (saith he) a kind of people that useth certain new laws of their own, but stiff-necked, and rebellious against all thy laws.*"

When Paul also began first to preach and expound the *gospel at Athens*, he was called a tidings-bringer of *new gods*: as much to say, as of a *new religion*.

“For” (said the Athenians) “may we not know of thee what *new doctrine* this is?” Celsus likewise, when he of set purpose wrote against Christ, to the end he might more scornfully scoff out the *gospel* by the name of *novelty*; “*What? (saith he,) hath God after so many ages now at last and so late be-thought himself?*” Eusebius also writeth, that the Christian religion from the beginning, for very spite, was called *νέα καὶ ξένη*, that is to say, *new and strange*. After like sort these men condemn all our matters, as *strange* and *new*: but they will have their own, whatsoever they are, to be praised as things of long continuance.

## M. HARDING.

.....They had said somewhat, if they had proved that the doctrine <sup>a</sup> of Christ had been called new by them who were the professors and followers of it. But now, reporting that the Gentiles, who knew not God, as Aman, as the Athenians, as Celsus the ethnic, and such the like, called the right and true religion of God new; they say nothing to any purpose. But let them shew, that before the coming of Christ any such religion was allowed that was new: or, that sithence Christ's incarnation, among Christian men, whatsoever religion was not shunned and rejected as heretical, which was new. Here are they dumb. And yet for show of learning, in a matter not necessary, they bring forth their store, and declare that the doctrine and religion of truth was new to them, which knew not God, nor Christ the Son of God, which no man denieth.

<sup>b</sup> Thus all men of any judgment may see, how fondly they reason. We <sup>b</sup> tell them, that all new doctrine now in the church of Christ

<sup>a</sup> A vain distinction. For neither do we call our doctrine new.

<sup>b</sup> We tell you, ye have lost the right names of things: and call that new that indeed is old.



is naught: and they prove, that infidels have in the time of Moses' law, and at the first preaching of the gospel, impugned God's everlasting truth with the odious term and reproach of newness. New doctrine was good to us at our first conversion from infidelity. But since that we received the true faith from St. Gregory the bishop of Rome, <sup>c</sup> who converted the realm of England to the faith by St. Augustine his legate, and others sent for that godly purpose; worthily we shun and abhor all new gospels, new faiths, new doctrines, new religions.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For the true faith of Christ had been planted, and still continued in this realm, four hundred years before the coming of this Augustine.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The truth of God neither is furthered by the face of *antiquity*, nor hindered by the opinion of *novelty*. For oftentimes the thing that indeed is *new*, is condemned as *old*: and the thing that indeed is *old*, is condemned as *new*. If *newness* in religion in all respects and every way were ill, Christ would not have resembled his doctrine to *new wine*; nor would he have said to his disciples, "I give you a *new commandment*:" neither would he have called the cup of thanksgiving the *new testament* in his blood. Arnobius saith: *Religionis autoritas non est tempore æstimanda, sed numine: nec quo die, sed quid colere cæperis, intueri convenit. Quod verum est, serum non est*: "The authority of religion must be weighed by God, and not by time. It behoveth us to consider, not upon what day, but what thing we began to worship. *The thing that is true is never too late.*"

<sup>1</sup> Matt. ix. 17.  
<sup>2</sup> John xlii. 34.  
<sup>3</sup> Luke xxii. 20.  
Arnobius contra Gentes, lib. 2. [p. 55.]

St. Augustine saith: *Quod antèrius est, iniquiunt ethnici, falsum esse non potest. Quasi antiquitas et vetus consuetudo præjudicet veritati*: "The heathens say, the religion that was first cannot be false. As though antiquity and old custom could prevail against the truth." Again he saith: *Nec dici debet, Quare modo? et quare sero? Quoniam mittentis consilium non est humano ingenio penetrabile*: "Neither may we say, Why cometh it now? why cometh it so late? For the counsel of God that sent it is unsearchable to the wisdom of man." Ye say, "They were infidels only, that charged the religion of Christ with *novelty*." And further ye say, "We tell them, that all new doctrine now in the church of Christ is naught." Hereto, M. Harding, we soon agree. And therefore we tell you,

<sup>4</sup> August. in Quæst. Nov. et Vet. Test. qu. 114. [iii. App. 119.]  
August. de Civit. lib. 10. cap. 32. [vii. 269.]

that your *new phantasies*, which ye have painted with the colour of *ancientry*, and therewith have deceived the world, are vain and naught. As for us, we have planted no *new religion*, but only have renewed the *old*, that was undoubtedly founded and used by the *apostles of Christ*, and other holy fathers in the *primitive church*; and of this long late time, by mean of the multitude of your traditions and vanities, hath been drowned.

Bernard. [l. Guillelmi abbat.] de Vita Solitaria. [cap. i. tom. v. 201.]

Therefore we may say with St. Bernard: *Novitatem dico, propter linguas hominum impiorum: qui cum manifestum lumen obnubilare non queunt, de solo novitatis nomine cavillantur, &c. Sed hæc novitas non est novella vanitas. Res enim est antiquæ religionis: perfecte fundatæ in Christo pietatis: antiqua hæreditas ecclesiæ Dei:* “I call it *novelty*, because of the tongues of wicked men: who, being not able to shadow the manifest light of the truth, find cavillations upon the *only name of novelty*. But this *novelty* is no *new vanity*,” (as is this late upstart religion of Rome.) “For it is a matter of *old religion: of perfect godliness founded in Christ: the ancient inheritance of the church of God.*”

Tertull. de Virginibus veland. [sub init. pp. 172, 173.]

The old learned father Tertullian saith: *Viderint ergo, quibus nocum est, quod sibi est vetus: hæreses non tam novitas, quam veritas revincit. Quodcunque contra [al. adversus] veritatem sapit, hoc est [al. erit] hæresis, etiam vetus consuetudo:* “Let them therefore take heed, which count that thing new, that in itself is old. Heresy is reprov'd not so well by *novelty* as by *verity*. Whatsoever thing savoureth against the *truth*, the same is an heresy, yea although it be a *custom never so old.*” Ignatius saith: *Antiquitas mea Jesus Christus est:* “My antiquity is Christ Jesus<sup>1</sup>.” For otherwise the religion of Christ at that time was counted *new*, and in respect of the *ancient religion* of the heathens, even for *novelty's* sake, universally and of all men was condemned [ed. 1609 commended].

Ignat. ad Philadelphien. [Russel, ll. 160.]

That *Augustine the monk of Rome brought first the faith into this land*, it is utterly untrue. For, as I have said before, it appeareth plainly by sundry the ancient fathers,

<sup>1</sup> [. . . ἐμοὶ δὲ ἀρχαία ἐστὶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. “Mihi pro archivis est Jesus Christus.”]

Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Hilary, Theodoretus, Eusebius, and others, that the faith of Christ had been universally received and perfectly rooted in this realm many hundred years before this *Augustine the monk* was born<sup>2</sup>. Indeed he brought in great heaps of strange *novelties* and *superstitions*, as *candles, candlesticks, banners, and holy water*, and other like shows, whereof the church of God had no great need. And yet have the same sithence been increased by other new devices and vanities above measure.

But forasmuch as certain of M. Harding's beauperes of Louvain have lately found themselves talk, and kept great moots in the behoof of their *Augustine, the Italian monk*, whom they call the *apostle of England*, and will needs have to be received and honoured *as a saint*, I have thought it therefore good, briefly and by the way, to note a few words touching the same.

It seemeth, they be much offended that so virtuous a man, and so holy a saint, should be charged with *pride* and *cruelty*: with *pride*, in so disdainfully despising his brethren, the bishops of this island of Britain: with *cruelty*, in procuring the death both of many thousands of Christian people, and also specially of the innocent and unarmed *monks* of Bangor<sup>3</sup>: and all this, for that they refused to receive him as their *metropolitan*, and to agree with him in certain small points of the *Roman religion*. Howbeit, his *pride* is well blazed by Beda, writing purposely of the same, in that he sat still in his throne, and disdained to rise up, and to give any token of reverence unto the seven

Beda, Septem Britan. episc. et plures viri doctissimi.

<sup>2</sup> [Supra vol. ii. p. 29, note <sup>13</sup>; and pp. 74, 75, with notes <sup>35</sup>, <sup>36</sup>, <sup>39</sup>; also vol. iv. 115, 116, 163.]

<sup>3</sup> [This charge does not seem to rest upon any sufficient foundation. It is true, that to the worthless testimony of Geoffry of Monmouth, referred to above, vol. iv. 164, bishop Jewel has here added other authorities; and if Gray's Chronicle is as he reports it, it justifies his view of the case. Still his statement is hardly satisfactory. If however he has fallen into error respecting the antiquities of the British church, he errs in common

with all our older writers, both before and after the Reformation; in fact it was not till Usher, Spelman, and Stillingfleet severally undertook this portion of our church history, that fable gave place to fact. Of late these errors have been more clearly refuted and corrected by the Rev. T. B. Pantin, (particularly in his learned edition of Stillingfleet's *British Churches*), to whom the Editor takes this opportunity of offering his acknowledgments for much valuable assistance in this part of bishop Jewel's works.]

bishops, and other learned and grave men of the Britons, making their appearance at his council. And therefore they said, they would not hearken to his demands, nor take him for their *archbishop*, as having otherwise of old an *archbishop* of their own, to whom they owed their obedience. Their words, as they are reported by Beda, were these: *Si modo nobis assurgere noluit, quanto magis, si ei subdi cœperimus, jam nos pro nihilo contemnet?* "If even now he disdain to rise up unto us, how much more will he despise us, and regard us as nothing, when we shall once be under his jurisdiction?"

Beda, lib. 2.  
cap. 2.

But to excuse this Augustine of shameful *cruelty*, lest he should seem to be accessory to the murdering of so many, and so by their own laws to be *irregular*, as a man of blood, they say, "He neither enkindled the war against the Britons, nor was present at the fight, but was dead long before." Which thing also they think may be proved by the express words of Beda. For thus he saith: *Quamvis ipso Augustino jam multo ante tempore ad cœlestia regna sublato*: "Notwithstanding Augustine himself, long before the time of this war, were taken up into the kingdom of heaven." For the truth and certainty hereof, it may please thee, good Christian reader, to understand, that these last words of Beda, concerning the death of Augustine, are manifestly forged, and have been violently thrust into the text by a guileful *parenthesis*, by them that sithence have been ashamed of his *cruelty*, and were never written by the *author*, as by evident proofs it shall plainly appear.

Beda, eod.  
loco.

But first of all, in an *old chronicle*, written in French above two hundred years past, by Thomas Gray<sup>3</sup>, ye shall find it recorded thus: "Augustine being thus refused of the bishops, and others the learned of the Britons, made such complaint thereof to Ethelbert<sup>4</sup> *the king of Kent*,

Tho. Gray.  
Augustine  
the inflamer  
of the war.

<sup>3</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 164, note 59. In the catalogue of archbishop Parker's library at C. C. C. there is a notice of a French work in MS. entitled, "Scala Cronica, incepta 1355," which is probably the work in question. The Editor is unwilling to delay the press, but

he will give an account of this work in the list of authors subjoined to the preface.]

<sup>4</sup> [Respecting the mistaking Ethelfrid for Ethelbert, vid. supra vol. iv. p. 165, note 60, and vol. ii. p. 66.]

that forthwith he levied his power, and marched against them, and slew them in most cruel wise, having" (as he saith) "no more regard of mercy than a wolf hath upon a sheep." Hereby it appeareth, that this Augustine was the inflamer of the war, and so the causer of the slaughter.

And whereas, by the words of Beda, as they be now commonly extant in the Latin, we are told this Augustine was dead long before the war began, it appeareth plainly by the *true* Beda indeed, translated above seven hundred years ago into the old English, or Saxon tongue, by Alfredus, or Aluredus, then king of this land, that the same Augustine was yet alive after the same war was ended; and that he afterward consecrated two bishops, Mellitus and Justus: Mellitus to be bishop of London, and Justus to be bishop of Rochester. Which things thus declared, it followeth orderly in the story, "*Then,*" (these wars being ended, and these bishops consecrated,) "*afterward died the beloved father Augustine.*" "*After the war he died,*" he saith, "*and not before,*" as they have sithence altered it in the Latin. I trow, M. Harding, ye are not so much amazed with the admiration of your Augustine, that ye will say he had power to consecrate bishops, and to use his archiepiscopal authority, being dead.

As for these words that we find reported by the *parenthesis* in the Latin, as written by Beda; (*Quamvis Augustino jam multo ante tempore ad caelestia regna sublato;*) forasmuch as they are quite contrary to the very course and order of the story, and specially for that they are not once touched in the *ancient Saxon translation*, sundry copies whereof at this present are extant, and to be seen, of such reverend antiquity, as may not justly be called in question; therefore we have good cause to judge, that the said words have been sithence forced and shifted in by some good skill and policy, lest Augustine, so holy a man, should be found guilty of so great a cruelty<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>5</sup> [The general opinion at present, on the authority of all the MSS., is, that the words are genuine; and that the absence of an equivalent in Alfred's Saxon version proves nothing, inasmuch as

similar omissions are observable in other parts of that work. See Smith's note in loc. in his edition of Bede, reprinted in Mr. Hussey's Oxford edition.]

The true story of Beda translated by king Alfred. Augustine alive in the time of the war.

## The abstract of Chronicles written.

The year of our Lord.	The year of Augustine's abode in England.	
596	1	This year Augustine arriveth in England, and afterward continueth archbishop of Canterbury fifteen years: <i>Polydorus</i> , lib. 4.
597	2	
598	3	
599	4	
600	5	
601	6	This year Augustine receiveth his pall.
602	7	
603	8	
604	9	This year Augustine consecrateth Mellitus bishop of London, and Justus bishop of Rochester: <i>Beda</i> , lib. 2. cap. 3.
605	10	This year the war was kept against the Britons, and the monks were slain at Bangor: <i>The Saxon Chronicle of Peterborough</i> . This selfsame year Augustine confirmed the king's charter granted to the monastery of St. Peter in Canterbury.
606	11	This year Augustine baptizeth ten thousand people in the water of Swale: <i>Ranulphus Cestren</i> .
607	12	
608	13	This year Augustine dieth, 7 <i>Calend. Junii</i> . <i>Matthæus Westmonasteriensis</i> .
609	14	
610	15	This year dieth Augustine, as it is written by <i>Polydore</i> , lib. 4. And therefore he was alive five years after the slaughter of the monks at Bangor.

Verily in the *old English chronicle* it is recorded, not only that this Augustine, the Italian monk, by his complaint caused the king of Kent to arm his people against the true and faithful Christians of the country, then being in Wales; or that he was alive at the time of the battle, but also that he was himself present in person, going toward

the same. The words be these: “Augustine came again, and told king Ethelbert that the Britons would not obey him. Wherefore the king was wroth, and sent to Elfred, *the king of Northumberland*, to come to help him to distress the Britons of Wales. *And (Augustine) the archbishop of Canterbury met with them at Leicester.* The king of Leicester at that time was called Brocvaie. He, being afraid of the two kings, fled out of the land, and came never again. And the two kings seized all his lands, and departed them between themselves. And afterward they went towards Wales. The Britons heard of them, and sent men to them in their shirts, and barefoot, to ask mercy. But they were so cruel, that they had of them no pity,” &c. Hereby it appeareth, that this Augustine not only enkindled this cruel war, but also was alive and present in the army.

Augustine  
alive, and in  
company  
with the  
kings march-  
ing towards  
the field.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ But to put both you and your friends quite out of doubt touching as well the truth hereof, as also the manifest and sensible corruption of your Beda, I will here shew you the copy of a charter granted by Ethelbert the king of Kent to the abbey of St. Peter in Canterbury, and confirmed by Augustine the black monk, and archbishop there, the self-same year when the slaughter of the monks, whereof we speak, was committed. Thus it beginneth:

<sup>6</sup> ✠ In nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi. *Omnem hominem, qui secundum Deum vivit, et remunerari a Deo sperat, et optat, oportet ut puris precibus consensum hilariter [suppl. et] ex animo præbeat: quoniam certum est, tanto facilius ea quæ ipse a Domino poposcerit, consequi posse, quanto et ipse libentius Deo aliquid concesserit.* Quocirca ego Ethelbertus Rex Cantiaë cum consensu venerabilis archiepiscopi Augustini, ac principum meorum, do et concedo Deo, in honore Sancti Petri, aliquam partem terræ

<sup>6</sup> [Two copies of this charter, (taken from the Cotton MSS.) one of which is nearly literal, will be found in the *Monasticon Anglicanum*, vol. i. p. 126, (ed. 1817.)

Jewel's copy seems to be compounded of both. The principal variations are marked above in brackets.]

*juris mei, quæ jacet in oriente civitatis Doroberniæ. Ita duntaxat, ut monasterium ibi construatur, et res quæ supra memorari, in potestate abbatis sit, qui ibi fuerit ordinatus. Igitur adjuro, et præcipio in nomine Domini Dei Omnipotentis, qui est omnium rerum judex justus, ut præfata terra subscripta donatione sempiternaliter sit confirmata, ita ut nec mihi, nec alicui successorum meorum, regum, aut principum, sive cujuslibet conditionis dignitatibus, et ecclesiasticis gradibus, de ea aliquid fraudare liceat. Si quis vero de hac donatione mea aliquid minuere, aut irritum facere temptaverit, sit in præsentem separatus a sancta communione corporis et sanguinis Christi, et in die judicii, ob meritum malitiæ suæ, a consortio sanctorum omnium segregatus. Circumcincta est hæc terra his terminis: in oriente ecclesia S. Martini: in meridie viæ Othburghat [al. via de Burgate]: in occidente et in aquilone Druting [al. Drutingestreto] in civitate [al. acta in civitate] Doroverni, in anno ab Incarnatione Christi DCV. indictione VIII. [al. VI.]*

✠ <sup>7</sup> Ego Ethelbertus rex Cantia, [al. Anglorum] sana mente, integroque consilio, donationem meam signo sanctæ crucis propria manu roboravi, confirmavique. Ego Augustinus, gratia Dei archiepiscopus, (testis consentiens) libenter subscripsi. Ego Eadbaldus regis [suppl. filius] favi. Ego Hemigisilus dux laudavi. Ego Hocca comes consensi. Ego Angemundus referendarius approbavi. Ego Graphio comes benedixi. Ego Tangisilus regis optimas confirmari. Ego Pinca consensi. Ego Geddi corroboraui.

This charter is extant, and may be seen under authentic seals: and another likewise bearing the same date and like inscription. Mark well the year of our Lord, M. Harding, and compare well the times. This charter, as it is plain and evident to the eye, was sealed and dated in the year of our Lord 605<sup>n</sup>. And the self-same year,

Annæ 605.

<sup>7</sup> [Monastic. Angl. vol. i. pp. 126, 127.]

<sup>n</sup> [It is singular, that the date and the seal, on which bishop Jewel in his day so naturally

relied, are the very grounds upon which a sounder criticism would argue *against* the genuineness of this charter. According to the authorities cited by bishop Stil-



as it appeareth by the Chronicle of Peterborough, the monks were slain, even the self-same year, I say, in which this charter was granted by the king, and confirmed by Augustine. Now, I beseech you, where is the credit of your vain story? How can it possibly be true, that your corrupted Beda saith: *Quamvis Augustino jam multo ante tempore ad caelestia regna sublato?* If Augustine were alive the self-same year, how can it be true, I say, that he was dead so long before? Do you not see manifest forgery with your eyes? Is not this corruption so gross, that ye may feel it with your fingers? If Augustine had been dead so long time, or so many years before, how could he confirm charters the same year present? Will you make him so holy a man, that he was able to write, and seal, and confirm charters, being dead? Your Beda, as he is by some of your side guilefully corrupted, saith: "Augustine was dead a great long while before the slaughter." But Augustine himself saith, he was alive the self-same year when the slaughter was made. And that he proveth not by conjectures and guesses, as you do often, but by sufficient record under the *king's great seal*. And I beseech you, what better evidence may be shewed? It was an easy matter, by interlarding a few words, to falsify the truth of a story: and there was good cause, in regard of your Augustine's credit, why ye should do 'it. But what cause can you imagine why any man in this point should corrupt and falsify the *king's great seal*? What gain could he have had therein? or what hope of gain? or if there had been cause never so great, yet what man could so easily have wrought it? Nay, Matthæus Westmonasteriensis, that wrote Flores Historiarum, saith, that "Augustine lived until the year of our Lord 608<sup>9</sup>:" and was alive three years

Matth. West-  
monasterien.  
[p. 208.]

lingfleet, (Orig. Britannicæ, Mr. Pantin's edit. p. 21,) the way of computation from the year of our Lord (though mentioned as early as A. D. 525, and shortly after that date used in private correspondence) was not introduced into public documents, even in England, much before the eighth century.

With respect to seals, although the evidence is conflicting, it seems certain that their use was very rare before the Norman conquest. See Stillington, pp. 26—31.]

<sup>9</sup> [According to Thorne's Canterbury Chronicle he died A. D. 605.]

after the monks were slain. If he were alive three years after the slaughter, how is it true that you say he was dead so long a while before the slaughter?

Now may it be your choice, M. Harding, whether ye will believe king Ethelbert and your Augustine himself under their own instruments and authentical seals, or else your story of Beda, manifestly corrupted and wrested quite from the original, as it is most easy to be seen. ➔

Therefore, M. Harding, it shall henceforth be good, both for you and for your fellows, not to adventure so rashly in judgment before ye know. Thus much briefly, as answer unto them, that so fain would have their Augustine acquitted of *pride* and *cruelty*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 2.*

Wherein they do much like to the *conjurors* and *sorcerers* nowadays, who, working with devils, use to say they have their books and all their holy and hid mysteries from Athanasius, Cyprian, Moses, Abel, Adam, and from the archangel Raphael; to the end, that their cunning being thought to come from such patrons and founders, might be judged the more high and holy. After the same manner, these men, because they would have their own religion, which they themselves, and that not long sithence, have brought forth into the world, to be the more easily and rather accepted of foolish persons, or of such as cast little whereabout they or others do go, they are wont to say they had it from Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostom<sup>9</sup>, from the apostles, and from Christ himself. Full well know they, that nothing is more in the people's favour, or better liketh the common sort, than these names.

<sup>9</sup> [The Lat. Apol. adds, "Ambrosius."]

M. HARDING.

Nay, sirs, yourselves may with more reason be likened to enchanters, necromancers, and witches. For as they say that they have their books and their mysteries from those doctors and first fathers, and from Raphael the archangel, but cannot shew the delivery thereof by any succession from hand to hand, as for example, who received the same from Raphael, from Adam, from Abel, &c., and who kept them from time to time: so ye say also, that ye have your gospel, and every part of your doctrine, from the apostles, from Christ, from the prophets, from the patriarchs, from heaven, from God's own bosom, who is Father of lights. But ye cannot shew us your lawful succession, by whom, and by whose preaching, as by hands, it came down along from Christ and his apostles unto you. <sup>a</sup> Where lay your sacramentary doctrine hidden between the time of your prophet Zuinglius, and your patriarch Berengarius? How, and by what delivery from hand to hand, continued the same those five hundred years? Shew us your succession. Where be your bishops? where be your churches <sup>10</sup>?.....

ames i. 17.

<sup>a</sup> It lay in the scriptures, and in the books of the holy fathers.

The doctrine which the catholics of our country hold and profess, <sup>b</sup> as well touching the blessed sacrament, as all other points of our faith, they have received it of their bishops, and they of their predecessors, by order until they reach to St. Augustine: St. Augustine received it of St. Gregory: <sup>b</sup> he of others before him, <sup>b</sup> and they all one of another by continual ascent unto St. Peter: who received it of Christ: Christ of God his Father. <sup>b</sup> And this doctrine we find taught and plainly set forth in the books that <sup>c</sup> St. Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, Cyprian, Dionyse, and the other holy fathers have left to the posterity. And so they be witnesses of the truth of the doctrine which our bishops have taught us.

<sup>b</sup> Untruths vain. Read the answer.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For all this is but a show of empty names, and nothing in them.

Preach ye, and cry ye out never so much, make so many laws in your parliaments as ye list, imbrue your swords in the blood of the catholic Christians, as ye cry for it in your pulpits, yet shall that rock, whereon we stay, be too hard for you. Neither shall ye ever be able to overthrow the catholic church builded thereupon. For certain we are, that neither all your power, nor hell gates, shall prevail against it.....

Matt. xvi.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Marcus Varro was wont to say: *Utile est civitatibus, ut se viri fortes, etiamsi falsum sit, ex diis genitos esse credant*: "It is very behoveful for cities and commonweals, that men of valiant courage believe themselves to be the

[Varro, inter Fragmenta, p. 195.]

<sup>10</sup> [Here occur some observations about Berengarius and Bertram.]

children of the gods, yea although indeed it be untrue." Unto which words St. Augustine addeth these: *Hæc sententia, cernis, quam latum locum aperiat falsitati*: "Ye see how large a scope this saying doth open to the maintenance of falsehood." Many vain men, to advance the nobility of their blood, have set their petite degrees, some from Achilles, some from Æneas, some from Hercules, and some from the *ark of Noe*. The heretic Dioscorus, to get some credit to his doctrine, would seem to bring the descent thereof from all the ancient fathers of the church.

August. de Civitate, lib. 3. cap. 4. [vii. 61.]

Concil. Chalced. act. 1. p. 767. [vi. 684.]

For thus he said in the open council: *Ego testimonia habeo sanctorum patrum, Athanasii, Gregorii, Cyrilli, in multis locis.....Ego cum patribus ejicior: ego defendo patrum dogmata: non transgredior in aliquo: et horum testimonia, non simpliciter, neque transitorie, sed in libris habeo*: "I have the witness of the holy fathers, Athanasius, Gregorius, Cyrillus, in many places. I am thrown forth with the fathers: I defend the fathers' doctrine: I swerve not from them in any point: I have their witness, not barely, nor by the way, but in their books<sup>11</sup>."

Concil. Chalced. act. 1. p. 792. [vi. 809.]

So said the heretic Eutyches: *Ego legi scripta beati Cyrilli, et sanctorum patrum, et sancti Athanasii*: "I have read the books of Cyrillus, of the holy fathers, and of Athanasius."

Concil. Chalced. act. 4. p. 877. [vii. 76.]

So said the heretic Carosus: *Ego secundum expositionem trecentorum decem et octo patrum, sic credo: sic baptizatus sum*: "Thus do I believe, and thus was I baptized, according to the exposition of the three hundred and eighteen fathers in the *council of Nice*." Thus the Arian heretics alleged the authority of the ancient father Origen: thus the Pelagian heretics alleged the authority of St. Augustine. As upon occasion it hath been said before.

Socr. lib. 4. cap. 21. [al. cap. 26. tom. II. 246.]

Even with such truth, M. Harding, are you wont to blaze the arms of your religion. There is no toy so vain or so fabulous, but ye are able by your cunning to bring it lineally either from Christ himself or from his apostles,

<sup>11</sup> [Bishop Jewel quotes from the editor has generally consulted Crabbe's edition of the councils; Mansi's edition.]

or from one or other of the ancient fathers. The bishop of Sidon, in the late diet of the empire holden at Augusta, Anno 1548. avouched openly, that ye had your whole *canon* from the apostles of Christ, word by word, even as it is peevisly written in your *mass books*. Andreas Barbatius proveth the antiquity of the *cardinals* of Rome by these words, written in the first book of the Kings: *Domini sunt cardines terræ: et posuit super eos orbem*: “The corners of the earth be the Lord’s: and upon them he hath set the world.” Abbot Panormitane saith: *Cardinalatus est de jure divino: . . . quia papa per sacerdotes Leviticos intelligit cardinales*: “The *cardinalship* standeth by the law of God: for the pope by the Levitical priests understandeth his *cardinals*.” Hosius seemeth to say, that *monks* have their beginning even from the *apostles*, meaning thereby, as one of your companions there doth, in favour, I trow, of religion, that *Christ himself was the abbot*. For thus he saith: *Christus dux, et exemplar vitæ monasticæ*: “Christ was the captain and samplar of monk’s life.” And yet the same man afterward, as having forgotten his former dream, utterly displaceth Christ, and giveth the whole honour hereof unto Elias and Elizæus. These be his words: *Elias et Elizæus duces instituti Benedictini*: “Elias and Elizæus were the captains of *St. Benet’s order*,” that is to say, they were *black monks*. By like wisdom ye would seem to fetch your *holy water* from Elizæus: your *cardinal’s hat* from St. Hierom: your *monk’s cowl* from St. Augustine. This was sometime a jolly good way to win credit, specially whiles, whatsoever ye said, the people was ready to give you ear. So the old Arcades said in commendation of their antiquity, that they were a day or two elder than the *moon*. Saturnus being in Italy, for that he was a stranger, and no man knew from whence he came, therefore was called *Filius Cæli*, and was thought to come from heaven. Romulus and Alexander, for that they were born in bastardy, and never knew their own fathers, therefore, to magnify the nobility of their blood, would be called the *children of the gods*: the one of Mars, the other of Jupiter.

Polyd. de Invent. lib. 4. cap. 7.

1 Sam. II. 8.

Extra, Qui filii sint legitimi, per Venerabilem Abb. [Panorm. tom. iii. pt. 2. fol. 47. col. 2. no. 19.]

Hosius In Confessione Petricovien. cap. 88. [fol. 112. B.]

Cop. Dialog. 2. p. 194. [in marg.]

Cop. Dialog. 2. p. 284. [in marg.]

προσεληναίοι.

Much hereof is alleged before.

With such truth and fidelity, M. Harding, your wont is to paint out all the parts and members of your doctrine. For be it never so vain or childish, or lately devised, yet ye bear us in hand, "that your predecessors received the same" (as you say) "of their bishops: and they of others their predecessors by order, until they reach to your Augustine the monk of Rome," whom ye have full worthily made a saint. "Your Augustine" (ye say) "received the same of Gregory: Gregory of others before him: and they all one of another by continual ascent unto St. Peter: and Peter of Christ: and Christ of God his Father." No *herald* could lightly have said more in the matter. I trow, ye would prove by this *ascent* and *descent*, that *God the Father* made *holy water* and said *mass*.

Indeed, as well herein, as also in your empty names of Augustine, Hierom, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, Cyprian, Dionyse, &c., as I told you once before, ye bring us only a vain show of painted boxes, and nothing in them. For in all these *holy fathers*, where find you either your *private mass*, or your *half communion*, or your *accidents without subject*, or the rest of your like vanities, wherewith ye have so long time deceived the world? Leave your dissimulation: set apart your conjectures and blind guesses: and for your credit's sake once shew us these things in the ancient holy fathers, and shew them plainly, and indeed, that we may think there is some weight in your word.

But your own *Gloss*, speaking of the ministration of the *holy communion*, which now in your churches in a manner is wholly abolished, saith thus: *Hoc antiquum est. Nam hodie videtur esse relictum* [suppl. *arbitrio*]: "This was the *old order*, that the people should receive together: for, as it seemeth, now it is left." Dr. Tonstall saith, it was no heresy to deny your *transubstantiation* before your late *council of Lateran*. Erasmus, whose judgment, I think, ye will not refuse, saith thus: *In synaxi transubstantiationem sero definivit ecclesia*: "In the holy ministration it was long and very late, ere the church determined the article of *transubstantiation*." All this notwithstanding, M. Harding, ye blush not to say, that both these and

De Con. dist.  
2. Peracta in  
Glos.

Cutb. Ton-  
stal. de Eu-  
charistia, lib.  
1. p. 45. l.  
46.]

Anno 1215.  
Eras. 1 Cor.  
vii. [p. 496.]

all other your phantasies have been conveyed unto you by most certain succession from hand to hand : from your English Augustine : from Gregory : from the fathers : from the apostles : from Christ : and from the bosom of God himself.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. *Divis.* 3.

[Vol. iv. p. 58.]  
 3  
 But how if the things which these men are so desirous to have seem *new*, be found of greatest *antiquity*? Contrariwise, how if all the things well-nigh, which they so greatly set out with the name of *antiquity*, having been well and thoroughly examined, be at length found to be but *new*, and devised of very late? Soothly to say, no man, that hath a true and right consideration, would think the Jews' laws and ceremonies to be *new* indeed, for all Haman's accusation. For they were graven in very ancient tables of greatest *antiquity*. And although many did take Christ to have swerved from Abraham and the old fathers, and to have brought in a certain *new religion* in his own name, yet answered he them directly <sup>12</sup>: "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me also. For my doctrine is not so *new* as you make it. For Moses, an author of greatest *antiquity*, and one to whom ye give all honour, hath spoken of me." St. Paul likewise, Though the *gospel of Jesus Christ* be of many counted to be but *new*, yet "hath it" (saith he) "a testimony most <sup>[Rom. iii. 21.]</sup> old, both of the law and of the prophets." As for our doctrine, which we may more rightly call *Christ's catholic doctrine*, it is so far off from *new*, that God, who is above all most ancient <sup>13</sup>, and the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, hath left the same unto us in the *gospel*, in the *prophets*, and *apostles'* works,

<sup>12</sup> [Apol. Lat. "vere."]  
 JEWEL, VOL. VI.

<sup>13</sup> [Apol. Lat. "Antiquus dierum."]  
 C

being monuments of greatest age. So that no man can now think our doctrine to be *new*, unless the same think either the prophets' faith, or the gospel, or else Christ himself to be *new*<sup>14</sup>.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 2. Divis. 1 and 2.*

[Vol. iv. p. 58.]

And as for their *religion*, if it be of so long continuance as they would have men ween it is, why do they not prove it so by the examples of the primitive church, and by the fathers and councils of old times? Why lieth so ancient a cause thus long in the dust, destitute of an advocate? Fire and sword they have had always ready at hand: but as for the old councils and fathers, all mum, not a word. They did surely against all reason, to begin first with these so bloody and extreme means, if they could have found other more easy and gentle ways<sup>15</sup>.

And if they trust so fully to *antiquity*, and use no dissimulation, why did John Clement, a countryman of ours<sup>16</sup>, but few years past, in the presence of certain honest men, and of good credit, tear and cast into the fire certain leaves of Theodoret, the most ancient father, and a Greek bishop, wherein he plainly and evidently taught, that the *nature of bread* in the communion is not changed, or abolished, or brought to nothing? And this did he of purpose, because he thought there was none other copy thereof to be found.

<sup>14</sup> [Half a page of Harding's "superfluous talk" is omitted.]

<sup>15</sup> [Harding here gives a list of authors, and then adds: "In the learned works of these men, it doth well appear what scriptures, fathers, and councils have been

brought for the catholic faith."]

<sup>16</sup> [John Clement, of C. C. C., a learned physician, Greek reader at Oxford, died in exile, A. D. 1572. See Wood's *Athenæ*. The charge mentioned above is alluded to supra vol. i. p. 85.]



M. HARDING.

.....Touching the matter ye have devised upon M. Clement, he doth not only deny it in word that ever he burnt or otherwise destroyed any leaf of Theodoritus, but also declareth by the whole order of his life, and by special regard and love he beareth to the tongue which that learned bishop wrote in, that he hath ever been, and yet is far from the will to burn or destroy any scrap, syllable, or letter of Greek, much more certain leaves of the learned father Theodoritus, where any such thing was written, as you imagine. Nay, will ye have the troth? In very deed he saith, and by such way as a godly and grave man may avouch a truth, protesteth, that he never had hitherto any part of that book, neither in Greek or in Latin in written hand.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This report was made in the presence and hearing of M. Peter Martyr, and sundry other learned men, of whom certain are yet alive. The reporter was both a learned man and a grave father, and not long sithence a *bishop* in England: who said he was present, and saw the thing done with his eyes. More to say hereof I am not able.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 2. Divis. 3.*

Why saith Albertus Pighius, that the ancient father St. Augustine had a wrong opinion of *original sin*? and that he erred and lied, and used *false logic*, as touching the case of *matrimony*, concluded after a vow made: which *matrimony* St. Augustine affirmeth to be perfect indeed, and that it may not be undone again, the vow and promise notwithstanding.

Dist. 27. Quidam.

Augustin. de Bono Viduit cap. 10. [vl. 375.]

M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup> We never took ourselves bound to any private opinion of whatsoever doctor. For all our faith is catholic, that is to say, universal, such as not one doctor alone, <sup>b</sup> but the universal number of doctors have taught, and Christian people have received. If in a secret point of learning, St. Augustine or St. Cyprian teach singularly, we follow them not. Much less do we bind ourselves to maintain whatsoever Albertus Pighius hath written. Our doctrine of original sin is to be read in the fifth session of

a M. Harding refuseth St. Augustine's authority.

b This untruth is over-cold and vain. For M. Harding well knoweth the substance of his doctrine standeth not by the doctors.

the late Tridentine council. If Pighius dissent from that, he Sub Paulo 3. dissenteth from us. But if he stand only upon some point not yet determined by the church, his opinion may be tolerated until the church define that question. When you note the point, (for there are many points in that doctrine,) then we will shew you further our mind therein.

c Promise made unto God without delivery. A folly of all follies.

d A vow made before the bishop or abbot is of more force than a vow made before God alone.

The marriage, which is made after a simple vow of chastity, standeth in his force, by reason that there is more in marriage than was in the bare vow. <sup>c</sup> For in the simple vow there is nothing but a promise made to God, without any deliverance of that thing which was promised. But in marriage the man and woman by present acceptation of each other's bond, do make the matter to extend beyond the nature of a promise. Therefore if likewise the vow made to God were not a simple promise, but also a delivering of the thing promised: then cannot the marriage following make void the vow, which was not only promised, but also performed. <sup>d</sup> The performance is, when he that voweth doth profess himself in the hands of his superior by taking the habit of some religion, or by receiving holy orders of the bishop. For in that solemn act he delivereth up all his own right and power, so that now he is not master of himself to give his body to any person in marriage or otherwise. You should know by the law of nature, if you would consider it, that if I promise a horse to one man, and afterward promise the same, and deliver him to another, that the second man is true lord of that horse, although I have done injury to him to whom I made the first promise. For the promise with the delivery is more vailable to transfer my right in the horse, than my promise alone. Even so it is a great sin to break a simple vow of chastity made to God.....

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Alb. Pighius, In 1 contro- versal. De Peccato Ori- ginali.

How lightly your captain-general, Albertus Pighius, weigheth the authority of St. Augustine, it may appear by his words. For thus he writeth: *Quod non solum incerta sed etiam falsa sit.....Augustini sententia, ita mihi demonstrari posse videtur*: "Thus methinketh I am able to prove that St. Augustine's judgment herein is not only uncertain, but also false." And again afterward in the conclusion: *Quod Augustini sententia non solum incerta, sed etiam certo falsa sit, satis mihi demonstratum videtur*: "That St. Augustine's judgment is not only uncertain, but also certainly false, methinketh I have sufficiently proved." And again: *Non multum me movet Augustini sententia: mihi non placet Augustini ea de re definitio et*

*sententia*: “St. Augustine’s judgment doth not greatly move me: I like not St. Augustine’s determination and judgment touching this matter.” And again: *Ego omnium, non solum adversariorum, sed etiam catholicorum receptas in scholis redarguo sententias*: “I do reprove the judgments, not only of our adversaries, but also of the catholics allowed in the schools.” For these causes Ruardus Tapper of Louvain, and Liriensis of Portugal, have namely written against Pighius<sup>17</sup>. And forasmuch as ye are desirous to have the point noted, wherein Pighius so much misliketh St. Augustine’s judgment, Dominicus a Soto<sup>18</sup>, your own doctor, noteth it thus: *Pighius de hoc male audit, quasi peccata in nobis originalia omnino inficietur*: “Pighius is ill reported of, as a man that utterly denieth original sin.” Thus your doctors weigh St. Augustine’s authority lighter or heavier as they list.

The matter of *marriage after a vow* is blown away with a silly distinction of a *vow simple* and a *vow double*, which ye commonly call a *solemn vow*: and all the same is substantially and clearly proved by “the promise and delivery of a horse.” For this example of all others liked you best. Surely, M. Harding, a very simple creature, and somewhat inferior to a *horse*, would hardly be tied to such distinctions. For the better clearing hereof, that ye call a *simple vow*, that is made before *God alone*: that *double* or *solemn*, that is made in the presence of the *bishop* or *abbot*. Now, it is plainly confessed by your own doctors, that your *simple vow*, be it never so *simple*, yet bindeth you as straitly before *God* as the *double*. For pope Cælestinus saith: *Votum simplex apud Deum non minus ligat, quam solenne*: “The *simple vow* before *God* bindeth no less than the *solemn*.” And touching the *promise and delivery of your horse*, Johannes Scotus saith: *Alia ratio est, quod vovens solenniter mittit in possessionem illum, cui vovet solenniter: vovens autem private, non: sed quasi promittit. Sed hæc ratio valet minus, quam secunda. Quia omnia,*

<sup>17</sup> [Zedler (Universal-Lexicon) states that this work of Pighius was placed by the Spanish inquisitors in the Index libr. prohibet.]

<sup>18</sup> [Originally bishop Jewel had

erroneously written “Petrus a Soto,” but in consequence of Harding’s animadversions he corrected it to Dominicus. Supra vol. iv. p. 119.]

Alb. Pighius, in eadem controversia.

Ruard. Tapper, Liriensis Episcop. Lusitanus.

Petrus [leg. Dominic.] a Soto, de Natura et Gratia. [p. 27.]

Extr. Qui clerici et voventes. Rursus. [lib. 4. tit. 6. cap. 6.]

Scotus in 4. Senten. Dist. 38. quæst. 1.

*quæ intrinseca sunt voto, ut votum respicit actum voluntatis, per quem obligat se vovendo et transfert dominium suum in alterum,.....omnia, inquam, ista sunt æqualia hinc inde. Igitur non magis datio hic, quam ibi: nec promissio ibi, quam hic:* “Another reason that they use is this: that he that maketh a *solemn vow* putteth him to whom he so voweth in possession. But so doth not he that maketh a *simple vow*: but only giveth his promise. This reason is worse and weaker than the second. For all things that be of the *substance of the vow*, (as a vow concerneth the act of the mind, whereby the mind bindeth itself by vowing, and transposeth the ownership of itself unto another,) *all these things, I say, are of like weight and equal of either side. Therefore there is no more performance of promise in the solemn vow than in the simple: nor more promise in the simple vow than in the solemn.*” Thus you see, M. Harding, with great travail and much ado, ye have found a difference without difference. Cardinal Cajetan saith: *Ejusdem speciei est transgressio voti solennis et simplicis: et differunt solum secundum magis grave, et minus grave:* “The breaking of a *vow simple* and a *vow solemn* is of one kind or nature: and the difference is only in more grievous and less grievous,” that is, that the one is more grievous and offensive than the other.

Therefore Thomas of Aquine himself, the first father, as it appeareth, of this distinction, saith thus: *Videtur, quod ecclesia possit dispensare in voto continentie solennizato per susceptionem sacri ordinis:* “It seemeth, that the church may dispense with a vow of chastity solemnized by the receiving of holy orders.”

And this is it that St. Augustine saith: *Qui dicunt talium nuptias, non esse nuptias, sed potius adulteria, mihi non videntur satis acute, ac diligenter considerare, quid dicant:* “They that say the marriage of such men or women” (as have vowed chastity) “is no marriage at all, but rather advoutery,” (as M. Harding and his fellows have said,) “seem unto me not to consider discreetly or advisedly what they say.” Thus, therefore, M. Harding, notwithstanding your *simple* or *double vow*, St. Augustine saith unto you, “Ye speak unadvisedly and indiscreetly, and

Cajetan. in Thom. Secund. Secundæ. qu. 88. art. 7.

Augustin. de Bono Viduitat. cap. 10. [vi. 375.]

understand not what you say." But of this whole matter we have entreated before more at large.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis.* 4.

Also, when they did of late <sup>16</sup> put in print the ancient father Origen's work upon the *Gospel of St. John*, why left they quite out the whole sixth chapter, wherein it is likely, yea rather of very surety, that the said Origen had written many things concerning the sacrament of the *holy communion* contrary to these men's minds, and would rather put forth that book mangled than full and perfect, for fear it should reprove them and their partners of their error? Call ye this trusting to *antiquity*, when ye rent in pieces, keep back, maim and burn the ancient fathers?

Liber hodie  
extat et cir-  
cumfertur  
mutilus.

M. HARDING.

A wise man affirmeth no more than he knoweth: a good man no more than standeth with charity: a learned man, in matters of weight, no more than he can avouch by evident <sup>a</sup> reasons, <sup>a</sup> sure proofs, or <sup>a</sup> sufficient authorities. This defender charging the catholics with mangling of Origen upon St. John's Gospel, as though of purpose they had left out the sixth chapter, which he imagineth to contain their sacramentary doctrine contrary to the catholic faith: forasmuch as he is uncertain hereof, and thereby noteth a great untruth in the setters forth of that work, neither by any means is able to prove the same: he sheweth himself a fool, a slanderer, and an unlearned man. We are like, I perceive, to hear of the faults they know by us, sith that they burden us with that they know not, and for the same can pretend but a slender conjecture. But, sir defender, why complain you not of the leaving out of other chapters and parts of that work, as well as of the sixth chapter? For whereas Origen wrote upon John nine and thirty tomes, as St. Hierom witnesseth: the Latin translation printed in Venice hath but thirty-two, lacking the seven last tomes. Neither be all they whole and perfect, but many of them maimed and mangled.....<sup>17</sup>

a Hereby M.  
Harding  
shaketh  
much the  
credit of his  
own learn-  
ing.

What manner a doctrine of the blessed sacrament he hath

<sup>16</sup> [As the date of this edition is not given, it is difficult to ascertain the grounds for this charge.]

translated so much as came to his hands, sent, says Harding, all over Europe to perfect the copies.]

<sup>17</sup> [Ambrose Ferrerius, who

[Vol. iv. p. 59.]

In prologo  
39. Hom. Ori-  
gen. in Luc.

uttered upon the sixth chapter of John, and how catholic he was in that point, it appeareth by divers his other works, that you have no cause to belie him, in that you never saw. For the truth of Christ's body in the sacrament, his testimonies be evident. For credit's sake here will I recite a couple. In one place he saith thus: "Ye know, which have been wont to be present at the divine mysteries, how that when ye take the body of our Lord, ye keep it with all wariness and reverence, that no whit thereof fall down, that nothing of the consecrated gift miscarry. For ye believe yourselves to be guilty, and right well do ye so believe, if by negligence ought fall down." In another place, writing upon the centurion's words spoken to Christ, Matt. viii: "When" (saith he) "thou takest that holy meat, and that uncorrupt dainty, when thou enjoyest that bread and cup of life, thou eatest and drinkest the body and blood of our Lord, then our Lord entereth under thy roof....."

Hom. 13.  
Exod. [ii.  
176.]

Hom. 5. in di-  
versos Evan-  
gel. locos.  
[ed. Prob. II.  
518.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We lay not in the mangling of this ancient father, as matter of sufficient evidence, but only as a great conjecture of your corruption, referring the judgment thereof unto the reader. Certainly, M. Harding, we have good cause many ways to doubt your dealing: but in nothing more than in the handling of the fathers. Ye remember, how wickedly pope Zosimus, the better to colour his ambition, long sithence corrupted the Nicene council. Neither can ye forget, what trifles and fabulous vanities ye have lately sent us abroad under the old smoky names of Abdias, Leontius, Amphilocheus, Hippolytus, and Clemens, whom ye so solemnly call the *apostles' fellow*. In these uncleanly conveyances to any wise man there can appear no simple meaning. Notwithstanding, ye thought it good policy to deceive the world by any shift or shadow of ancient fathers.

What Origen thought of the words of Christ in the sixth chapter of St. John, it is easy to conjecture by that he hath written otherwheres. Upon the Leviticus he writeth thus: *Est et in evangelio [al. evangelii] litera quæ occidit [al. occidat]:.....Si enim secundum literam sequaris illud [al. hoc ipsum] quod dictum est, Nisi comederitis carnem Filii hominis, &c. ea litera occidit*: "Even in the gospel there is a letter that killeth: for whereas Christ

Concil. Afri-  
can. cap. 105.  
[l. c. 101. tom.  
iv. p. 513. a.]

Origen. in  
Levit. hom.  
7. [ll. 225.]

saith, ‘ *Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man,*’ &c. if ye take the same according to the letter, that letter killeth.” This was Origen’s judgment of the sacrament: and the same in those days was counted catholic.

Ye reply, Origen saith: “ When ye take the body of our Lord, ye keep it with all wariness and reverence, that no part thereof fall down.” And again: “ When thou takest that holy meat, then our Lord entereth under thy roof<sup>18</sup>.” Both these places, in my former Reply, are fully answered. But what catholic doctrine, M. Harding, can ye pick out of these words? what *transubstantiation*? what *real presence*? what *accidents without subject*? Ye will say, Origen calleth the sacrament *Christ’s body*. So doth Christ himself: so doth Paul: so do all the *ancient fathers*: so do we ourselves, because it is the *sacrament of Christ’s body*. Your own Gloss saith, as it hath been often alleged: *Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat corpus Christi*: “ It is called the body of Christ, that is to say, It signifieth the body of Christ.” *But the people* (ye say) *received it warily, and with reverence*. So do they now, even in those churches that you most dislike withal.

He saith further: “ *When thou receivest that holy meat, then our Lord entereth under thy roof.*” And what great matter think you to win hereby? Even in the same place Origen saith: *Intrat etiam nunc Dominus sub tectum credentium duplici figura, vel more*: “ Even now the Lord entereth under the roof of the faithful after two manners or sorts. For when the holy and godly bishops enter into your house, even then through them our Lord entereth.” Will ye conclude hereof, that the *bishop* is transubstantiated into Christ? or, that Christ is *really* and *substantially* dwelling in him? This is an allegory, M. Harding, or a mystical kind of speech, wherein, as you know, that learned father was much delighted. The *roof* that he meaneth is not material, but spiritual: that is to say, not

<sup>18</sup> [Supra vol. iii. p. 38. The rious. Vid. supra vol. ii. p. 405. Hom. in diversos locos are spu- note<sup>1</sup>.]

the body of man, but the soul: like as also the coming or entering of Christ into the same is not bodily, but only spiritual.

Aug. Quæst.  
Evang. lib. 2.  
cap. 33. [iii.  
pt. 2. 260.]

So St. Augustine saith: *Prædicant Christum, et eum annuntiando venire faciunt in exhausta fame viscera filii esurientis*: "They preach Christ, and by preaching, cause him to come into the bowels of the hungry child, wasted with famine." Likewise again he saith of the centurion:

Aug. de Tem-  
pore, serm.  
74. [v. 423.]

*Tecto non recipiebat Christum: corde recipiebat* [al. *recepit*]: *quanto humilior, tanto capacior, tanto plenior*: "He received not Christ into his house: he received him into his heart: the more humble, the more room had he to receive him, and the fuller he was." So saith Chry-

Chrysost. in  
Psal.

sostom: *Qui vocant David cum cythara, intus Christum per ipsum vocant*: "They that call in David with his harp, by mean of him call in Christ." Again he saith:

Chrysost. in  
Matt. hom.  
46. in Opere  
Imperf. [vi.  
app. 197.]

*Christus aut suscipitur, aut occiditur apud nos. Si enim credimus verbis ejus, suscipimus eum, et generamus in nobis*: "Christ either is received or slain within us. For if we believe his word, we receive him, and beget him within us." In such sort St. Hierom writeth unto Paula:

Hieronymus  
ad Paulam, de  
obitu Blesil-  
læ. [iv. pt. 2.  
59.]

*Ad talem clemens ingreditur Jesus, et dicit, Quid ploras? Non est mortua puella, sed dormit*: "Into such a one Jesus entereth mild and gracious, and saith, 'Why weepest thou? Thy damsel is not dead, but lieth asleep.'"

This manner of speech, as I said before, is *spiritual* or *mystical*, and may not be taken according to the outward sound of the *letter*. So saith St. Hierom: *Secundum mysticos intellectus quotidie Jesus ingreditur in templum Patris*: "According to the *mystical* understanding, Christ entereth daily into the temple of his Father." In this sense Origen saith, *Christ entereth into our house*. Which phrase, writing upon St. Matthew, he expresseth in plainer manner: . . . . *Tradunt et ejiciunt ab anima sua Salvatorem, et verbum veritatis quod erat in eis*: "They betray and throw forth our Saviour from out of their soul," (as do all apostates and renegades that deny the known truth of God,) "and they betray the word of truth that was within them." All this we grant, M. Harding: and all this may

Hieron. in  
Matt. lib. 3.  
cap. 21. [iv.  
97.]

Origen. in  
Matt. tract.  
35. [iii. 895.]



stand without either your *transubstantiation* or your *real presence*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 3. Divis. 1. and 2.*

It is a world to see, how well favouredly, and how towardly, touching religion, these men agree with the fathers, of whom they use to vaunt they be their own good<sup>18</sup>.

The old *council Eliberine* made a decree, *that nothing that is honoured of the people should be painted in the churches*<sup>19</sup>.

M. HARDING.

The words of that provincial council be these: "It is thought good, that paintings be not in the church: that what is worshipped or adored, it be not painted on walls." This express prohibition of painting, and that nought be painted in church walls that is worshipped or adored, may seem both to presuppose a former use of such paintings, and also to allow the other sort of images. Whether it do or no, <sup>a</sup>it forceth not greatly. The seventh general council, assembled at Nice against the image-breakers, hath not only allowed the <sup>b</sup>devout use of images commonly used in the churches of Christian people, but also condemned all those that throw them down, and maintain the contrary opinion. Now we are taught that a provincial council ought to give place to a general.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The painting of *images* in church walls was forbidden in the *council* holden at Eliberis, or Granado, in Spain: *ergo*, say you, *such images were used before that council*. All this may well be granted without prejudice. But ye see plainly they were forbidden in that *council*. One saith: *Ex malis moribus bonæ leges ortæ sunt*: "Of ill manners came good laws." *Men used (ye say) before that time to paint images in church walls*. But this use was naught.

<sup>18</sup> [Apol. Lat. "suos." Harding's observations are omitted as not worth quoting.]

<sup>19</sup> [Concil. Eliber. can. 36.

"Placuit picturas in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur."]

[Concil. Eliberit. Mansi, tom. ii. 11.]

<sup>a</sup> It forceth not greatly.

<sup>b</sup> Devout use of images.

[Vol. iv. p. 59.]

Eliber. Concil. cap. 36. [Mansi, ii. 11.]

And therefore the *council* decreed against it: and that, as it may be gathered by the words, for fear of *idolatry*.

But you say, "The second general Nicene council allowed well the devout use of images." And a *general council* ought to take place before a *provincial*: for that in a *general council* there are many bishops; in a *provincial* there are but few. Thus, I see, ye weigh your religion not by *truth*, but by *company*. Howbeit, this rule is very loose, and may soon deceive you.

Good Christian reader, let no man beguile thee by the colour of *councils*. Read this *second Nicene council* throughout, if thou be able. Thou wilt say, there was never any assembly of Christian bishops so vain, so peevish, so wicked, so blasphemous, so unworthy in all respects to be called a *council*. The blessed *bishops* there agreed together with one consent, that *images* in churches are not only to be allowed, but also *devoutly and reverently to be honoured, and that with the same honour that is due to God himself*.

Conc. Nicen.  
2. act. 2. [xii.  
1087.]

One of them saith: *Venerandas imagines recipio, et adoro, et id perpetuo docebo*: "I receive and worship the reverend images, and this will I teach while I live." Another

Conc. Nicen.  
2. act. 4. [xii.  
1090.]

Scilicet Elias,  
Cretæ episc.

saith: *Sacras imagines perfecte adoro: qui vero secus confitentur, eos anathematizo*: "I do perfectly adore the holy images: and I accurse all them that hold the contrary."

Scilicet Joh.  
locum-tenens  
episc. Orientalium.  
[xiii. 72. d.]

Another saith: *Non sunt duæ adorationes, sed una, ipsius imaginis, et primi exemplaris, cujus est imago*: "There be not two kinds of *adoration*, but one only, due as well to the *image* as to the pattern of the *image* <sup>20</sup>." *This holy council* (ye say) *decreed against image-breakers*: but the *counsel of God* decreeth against *image-worshippers* and *image-makers*.

Aug. de Con-  
sensu Evang.  
lib. 1. cap. 10.  
[iii. pt. 2. 8.]

St. Augustine saith: *Sic omnino errare meruerunt, qui Christum et apostolos ejus non in sanctis codicibus, sed in pictis parietibus quæsierunt. Nec mirum, si a pingentibus fingentes decepti sunt*: "So were they worthy to be de-

<sup>20</sup> [These words are used by Johannes locum-tenens episcoporum Orientalium, as his deduction from a passage which he cites from

St. Basil: ὅθεν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέδει-  
ξεν οὐ δύο προσκυνήσεις, ἀλλὰ μίαν  
εἶναι καὶ τῆς εἰκόνος καὶ τοῦ ἀρχε-  
τύπου οὐ ἔστιν ἡ εἰκὼν.]

ceived, that sought Christ and his apostles not in the books of holy scripture, but in painted walls. Neither may we marvel, if feigners by painters were deceived."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 3.*

The old father Epiphanius saith: "*It is an horrible wickedness, and a sin not to be suffered, for any man to set up any picture in the church of the Christians, yea though it were the picture of Christ himself*<sup>21</sup>." Yet these men store all their temples, and each corner of them, with painted and carved images, as though without them religion were nothing worth.

Epiphan. in Epist. ad Joh. episcop. Hierosolym. [Inter opp. Hieronym. tom. iv. pt. 2. 828.]

M. HARDING.

To that ye pretend to allege out of Epiphanius, we say, first, that although he were of the mind you make him to be of, and said as you report of him, yet is he but one man, whose singular opinion is not to be preferred before the <sup>a</sup> judgment of all other so many excellent fathers, and the determination of the whole church. <sup>b</sup> Now indeed you misreport Epiphanius. For he saith not so as you write. He calleth not the having of the image of Christ, or of any saint in the church, an horrible wickedness, or a sin not to be suffered: he hath no such words.

a Untruth. For the ancient fathers make no mention of images.

b Untruth. For we report him truly, as shall appear.

Secondly, what if we say this place maketh nothing at all against the use of images, and that <sup>c</sup> he speaketh never a word against the image of Christ or his saints in the church, but only against one particular image, which he found hanging at a church door in a village of Palestine called Anablatha? And seeing he <sup>d</sup> speaketh not generally against all images, but against such as that was, which there he noteth by this special word *istiusmodi vela*, "veils of this sort:" he giveth us to understand, that he misliked some quality or circumstance of that one image, and not reproved the <sup>e</sup> common and received custom of the church in having images in due order. Now what circumstance that was, it dependeth of so many particularities, which might happen either on the image's part, as it is most like, or on the people's part there inhabitant, and is so little declared by Epiphanius in that place, that neither we can say any thing determinately thereof, nor ye should bring such an obscure and uncertain matter to the disproof of a verity always so well in the church acknowledged and practised<sup>22</sup>.....

c Untruth. For his words be plain: *Imaginem, quasi Christi, aut sancti cujusdam.*

d A childish and a vain shift. For Epiphanius speaketh directly against all images.

e Untruth. For images then were not commonly received in the church.

<sup>21</sup> [Supra vol. iii. p. 223, note former Answer. See the Replie, art. 14. supra vol. iii. p. 222.]

<sup>22</sup> [Harding here refers to his

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O how many and how pretty shifts here be devised, if any would help to serve the purpose! One of the late *Copus, dial. 5. p. 692.* *Lovanian clergy*, for that he saw these words were clear, and might not be avoided by any gloss, therefore he thought it the wisest way, first, to bring the authority and credit hereof in question, and to say, that *Epiphanius never* 1.  
*wrote any such epistle.* Next he saith: “*The same epistle* 2.  
*was never translated by St. Hierom:*” but forasmuch as he saw that his folly herein was open, and easy to be controlled, thirdly he saith, that the *image* that Epiphanius 3.  
 rent in sunder was not the *image* either of *Christ* or of any *Christian saint*, but the *heathen image of Jupiter*, or *Hercules*, or some other idol, he knoweth not what. Fourthly, 4.  
 he saith: “*The said holy father Epiphanius was an heretic* 23,” one of those that were called *Anthropomorphitæ*, whose error was, that God in his divinity had the whole shape and proportion of a man. Howbeit, this folly far passeth all the rest. For it behoved those *heretics*, most of all others, for defence of their error, to maintain *images*. And yet it seemeth a very uncivil part to condemn so reverend and so godly a father of so gross an *heresy* without proof: and specially such a father as hath so learnedly written against all *heresies*. Fifthly, he saith, even as 5.  
*M. Harding* here saith, “*Epiphanius was but a man, and one man, and his judgment singular, and therefore the less to be esteemed.*” Last of all he saith, “*The same holy* 6.  
*father Epiphanius was a Jew:*” and being a Christian, and a reverend father, and a Christian bishop, yet notwithstanding maintained the religion of the Jews, and therefore rent in sunder the *image of Christ*, in despite of Christ. And for proof hereof he allegeth Simeon Metaphrastes, a doctor as wise as himself.

M. Harding, for that he imagined these shifts were very

23 [Or rather he insinuates that “*resis Anthropomorphitarum.*” He does not say who the words: “*Non ignoro alios resis*” “others” were.]  
 “*spondere suspectum fuisse hæ-*

Simeon Metaphrastes.  
 [ap. Sur. iii. 181.]

unsavoury, and would hardly serve, therefore hath devised to convey himself out some other way. First he saith: we falsify this holy father, and allege his words otherwise than they be. Secondly he saith: "It was not the image of Christ that Epiphanius found painted in the veil," but some other pretty thing, he knoweth not what. Lastly he saith: "Epiphanius reproveth not generally all such veils so painted, but only that one veil that he found."

For trial hereof I refer myself to the original. The words thereof be these: *Inveni ibi velum pendens in foribus ejusdem ecclesie, tinctum atque depictum, et habens imaginem, quasi Christi, aut sancti cujusdam. Non enim satis memini cujus imago fuerit. Cum ergo hoc vidissem in ecclesia Christi, contra auctoritatem scripturarum, hominis pendere imaginem, scidi illud, et magis dedi consilium custodibus ejusdem loci, ut pauperem mortuum eo obvolverent, et efferrent, &c. Quæso [l. Precor] ut jubeas presbyteros ejusdem loci præcipere, in ecclesia Christi istiusmodi vela, quæ contra religionem nostram veniunt, non appendi: decet enim honestatem tuam hanc magis habere sollicitudinem, ut scrupulositatem tollat, quæ indigna est ecclesia Christi, et populis qui tibi crediti sunt:* "I found there a veil hanging at the entry of the church, stained and painted, and having the *image*, as it were, of Christ, or of some saint. For whose picture it was indeed I do not remember. Therefore, when I saw the *image of a man to hang in the church of Christ, contrary to the commandment of the scriptures*, I tare it in sunder, and gave counsel to the wardens of that church, that they should wind and bury some poor body in it, &c. I beseech you, charge the priests of that place, that they give commandment that such veils as be *contrary to our religion* be no more hanged up in the church of Christ. It behoveth your reverence to have care hereof that this *superstition, unmeet for the church of Christ*, and unmeet for the people to thee committed, be removed." Now judge you, M. Harding, wherein we have falsified this learned father's words. You say, "He speaketh not one word against the image of Christ or his saints." I beseech you then, against what

Epiphanius  
ad Johan.  
Hierosolym.  
Apud Hieron.  
tom. 2. [ed.  
Ben. tom. iv.  
pt. 2. 828.]

Habens im-  
aginem, quasi  
Christi, vel  
sancti cujus-  
dam.

other *image* speaketh he? Epiphanius saith plainly: "*It had the image, as it were, of Christ, or of some saint.*" You say, "He found fault with that veil only, and not with any other." Once again, I beseech you, tell us what had the *image of Christ, or of his saints*, offended Epiphanius more than other images? If the *image of Christ* may not be suffered in the *church of Christ*, what *image* then may be suffered? What cause of difference can you imagine, that any other veils should be allowed rather than this? Your answer is this: "We cannot say any thing determinately thereof." Whereby it appeareth ye would fain say somewhat, if ye wist what. Yet must we be overruled by all and every such your *determinations*, yea although you yourself confess ye can *determinately determine nothing*.

Notwithstanding, the ancient fathers of the church have long sithence *determinately* and plainly judged against you. Lactantius saith in plain words: *Non est dubium, quin religio nulla sit, ubicunque simulachrum est*: "Determinately and out of all doubt there is no religion, where-soever there is an *image*." Tertullian saith: *Idolum tam fieri, quam coli Deus prohibet. Quanto præcedit, ut fiat quod coli possit, tanto prius est, ne fiat, si coli non licet.*—*Facio, ait quidam, sed non colo: quasi ob aliquam causam colere non audeat, nisi ob quam et facere non debeat: scilicet, ob Dei offensam utrobique. Imo tu colis, qui facis ut coli possit*: "God hath forbidden an *image* or an *idol* as well to be made as to be worshipped. As far as making goeth before worshipping, so far is it before, that the thing be not made that may not be worshipped. Some man will say, I make it, but I worship it not: as though he durst not to worship it for any other cause but only for the same cause for which he ought not to make it. I mean both ways for God's displeasure. Nay rather thou worshippest the *image*, that givest the cause for others to worship it."

Therefore St. Augustine, speaking of the *image of God the Father*, saith thus<sup>24</sup>: *Tale simulachrum Deo fingere*

Aug. de Fide  
et Symbolo,  
cap. 7. [vi.  
157.]

<sup>24</sup> [S. August. "Tale simula- "in templo collocare, multo magis  
"chrum Deo nefas est Christiano "in corde, nefarium est &c."]

[leg. collocare] nefarium est: "To devise such an image for God, it is abominable."

Theodorus [leg. Theodotus] the bishop of Ancyra saith: *Sanctorum imagines et species ex materialibus coloribus formari, minime decorum putamus. Manifestum enim est, quod vana sit hujusmodi cogitatio, et diabolicæ deceptionis inventum*: "We think it not convenient to paint the images of saints with material or earthly colours. For it is evident, that this is a vain imagination, and the procurement of the deceitfulness of the devil."

To like purpose writeth Epiphanius: *Estote memores, dilecti filii, ne in ecclesias imagines inferatis, neque in sanctorum cœmiteriis eas statuatis. Sed perpetuo circumferte Deum in cordibus vestris. Quinetiam, neque in domo communi tolerantur. Non enim fas est, Christianum per oculos suspensum teneri, sed per occupationem mentis*: "My dear children, be ye mindful, that ye bring no images into the churches, and that ye erect up none at the burials of the saints. But evermore carry God in your hearts. Nay, suffer not images to be, no not in your private houses. For it is not lawful to lead a Christian man by his eyes, but rather by the study or exercise of his mind."

For this cause Epiphanius saith, "The superstition of images is unfit for the church of Christ."

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 4.

The old fathers Origen and Chrysostom exhort the people to read the *scriptures*, to buy them books, to reason at home betwixt themselves of divine matters: *wives* with their *husbands*, and *parents* with their *children*. These men condemn the *scriptures as dead elements*, and, as much as ever they may, bar the people from them.

M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup> Partly it is true, partly false, that you say. Origen exhorteth all to resort to the churches in the holy days, and there to hear the words of God: and thereof afterward to think earnestly, and to meditate on the law of God, and to exercise their

a Untruth. For the whole hereof is true: and no part false.

minds in it day and night, in the way, in their house, in their bed, and when they rise. This hold we withal, and be desirous the <sup>b</sup> people bear away that the true and godly preachers teach them in the church, and that they think of it, and put it in daily practice of life. For else to what serveth all our preaching?

<sup>b</sup> O vain excuse! Many of your people never hear sermon in all their lives.

Chrysostom, Hom. 2. in Matth., speaketh against them which contemned the scriptures, and said they were no monks, but had wives, and children, and care of household. As though it pertained not to married men to read any part thereof, but to monks only.....

If in our time the people might be induced to read the holy scriptures with such minds, for such causes, to such intents and purposes only as Chrysostom requireth, God forbid we should by any means stay them therefrom. <sup>c</sup> But considering the manner of our time, and calling to due examination the curiosity, the temerity, the unreverence, the contempt of all holy things, that now all men may espy in the people; if we think it not good they be admitted to the reading of the scriptures freely, and without any limitation, howsoever you and your fellows judge of us, we doubt not of the account we have to make of that our meaning before our Lord's dreadful seat of judgment... Now to conclude, we tell you, that you have misreported both Chrysostom and specially Origen. For howsoever they speak of the reading and meditation of the scriptures, for amendment of life, verily in the places by you quoted <sup>d</sup> they exhort not the people to reason and dispute of divine matters among themselves, specially the husbands with their wives, the parents with their children, as you say they do.....

<sup>c</sup> M. Harding's favourable opinion of the people.

<sup>d</sup> Manifest untruth. Read the answer.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Forasmuch as ye say, "Part hereof is true, and part false," I trust ye will give us leave freely to use the *truth*, until ye shall find yourself better able to prove the *falsehood*. It seemeth not greatly to mislike you, that the people have some little liberty to read some such part of the *scriptures* as you may best spare them, for the ordering of their lives. Whereby it appeareth, that for quieting of their consciences in matters of religion and causes of truth, ye think it best they read nothing. And this (ye say) ye are able to answer before the dreadful seat of God's judgment. Touching the truth hereof, to say so much as might be said, it would require great waste of time <sup>25</sup>. St. Augustine saith: *Si desit, aut ignoretur, qua*

Augustin. de Civitat. lib. 11. cap. 2. [vil. 273.]

<sup>25</sup> [See this subject treated in the Replie, Art. 15, supra vol. iii. 263.]



*eundum sit, quid prodest nosse, quo eundum sit?* “If ye have not, or know not what way to go, what shall it profit you to know whither to go?” St. Hierom saith: *Ut majus est voluntatem Domini facere, quam nosse, ita prius est nosse, quam facere. Illud merito præcedit: hoc ordine:* Hieron. ad Demetriad. de Virginit. tuend. [tom. v. 17.]

“As it is more to do the will of our Lord than to know it: so the knowledge of the same goeth before the doing. In goodness, doing goeth before: in order, knowing<sup>26</sup>.”

Again St. Augustine saith: *.....Si scripturas divinas aut non legimus ipsi, aut legentes alios non libenter audimus, ipsa nobis medicamenta convertuntur in vulnera: et inde habebimus judicium, unde potuimus habere remedium:* Augustin. de Tempore, serm. 55. [v. app. p. 249.]

“If we either read not the *scriptures* ourselves, or be not desirous to hear others read them, *then are our medicines turned into wounds: and then where we might have had remedy, we shall have judgment*<sup>27</sup>.” Such sayings are common and ordinary in St. Chrysostom. Thus he saith:

*Librum divinum accipiat aliquis in manum: convocatisque proximis, per divina eloquia riget et suam mentem, et convenientium, ut sic diabolicas insidias effugere valeamus:* Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 6. [iv. 48.]

“Let one of you take in hand the *holy book*: and let him call his neighbours about him: and by the *heavenly words* let him water and refresh both their minds and also his own.” Again he saith: *Poterimus et domi versantes, ante et post convivium, acceptis in manus divinis libris, utilitatem inde capere, et spiritualem cibum animæ præbere:*

“Being at home, we may, both *before and after meat*, take the *holy books* in hand, and thereof receive great profit, and minister spiritual food unto our soul.” And again: *Etiam* Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 10. [iv. 81.]

“Being at home, we may, both *before and after meat*, take the *holy books* in hand, and thereof receive great profit, and minister spiritual food unto our soul.” And again: *Etiam*

*domi vacemus divinarum scripturarum lectioni:* Chrysost. in Genes. hom. 29. [iv. 281.]

“Even when we be at home, let us bestow our time in reading the *scriptures*<sup>28</sup>.”

<sup>26</sup> [This epistle to Demetrias (not to be confounded with that in vol. iv. of the Bened. edit.) is declared by Erasmus not to be genuine, though eloquent and learned. The Ben. edd. place it amongst the spurious works in vol. v.]

<sup>27</sup> [The Bened. edd. have placed this sermon in the appendix, as

having been erroneously attributed to St. Augustine. They rather assign it to Cæsarius.]

<sup>28</sup> [S. Chrysost. [iv. p. 281.] Προσέχειν τῇ τῶν θείων γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει, μὴ μόνον ἐπειδὴν ἐνταῦθα παραγίνησθε, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἰκαδὲ μετὰ χεῖρας λαμβάνειν τὰ θεία βιβλία κ. τ. λ.]

Origen. in  
Esai. hom. 2.  
[iii. 109.]

Origen saith: *Utinam omnes faceremus illud quod scriptum est, Scrutamini scripturas*: “Would God we would all do accordingly as it is written, *Search the scriptures.*”

But ye say: “We have misreported both Chrysostom and Origen. For they exhort not the people” (as you say) “to reason of divine matters among themselves, specially the husbands with their wives,” &c. Whether of us both maketh truer report, let us be tried by Chrysostom. Thus

Chrysost. in  
Johan. hom.  
2. [viii. 16.]  
Chrysost. in  
Matt. hom.  
78. [vii. 749.]

he saith: *Neque in hoc tantum consessu, sed domi quoque, vir cum uxore, pater cum filio, invicem de his frequenter loquantur: et ultro citroque suam et ferant et inquirant sententiam: velintque hanc probatissimam inducere consuetudinem*: “Hearken not hereto only here in the church, but also at home: let the *husband* with the *wife*, let the *father* with the *child* talk together of these matters, and both to and fro let them both inquire, and give their judgments. And would God they would begin this good custom <sup>28</sup>.”

Here have you, M. Harding, the *husband* communing of *divine matters* with his *wife*: and the *father* with his *child*. Therefore so unadvisedly to say, *we have misreported this holy father*, it was of your part a misreport.

Hieron. in  
Epist. ad Co-  
los. cap. 3.  
In illud, Ver-  
bum Dei ha-  
bitet in vobis.  
[v. 1074.]

Likewise St. Hierom saith: *Hic ostenditur, verbum Christi non sufficienter, sed abundanter, etiam laicos habere debere: et docere se invicem, vel monere*: “Here we are taught, that even the *laymen* ought to have the *word of God*, not only sufficiently, but also abundantly: and one to instruct and to warn another <sup>29</sup>.” Again he saith: *Solent et viri, solent et monachi, solent et mulierculæ hoc inter se habere certamen, ut plures ediscant scripturas*: “Both married men, and monks, and wives, commonly have this contention among themselves, *who may learn most scriptures* <sup>30</sup>.”

Hieron. in  
Ps. cxxxiii.  
[i. pt. 2. 474.]

To conclude, Theodoretus saith thus: *Passim videas nostra dogmata non ab iis solum teneri, &c.*: “Ye may

Theodor. de  
corrigen.  
Græc. Affect.  
lib. 5. [ed.  
Gaisford. p.  
220.]

To conclude, Theodoretus saith thus: *Passim videas nostra dogmata non ab iis solum teneri, &c.*: “Ye may

<sup>28</sup> [The last sentence differs from the original: *καὶ τὸν καλὸν τοῦτο εἰσφέρειν ἅπαντας ἔρανον*. The additional reference to Hom. 78. in Matth. is merely confirm-

atory of St. Chrysostom's opinion.]

<sup>29</sup> [This commentary is not genuine.]

<sup>30</sup> [This work was erroneously attributed to St. Jerome.]

commonly see that our doctrine is known, not only of them that are the *doctors* of the church, and the *masters* of the people, but also even of the *tailors*, and *smiths*, and *weavers*, and of all *artificers*: yea and further also, of *women*; and that not only of them that be learned, but also of *labouring women*, and *sewsters*, and *servants*, and *handmaids*. Neither only the *citizens*, but also the *country folks* do very well understand the same. Ye may find yea even the very *ditchers*, and *delvers*, and *cowherds*, and *gardeners disputing of the holy Trinity and of the creation of all things.*" Now judge you, M. Harding, whether of us two hath erred in his report.

De Divina Trinitat. re- rumque omnium Creatione disser- tantes.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 4 and 5.

The ancient fathers, Cyprian, Epiphanius, and Hierom, say, For one who perchance hath made a *vow* to lead a sole life, and afterward liveth un- chastely, and cannot quench the flames of lust, *it is better to marry a wife, and to live honestly in wed- lock.* And the old father Augustine judgeth the self-same marriage to be good and perfect, and that it ought not to be broken again. These men, if a man have once bound himself by a vow, though afterward he burn, keep queans, and defile himself with never so sinful and desperate a life, yet they suffer not that person to marry a wife: or if he chance to marry, they allow it not for marriage. And they commonly teach, It is much better and more godly to keep a *concupine*, or an harlot, than to live in that kind of *marriage*.....

Cyprian, E- pist. 11. lib. 1. [p. 102.]  
Epiphan. contra Apo- stol. haeres. 61. [l. 512.]  
Hieron. ad Demetriad. [iv. pt. 2. 796.]  
Augustin. de Bono Viduit. cap. 10. [vi. 375.]

The old father St. Augustine complained of the multitude of vain *ceremonies* wherewith he even then saw men's minds and consciences overcharged: these men, as though God regarded nothing else but their ceremonies, have so out of measure increased

Augustin. ad Januar. ep. 118. [ii. 142.]

them, that there is now almost none other thing left in their churches and places of prayer.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In the 2d part, chap. 9. divis. 1. [supra vol. iv. 343.] And 2d part, chap. 17. divis. 1. [supra vol. v. 214.] All that M. Harding hath here to say hath been both alleged and also fully answered before in a place more convenient.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 5.

[August. de Opere Monach. tom. vi. 484.] Again, that old father St. Augustine denieth it to be lawful for a *monk* to spend his time slothfully in idleness, and, under a pretenced and counterfeit holiness, to live all upon others. And whoso thus liveth, the old father Apollonius likeneth him to a thief<sup>31</sup>. These men have, (I wot not whether to name them droves or herds of *monks*,) who for all that they do nothing, nōr yet once intend to bear any show of holiness, yet live they not only upon others, but also riot lavishly of other folks' labours.

[Socrat. tom. li. 238.]

M. HARDING.

a But St. Augustine calleth it worse than idleness. a We do not maintain that a monk should live idly. But we reprove you for accounting the service of God idleness. Neither is that the thing only which ye can allege in defence of that your brethren have done to monasteries in the countries where your gospel proceedeth. For ye have removed not only such monks as were proved idle, but all monks generally that would serve God according to that vow which they made under the <sup>b</sup> approved rule of St. Benedict, St. Augustine, St. Francis, St. Dominic, or of any other. You say, we have droves and herds of monks, thereby signifying they are beasts rather than men. Whereas St. Augustine calleth them *servos Dei*, "the servants of God," in that very work which you allege.....

b As though Christ's rule were lost, or were not sufficient.

Sith that our monks (I mean all religious men) served the altar, and were appointed to preach, minister the sacraments, and bestow their time in prayer for their own infirmities, and for

De Opere Monach. cap. 21. [vi. 491.]

<sup>31</sup> [Bishop Jewel probably refers to Socrates, who attributes this saying to a "certain monk."]

The Editor has been unable to discover upon what grounds Apollonius is named here.]

the sins of the people; <sup>c</sup> by the doctrine of St. Augustine they are not bound to labour, as they, who, for sowing spiritual things to the behoof of others, may reap their temporal things to their own necessary sustenance..... c Untruth, plain contrary to St. Augustine.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“Monks” (ye say) “be God’s servants: and monks’ life is the service of God.” And herein ye use such earnest talk, as though, if the whole generation of *monks* were removed, God should sit without *service*. Indeed St. Augustine, shewing us what good *service* the *monks* of his time did unto God, saith thus: *Isti non Deo serviunt, sed suo ventri*: “These *monks* serve not God, they serve their bellies.” Again he saith: *Jactantia eo est periculosior, quo sub nomine servitutis Dei decipit*: “Hypocrisy or vaunting of holiness is the more dangerous, for that it deceiveth us under the name of *God’s service*.” Again he saith: *Fallit dolosa imagine sanctitatis*: “It deceiveth us by the deceitful countenance or image of holiness. Again, touching these *monks*, he saith: *Non apparet, utrum ex proposito servitutis Dei venerint, an vitam inopem, et laboriosam fugientes, vacui pasci, et vestiri voluerint*: “We cannot tell, whether they became monks for purpose to serve God, or else being weary of their poor and painful life, were rather desirous to be fed and clothed doing nothing.” And therefore he calleth the *almose* that they get, *Sumptus lucrosæ egestatis: et simulatæ pretium sanctitatis*: “The charges of gainful poverty; and the price of feigned holiness.” Again he saith: *Venalem circumferunt hypocrisim*: “They carry their hypocrisy about to sale.” Augustin. de Opere Monach. cap. 12. [vi. 484.] Aug. de Sermone Dom. in Monte. [lii. pt. 2. 216.] Eodem loco. [ibid.] August. de Opere Monach. cap. 22. [vi. 492.] August. de Opere Monach. cap. 28. [ib. 498.] August. de Opere Monach. cap. 31 [ib. 501.]

St. Hilary, speaking of the same kind of holy people, saith thus: *Convivia sub obtentu religionis sumptuosa sectantur. Apothecas suas inutili religiosorum obsequio defendunt [leg. distendunt] de quibus scriptum est, Comedentes domos viduarum. Etiamsi Dominum se credant invocare, tamen audient, quod est in Evangelio [al. dictum in Evangelio esse], Scimus quia peccatores Deus non audit*: “Under the colour of holiness, they seek for dainty and costly fare: they maintain their storehouses by the unpro-

Hilar. in Ps. lii. [p. 89.]

*fitable service of religious people*: of whom it is written, *They devour up poor widows' houses*. Although they think *they serve God*, yet the same answer shall be made them that is written in the Gospel, '*We know that God giveth no ear to sinners.*'" Upon these words of the Gospel, "*Sell all that thou hast, and give it to the poor, and come and follow me,*" your very ordinary Gloss saith thus: *Bene operando, non mendicando*: "Follow me in well doing, not in begging <sup>32</sup>."

Matt. xxiii.  
14.

John ix. 31.

Luke xviii.  
Matt. xix.

Nicol. Cusanus  
Excitat.  
lib. 7. [leg.  
lib. 6.]  
Moneta. [p.  
548.]

And lest ye should think we speak only of old foreign faults, and that all such things sithence those days have been reformed, Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of Rome, one of your new doctors, saith: *Vix fallacia illorum, qui sub habitu Christi apparent, potest sciri ob suam varietatem. Nam alius quidem sub hac veste,.....alius sub caputio, alius sub hoc religionis signo, alius sub alio, Christo se militare asserit: licet pene omnes, non quæ Christi, sed quæ sua sunt, quærant. Omnes enim student avaritiæ a maximo usque ad minimum. Et in his omnibus una doctrina comperit eorum fallaciam: scilicet, Ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos*: "The deceitfulness of them that shew themselves under the apparel of Christ, because of their variety, can hardly be known. For one of them saith, he serveth Christ under one weed, and another under another: one under a hood, another under one badge of religion, another under another. Notwithstanding they all for the most part seek their own, and not the things that pertain to Christ Jesus. For they are all given to covetousness from the most to the least. And yet in all these diversities, by this mark or doctrine ye may descry their falsehood, 'By their works ye shall know them.'"

Bernard. in  
Canticis Can-  
tic. [serm.  
66. tom. iv.  
1307.]

Hieron. ad  
Eustochium

We grant, the *service of God* may not rightly be called *idleness*. But what if St. Bernard say of your monks, *Servi Christi, serviunt Antichristo*: "They pretend *Christ's service*, and *serco Antichrist*?" For where did God ever require you to do him such *service*? St. Hierom saith of them: *In statu servili et abjectionis esse abhorrent. Labo-*

<sup>32</sup> [The Editor has not found this note in the Glossa Ordinaria.]

*rare recusant præ pigritia: mendicare erubescunt validi: quia nihil daretur eis:* “They are loath to be abjects and in servile state. For idleness they will not labour: and to beg they are ashamed. For being valiant and lusty people, no man would give them any thing<sup>33</sup>.” Likewise saith St. Augustine: *Tanquam conservatricem evangelii prædicant pigritiam:* “They speak much of their idleness, as if it were the keep and castle of the gospel.”<sup>August. de Opere Monach. cap. 21. [leg. cap. 22. vi. 493.]</sup> Again he saith: *Contingit eis, quod in viduis junioribus indiscipulatis cavendum apostolus dicit: Simul et otiosæ esse discunt: non solum autem otiosæ, sed et curiosæ, et verbosæ, loquentes quæ non oportet:* “The same thing happeneth unto them, that St. Paul speaketh of young widows living out of order: They learn to be idle: and not only idle, but also curious, and full of words, speaking such things as are not meet.” Thus ye see, M. Harding, that this pretence and colour of *God’s service* hath oftentimes of the ancient fathers been called *idleness*.

Ye say, “Monks now serve the altar and minister sacraments: and therefore are not bound to bodily labour.” This is a fair colour to shadow their *idleness*. For who ever bade *monks to serve the altar*, or gave them authority to *minister sacraments*? What doctor? what father? what ancient council? In old times it was not lawful for a *monk* to be a *priest*. St. Gregory saith: *Nemo potest ecclesiasticis officiis deservire, et in monastica regula ordinate persistere:* “No man can serve the ecclesiastical office, and orderly keep the rule of monkery.” And St. Hierom saith: *Monachus, non docentis [al. doctoris], sed plangentis habet officium:* “A monk’s office is not to preach but to mourn.” Again he saith: *Alia causa est monachi, alia clericici: clericici oves pascunt: ego pascor!*<sup>16. Quæst. 1. Nemo.</sup> “The state of a monk is one thing, and the state of a priest is another. Priests feed the flock: I” (being a *monk*) “must be fed.” Whereupon the Gloss saith: *Ego pascor sacramentis ipsorum:*<sup>16. Quæst. 1. Monachus.</sup> “I am fed with the sacraments of the priests.”<sup>16. Quæst. 1. Alia causa.</sup> Whereby it is evident, that the *monk* himself had no authority to *minister sacraments*, no not so much as privately

<sup>33</sup> [There is some mistake in the marginal reference.]

to himself. But touching bodily labour, St. Hierom saith, "This was holden as a law among the monks in Egypt, that whoso would not labour should not eat<sup>32</sup>."

Hieron. ad Rusticum, [iv. pt. 2. 774.] et in Vita Hilarionis. [lib. p. 76.] August. ad Fratres in Eremo. serm. 1. [vi. app. 305.]

And St. Augustine saith, as it is alleged in his name: *Nihil Dei servis pejus est otiositate. Operentur ergo in nomine Domini*: "Unto the servants of God there is nothing worse than idleness. Let them work therefore in the name of our Lord<sup>33</sup>."

August. de Opere Monach. cap. 23. [vi. 493.]

Of such idle monks St. Augustine saith: *Isti manus otiosas, et repositoria plena habere volunt*: "These monks will have idle hands and full cellars." A learned father

Hist. Tripart. lib. 8. cap. 1.

was wont to say by the report of Socrates: "A monk that laboureth not with his hands may be resembled unto a thief<sup>34</sup>."

Bernard. in Ps. lxxii.

St. Bernard saith: *Restat ut sint in laboribus dæmonum, qui in laboribus hominum non fuerunt*: "They must needs be in the travails of devils that were not in the travails of men."

August. de Opere Monach. cap. 28. [vi. 498.]

Of these St. Augustine saith: *Diabolus tam multos hypocritas sub habitu monachorum usquequaque dispersit*: "Such a number of hypocrites hath the devil scattered abroad everywhere under the colour of monks."

The first suppressors of monasteries within this realm, in our memory, were two of your dearest friends, cardinal Wolsey, and Dr. Fisher, the bishop of Rochester: either of them well warranted thereto by the authority of the pope. Long before that time, the godly learned bishop Letoius overthrew and burnt the Messalians' monasteries,

<sup>32</sup> [S. Hieron. ad Rusticum: "Texantur et lina capiendis piscibus; scribantur libri, ut et manus operetur cibum et animus lectione saturetur. In desideris est omnis otiosus. Ægyptiorum monasteria hunc morem tenent, ut nullum absque operis labore suscipiant, non tam proper victus necessitatem, quam propter animæ salutem." Id. in vita Hilarionis: "Simulque fiscellos junco texens æmularum disciplinam, et apostoli sententiam dicentis, Qui autem

"non operatur non manducet."]

<sup>33</sup> [This work is, as Jewel intimates, spurious.]

<sup>34</sup> [The Historia Tripart., referred to by Jewel, translates the passage thus: "Alter quidam dicebat, Monachus nisi operatus fuerit, violento judicatur æqualis." The original in Socrates (Reading, tom. ii. p. 238.) bears out bishop Jewel: ἄλλος δέ τις ἔλεγε, ὅτι ὁ μοναχὸς εἰ μὴ ἐργάζοιτο, ἐπίσης τῷ πλεονέκτη κρίνεται. This saying is attributed, supra vol. vi. p. 38, to Apollonius.]



and said they were *dens of thieves*: and, as Theodoretus reporteth, chased the *wolves* away from the *fold*.

Of late years sundry of the *cardinals of Rome*, amongst whom also was *cardinal Pole*, being specially appointed in commission by *pope Paulus III.* to view the disorders and deformities of the church, returned their answer in this sort: *Alius abusus corrigendus est in ordinibus religiosorum: quod adeo multi deformati sunt, ut magno sint scandalo sæcularibus, exemploque plurimum noceant. Conventuales ordines abolendos esse putamus omnes*: “Another abuse there is to be reformed in the *orders of monks and friars*. For many of them are so vile, that they are a shame unto the seculars, and with their example do much ill. *As for conventual orders, we think it good they be all abolished.*”

This, M. Harding, was the judgment of your own friends. And therefore ye have the less cause to be offended with the suppressing of *abbies*. For your own dear catholic fathers *cardinal Wolsey, cardinal Pole, Dr. Fisher*, and others, partly have suppressed them themselves, and partly have consented unto the same. In the book called *Opus Tripartitum*, joined unto the *council of Lateran*, it is written thus: *Totus fere mundus obloquitur, et scandalizatur de tanta multitudine religiosorum pauperum, qui introierunt in mundum*: “Wellnear the whole world crieth against, and is offended for so great a *multitude of begging monks and friars* that are entered into the world.”

Therefore was this decree published in the *council of Lateran*: *Ne nimia religiosorum diversitas gravem in ecclesiam Dei offensionem inducat, firmiter prohibemus, ne quis de cætero novam religionem inveniat*: “Lest over-great diversity of religious folk bring great offence into the church of God, we do earnestly forbid, that from henceforth no man devise any new religion.” Thus it appeareth, your *pope* himself and his *cardinals* were so wearied and accloyed with multitudes of *monks*, that they would have them increase no further. *Damasus*, speaking of the order of them that were called *chorepiscopi*, saith thus: *Unde*

Theod. lib.

4. cap. 11.

[lib. 161.]

σπήλαια

ληστρικὰ.

Τοὺς λύκους

ἐκ τῆς πολ-

μνης ἐξή-

λασε.

Concil. [ed.

Crabb.] tom.

3. Con. De-

lectorum

Cardinal p.

822.]

Concil. [ed.

Crabb.] tom.

ii. p. 1000.

Operis Tri-

part. lib. 3.

cap. 3.

Conc. Lat.

sub Innoc.

III. cap. 13.

[Crabb. tom.

ii. p. 952.]

Dist. 68.

Chorepisco-

pl.

*iste tertius ordo processerit, ignoramus: et quod ratione caret, extirpare necesse est:* “From whence this third order is come, we cannot tell: and the thing that wanteth reason must needs be taken up by the roots.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 6.*

Concil. Rom.  
cap. 3. [xix.  
907. d.]

The old council of Rome decreed, that no man should come to the service said by a priest well known to keep a concubine. These men let concubines to farm to their priests, and yet constrain men by force against their will to hear their cursed paltry service<sup>34</sup>. [Vol. iv. p. 60.]

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.  
For it is easy  
to be found.

<sup>a</sup> We find no such canon<sup>35</sup> in the old Roman councils. Your allegations noted in the margin be false for the most part, as your doctrine is. Yet find we that Nicolaus and Alexander popes have willed no man to hear the mass of that priest, whom he knoweth undoubtedly to keep a concubine. <sup>b</sup>But wise men in the law think only that to be an undoubted knowledge, when either the judge hath by open sentence published such a man to keep a concubine, or the fact itself is notorious. . . . . Dist. 25. cap. nullus.

b Such wise  
men be the  
proctors of  
filthiness.

c Untruth,  
notorious  
and manifest  
to the world.  
The bishop  
of Argentine  
hath a flo-  
rence by the  
year of every  
priest that  
keepeth a  
concubine,  
and if she  
bear a child,  
he hath four.  
d Untruth.  
Read the an-  
swer.

<sup>c</sup>Whereas you say we let concubines out to farm to our priests, it is meet for you to say it, because it is false and slanderous. <sup>d</sup>Neither was ever any man or at this day is driven to hear his mass who keepeth a concubine. For if he will take upon him to prove any priest to keep a concubine, himself not being so infamous, as he may not stand in judgment, it is certain he shall be heard. If he cannot prove it, then is not he out of doubt by order of law, that this priest keepeth a concubine, and therefore he is bound, as other Christian people be, to hear his mass. <sup>e</sup>Which is no sacrilege, as your sacrilegious heart thinketh, and blasphemous tongue uttereth, but the blessed and holy sacrifice which Christ made at his last supper.

e Untruth.  
For pope  
Hildebrand  
saith: *Bene-  
dictio eorum  
vertitur in  
maledictio-  
nem.* [Dist.  
Si quis.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If it had pleased you better to have perused your books, ye might soon have found these selfsame words in the *council of Rome*, holden there under pope Nicolas the second [first, *ed.* 1609]. Which, although it be not so old as may be compared with the ancient fathers' councils, yet it is elder

Concil. Rom.  
sub Nicolao  
2. Conc.  
tom. 2. p. 765.  
anno 880.  
[Mansi xix.  
907. d.]

<sup>34</sup> [Apol. Lat. “illorum sacrilegia.”]

<sup>35</sup> [In the original Apol. Lat. the reference was to the 8th canon.]

than some parts and branches of your new religion. To like purpose writeth pope Zachary: *Quis sapiens judicabit, eos esse sacerdotes, qui nec a fornicationibus abstinent?* Zacharias pap. in ep. ad Bonif. [Crabb, tom. li. 454.] “What wise man will reckon them to be priests, that abstain not so much as from fornication?” If no wise man can judge them to be *priests*, what man then is he, that will authorize them to *minister sacraments*?

Now of the other side, M. Harding, consider you the common and ordinary practice of your *church of Rome*. First, touching the *pope* himself, your Gloss saith: *Facta papæ excusantur, ..... ut adulterium Jacob*: “The *pope’s* doings (or *advouteries*) are excused as the advoutery of Jacob.” And again: *Communiter dicitur, quod pro simplici fornicatione quis deponi non debet: cum pauci sine illo vitio inveniantur*: “It is commonly said, that a man may not be deposed or deprived for simple fornication; forasmuch as few (*priests*) be found without that fault.” Dist. 40. Non nos. In Glossa. Dist. 81. Maximian. in Gloss.

Again, whereas the words of the *decree* are these: *Nullus audiat missam presbyteri, quem scit concubinam indubitanter habere*: “Let no man hear the mass of that priest, whom he undoubtedly knoweth to keep a *concubine*,” the Gloss upon the same saith thus: *Hic canon quandoque fuit latæ sententiæ: sed hodie non est*: “This *decree* in old times stood as a ruled case: but now is it not so.” *Ideo licet notoria sit fornicatio, tamen non est propter eam abstinendum ab officiis presbyterorum*: “And therefore although the fornication be notoriously known, yet may we not therefore refrain from the service of the priest.” Dist. 32. Nullus. [Ib. in Glossa.]

Hereunto very well agreeth the gloss upon Otho’s Legatines: *Quid ergo, si sacerdos inveniatur coire cum muliere?* *Respondeo: adhuc dicitur occultum: nec propter hoc debet eum vitare in publico, nisi aliter convincatur*: “What if a man find the *priest* in the manner with a woman? I answer: All that notwithstanding, the fault is privy. Neither may a man therefore avoid that priest’s service, unless he be otherwise convicted.” De Concubinis Clericor. removendis. Licet ad profligandum. [p. 43. k.]

And again in the same gloss upon these words, *Qui publice detinet concubinas*, it is noted thus: *Tu dic Publice, quando multitudini se patere non expavet. Secus ergo, si* Glossa in eundem titulum. [p. 43. l.]

*secrete intra domum propriam, vel alienam detineat hanc concubinam. Nam tunc poenam hujus constitutionis non incurret. Domus enim rem secretam, non autem publicam denotat:* “By this word *openly*, understand thou, If he be not afraid lest the world espy him. Therefore it is otherwise if he keep the same *concubine secretly*, whether it be in his own house or in some other man’s. *For then he is not within the danger of this law.* For a house betokeneth a thing to be *secret*, and not *open*.”

By this favourable and gentle construction, unless the *priest* keep his woman *openly in the market-place*, he is without all danger of *laws* and *canons*, and we may not refrain to hear his service.

“It is no sacrilege,” (you say) “but the blessed and holy sacrifice.” Hereto I may answer you with the words of St. Augustine: *Quæ sunt sacrilegia, si illa erant sacra? Aut quæ inquinatio, si illa lavatio?* “What is sacrilege, if this be a sacrifice? or what is staining, if this be washing?” Verily your own pope Hildebrand hereof writeth thus: *Imperamus vobis, ne eorum officia, orationes, et cultus audiatis. Quia benedictio eorum vertitur in maledictionem, et oratio in peccatum: testante Domino per prophetam, Maledicam benedictionibus vestris. Qui vero huic saluberrimo præcepto obedire noluerint, idololatriæ poenam incurrent:* “We command you, that you hear neither their offices, nor their prayers, nor their service. For their blessing is turned into cursing, and their prayer into sin. As the Lord himself witnesseth by the prophet: ‘I will curse your blessings, saith the Lord.’ And whosoever will not obey this wholesome commandment, *he shall fall into the pain of idolatry.*” Judge ye now, M. Harding, whether this be *sacrilege*, as we say, or as you say, a “blessed and a holy sacrifice.” If it be a *sacrifice*, if it be *blessed*, if it be *holy*, why should he be accursed as an *idolater*, that will come unto it?

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 7.

The old *canons of the apostles* command that [Vol. iv. p. 60-61.]  
bishop to be removed from his office, which will

Aug. de Clvit.  
lib. 2. cap. 4.  
[vil. 34.]

Dist. 8r. Si  
qui.

[Apostol.  
Canon. 80,  
et 7.]

supply the place both of a *civil magistrate*, and also of an *ecclesiastical person*. These men, for all that, both do and will needs serve both places. Nay rather, the one office which they ought chiefly to execute, they once touch not: and yet nobody commandeth them to be displaced.

## M. HARDING.

<sup>35</sup> . . . If we ought to stick at any one certain worldly business, <sup>a</sup>which may seem unseemly for a bishop or a priest, as too base for his dignity, and too much hinderance to his vocation, undoubtedly marriage is of that sort. Whom may we better credit for this case than St. Paul? <sup>b</sup>“He that is without a wife” (saith he) “is careful for the things that be of our Lord, how he may please God; but he that is coupled with a wife is careful about the things which are of the world, and is divided.” . . . . .

But with our fleshly ministers, this business is not fleshly and worldly at all, but altogether spiritual, because their spirit is wholly occupied therein.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, vain above measure. For it was not unseemly for Christ's apostles to be married.  
<sup>b</sup> St. Paul speaketh thus, not only of priests, but also of every private Christian man.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Christ thought so little hinderance to be in *marriage* towards the preaching of the *gospel*, that of his twelve apostles he chose eleven that were married. So St. Ambrose saith, as it is alleged before: *Apostoli omnes, exceptis Johanne et Paulo, uxores habuerunt*: “All the apostles had wives, saving only St. John and St. Paul<sup>36</sup>.”

But ye say, with our fleshly ministers, this business is not fleshly, but altogether spiritual; because their spirit is wholly occupied therein. It pitieth me, M. Harding, to see you so vainly to bestow your *spiritual cogitations*. Matrimony is *God's* ordinance. God never ordained man to live in villainy and filthiness. St. Paul saith: “Matrimony is honourable in all men,” (as well in *priests* as in others,) “and the bed undefiled: but advouterers and fornicators the Lord himself will judge.” And again, writing unto the *married people of Rome*, he saith: *Vos non estis in carne, sed in Spiritu*: “You are not in the *flesh*, but in the *Spirit*.” They were married, and lived in the *laws of*

<sup>35</sup> [Harding attempts to explain the Canons of the Apostles.]

<sup>36</sup> [These commentaries are not genuine. See vol. iv. p. 554.]

marriage: yet St. Paul saith, "They were not in the *flesh*, but in the *Spirit*."

Aug. de Bono  
conjugal.  
c. 11. [vi. 327.]

St. Augustine saith: *Sancta sunt etiam corpora conjugatorum, fidem sibi, et Domino servantium*: "The bodies of married people, keeping faith both to themselves and to the Lord, are clean and holy." Origen saith: *Non solum virgines, aut continentes, offerunt corpora sua hostiam sanctam*: "Not only virgins or others that live in single life," (but also *married folks*) "offer up their bodies a holy sacrifice<sup>37</sup>." Chrysostom saith: *Sanctificationem Paulus vocat pudicitiam et temperantiam conjugalem*: "The honest chastity and temperance that is between man and wife, St. Paul calleth *holiness*<sup>38</sup>." And again: *Carent culpa nuptiæ, nec a virtute quicquam prohibent*: "Marriage is void of fault; and is no hinderance unto virtue."

Origen. in  
epist. ad  
Rom. c. 12.  
[iv. 644.]

Chrys. ad  
Hebræ. hom.  
57.

Hereof we have spoken before more at large. But touching the chaste life of your *spiritual clergy*, M. Harding, as sundry your own friends have recorded, and as the whole world is well able to judge, it is nothing else but a *spiritual filthiness*.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 8.

[Can. 4.  
Mans. ii.  
p. 1104.]

The old *council of Gangra* commandeth, that none [Vol. iv. p. 61.] should make such difference between an *unmarried priest* and a *married priest*, as to think the one more holy than the other for single life's sake<sup>39</sup>. These men put such a difference between them, that they straightway think all their holy service to be defiled, if it be done by a good and honest man that hath a wife.

M. HARDING.

It was not for your purpose, sirs, to use true dealing, and to allege the words as they are in that old council. For they speak

<sup>37</sup> [This is rather a paraphrase, than an accurate citation of Origen's words.]

<sup>38</sup> [There is some mistake in this reference, since there are only thirty-four homilies on the Epistle

to the Hebrews.]

<sup>39</sup> [Concil. Gangr. can. 4. Εἴ τις διακρίνοιτο παρὰ πρεσβυτέρου γεγαμηκότος, ὡς μὴ χρῆναι λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ προσφορᾶς μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω.]

of an <sup>a</sup>external sacrifice <sup>b</sup>which the church calleth the mass. <sup>a</sup>Untruth, The same it behoved you to dissemble, lest ye bewrayed your fond and peevish. For cause. The words be these: "If any man make a difference of a this word *external* is not priest who hath been married, as though when he sacrificeth a once named in all that man might not communicate with his oblation, be he accursed." council.

Those fathers speak evidently of a priest who hath some time <sup>b</sup>The council of Gangra been married, that is to say, before his priesthood. <sup>c</sup>For after never once named the priesthood it was never heard sithence the time of Christ, that the mass. any priest might marry by the law either of the Greek or of the Latin church. We therefore condemn the marriages of priests, <sup>c</sup>Untruth, so which be made after the taking of holy orders, and say, that I vain, that I is no good and honest man, but an incestuous advouterer, that marvel M. Hard- report it can marrieth afterward. . . . .<sup>40</sup> without blushing.

Can. 4.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To answer all your trifles, M. Harding, it were too long. We refuse not the names of *oblation* or *sacrifice*. We know that the *holy ministration* is commonly so called by the ancient fathers: for that, as Chrysostom saith, it is the *memory*, the *remembrance*, the *sampler*, the *token* of that one *sacrifice*, that Christ once offered in his body upon the cross. Howbeit, the reason hereof, that ye would seem to wrest out of the Greek word *λειτουργήσαντος αὐτοῦ*, is very simple, and bewrayeth in you, either want of skill, or great corruption. For being learned in the *Greek tongue*, ye must needs know that *λειτουργία* signifieth not a *sacrifice*, but a *ministry* or *public service*. Plutarchus saith thus: *Lictores, quasi litores dicebantur, quod essent λειτουργοί. Ληϊτὸν γὰρ τὸν λαὸν, ἢ τὸν δῆμον ἔτι καὶ νῦν οἱ Ἕλληνες ὀνομάζουσι.* Hereby it appeareth that the common *hangman* of the city was called *λειτουργὸς*, and his office *λειτουργία*: which, I trow, M. Harding, ye would not have to be called a *sacrificer*, and a *sacrifice*. Pachymeres, in his Annotations upon Dionysius, saith thus<sup>41</sup>: *Λειτουργὸς λέγει τοὺς*

Chrys. ad Hebræ. hom. 17. [xil. 168.] Hoc sacrificium exemplarius est. Magis recordationem sacrificii operamur.

Plutarchus in Romulo. [tom. i. p. 34.] Alexander ab Alexandro. [lib. i. c. 27.]

Pachymeres: λειτουργὸς λέγει τοὺς

<sup>40</sup> [Harding adds that "no mention is made of the participle of the preterperfect tense *γεγαμηκότος*, which speaketh of him that hath married before his priesthood. Fourthly," he proceeds, "it is pretended as though the canon said that a priest married is as holy as a priest unmarried. There is no such thing there: but only that the mass of the one is as good

as the mass of the other. Last of all, the argument of that council was against Eustochius the heretic, who condemned marriage itself, as though a married man might not be communicated withal."<sup>53</sup>]

<sup>41</sup> [The substance of this assertion will be found in the commentary on cap. 5. part 1. sect. 6. of the Hierarch. Ecclesiast.]

διακόνους  
καὶ τοὺς νῦν  
ὑποδιακόνους  
λεγομένους.  
Rom. xliii. 6.

*appellat diaconos, aut eos, qui nunc hypodiaconi appellan-  
tantur*: “He calleth them λειτουργοὺς, that are called  
*deacons or subdeacons.*” St. Paul, speaking of *kings and  
civil princes*, saith: Λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ εἰπί: λειτουργοὶ, *aut  
ministri Dei sunt*: I reckon ye will not say that either  
*deacons or subdeacons, or kings, or princes*, had authority  
to minister the *holy communion*, or, as you say, “to offer  
up the daily sacrifice.” Whereas St. Luke saith, λειτουργού-  
ντων αὐτῶν, *ministrantibus illis*: Chrysostom demandeth  
this question: *Quid est ministrantibus, λειτουργούντων?* He  
answereth, *Prædicantibus*<sup>42</sup>. Whereby it appeareth that  
the apostles’ *sacrificing* was their *preaching*. It had been  
overmuch vanity to note these things, had not your vain  
quarrel given the occasion. Certainly there is no mention  
in the said *council of Gangra*, either of your *mass*, or of  
your *external sacrifice*.

Act. xliii. 2.

Chrys. in  
Act. hom. 27.  
[ix. 216.]

“After priesthood” (ye say) “it was never heard sithence  
the time of Christ, that any priest might marry by the law  
either of the Greek or of the Latin church.” This warrant  
were undoubtedly good, if every your word were a gospel.  
But what if your own Gloss, that is to say, the very  
ground and mother of your divinity, stand against you,  
and say, Ye warrant unwisely, or, if that mislike you,  
unadvisedly, ye know not what? Verily, upon the *pope’s*  
own *decrees* ye shall find it noted thus: *Multi ex hac litera  
dixerunt, quod orientales possunt contrahere in sacris ordi-  
nibus*: “Of these words many have gathered, that the  
priests of the east church may marry, being within holy  
orders.” Nicephorus saith that Euppsychius, being a *priest*,  
and the *bishop of Casarea* in Cappadocia, married a wife  
a little before that he was martyred. The like he seemeth  
to write of Apollinaris the elder, that being a *priest*, mar-  
ried a wife at Laodicea.

Dist. 31. Al-  
ter. in Glossa.

Nicephor.  
lib. 10. c. 10.  
[ii. 28.]

Nicephor.  
lib. 9. c. 17.  
[i. 719.]

Here M. Harding will answer us boldly, as he hath  
done before<sup>43</sup>, that this Euppsychius was neither *bishop* nor  
*priest*, “but only a gentleman of noble parentage:” and

<sup>42</sup> [S. Chrysost. τί ἐστι, λειτουργού-  
ντων; κηρυττότων.]

where the question of Euppsychius  
is discussed at length. Also vol.

<sup>43</sup> [Supra vol. iv. pp. 584—588; iv. p. 108.]



for proof thereof he will allege Sozomenus and Nicephorus. But let him read the second *council of Nice*: there shall he find that the same Euppsychius is called *Euppsychius presbyter*, “Euppsychius the priest<sup>44</sup>.” let him read the ancient *learned father* Athanasius; there shall he find that the same Euppsychius is called *episcopus Cappadociae*, “the bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia.” Thus shall M. Harding find that Euppsychius was both a *priest*, and a *bishop* too. And I speak of the same Euppsychius the *martyr*, and of none other. Therefore, good reader, it may please thee to tell M. Harding, he deserveth small credit in his answer, that will adventure to answer before he know.

Conc. Nicen.  
2. Actiōne 6.  
[xiii. 317.]

Athana. con-  
tra Arian.  
Orat. 1. [i.  
278.]

In the *council* holden at *Ancyra*, there is a canon written thus: *Diaconi, quicunque ordinantur, si in ipsa ordinatione protestati sunt, et dixerunt, velle se conjugio copulari, quia sic manere non possunt, hi, si postmodum uxores duxerint, in ministerio maneat, propterea quod eis episcopus licentiam dederit*: “Deacons that receive orders, if at the time of their admission they make protestation, and say they will be married, for that they cannot otherwise continue, if they afterward marry, let them remain in the ministry, for that the bishop hath already dispensed with them<sup>45</sup>.”

Concil. Ancy-  
ran. can. 10.  
[ii. §17.]

Chrysostom, speaking of the *marriage of bishops*, saith thus: ..... *Quamvis nuptiæ plurimum difficultatis in se habeant, ita tamen assumi possunt, ut perfectiori vitæ impedimento non sint, verum id plane perquam raro atque difficile*<sup>46</sup>: “Notwithstanding marriage have in it much trouble, yet so it may be taken, that it shall be no hinderance to perfect life. But certainly that is a seldom thing and very hard<sup>47</sup>.” He saith *marriage may be taken or chosen*: and thus he speaketh namely of the *marriage of priests and bishops*.

Chrys. in  
epist. 1. ad  
Tim. hom. 10.  
[ed. Lat.  
1588. tom. iv.  
1355.]

*Addition.* ☞ “Whereas M. Jewel beareth thee in hand, that Chrysostom saith, *Marriage may be taken or*

M. Harding  
fol. 305. a.

<sup>44</sup> [ἀκούσωμεν . . . τι φησιν (Athanasius) ἐν τῇ δογματικῇ αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῇ τῇ πρὸς Εὐψύχιον πρεσβύτερον Καισαρείας.]

<sup>45</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 582.]

<sup>46</sup> [In the first ed. of the De-

fence the words “verum id—difficile” were omitted; but they were added in the ed. of 1570, in consequence of Harding’s observations in his “Detection.”]

<sup>47</sup> [See note 77, vol. iv. p. 596.]

chosen, and that of priests and bishops, 'for of their marriage he speaketh,' saith this man,—all this is false. For, first, understand thou, this sentence is not in Chrysostom at all: not in the Greek, I say, in which tongue only he wrote. For I have seen the Greek, and diligently conferred it myself. But it is added unto his text, either by the translation, or by falsehood used at the printing, as in these corrupt times false printers have corrupted many books of the old fathers. Again, these words are not spoken specially of *priests' marriage*, but generally and indefinitely of all marriage." *The answer.* I say, "Chrysostom speaketh these words namely of the marriage of *priests* and *bishops*." M. Harding answereth me gently, as his manner is, "All this is false." Gentle reader, I beseech thee, if thou be able, consider the whole place of Chrysostom, and weigh well the causes of his writing: so shalt thou be able indifferently to judge, whether M. Harding or I have dealt untruly. First of all, Chrysostom expoundeth these words of St. Paul, "A bishop must be the husband of one wife." This is the ground of the rest that followeth. And speaking hereof unto the people, he saith thus: *Cur non ait Paulus, Oportet episcopum angelum esse, &c.* "Why did not St. Paul say, A bishop must be an angel, subject to no infirmity, or affection, or vice of man? &c. Why did he not say, A bishop must go out of the world, and be above all the cares of this life?" &c. He answereth, "Lest the ministry of the church should be forsaken, St. Paul required not in a bishop that virtue (of chastity) that is so high and so heavenly, but another virtue that is mean and reasonable, lest the church should be left without bishops<sup>17</sup>."

To be short, in that very same place, Chrysostom above four-and-twenty times hath the express names of *priest*

<sup>17</sup> [S. Chrysost. Τίνος οὖν ἔρεκεν ταῦτα οὐκ εἶρηκεν; ὅτι ταιούτους ὀλίγους εὐρεθῆναι ἐνῆν, ἐπισκόπων δὲ ἔδει πολλῶν, καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην πόλιν τῶν προηγησομένων. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐνεδρεύεσθαι ἔμελλε τὰ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, διὰ τοῦτο συμμετρημένην εἶπεν ἀρετὴν, οὐκ ἐκέκινεν τὴν ἄνω, τὴν ὑψηλὴν· τὸ γὰρ υψηλίον εἶναι καὶ κόσμιον καὶ σώφρονα, πολλῶν ἦν. The word ἀρετὴν here clearly applies not to chastity alone, but to the whole Christian character of a bishop.]

M. Harding,  
fol. 305. b.

Chrysost. in  
1 Timoth.  
cap. 3. hom.  
10. [xl. 600.  
et ed. Lat. iv.  
1355.]

and *bishop*. And yet must we believe M. Harding only upon his word, that Chrysostom speaketh these things only of the *marriage* of all men in general, and not one word specially of the *marriage of priests*. Now forasmuch as M. Harding telleth us all this is false, judge thou, good reader, between us both, in whether of us is the falsehood. And as thou findest him herein, so think of the rest of all his dealings.

“These words are not in the Greek: I have conferred it: it is falsehood used at the printing: false printers have corrupted many books.” *The answer*. What printers, M. Harding? What were their names? Where dwelt they? What did they? Will you pronounce your sentence of condemnation against them all, not knowing, neither against whom, nor against how many, nor wherefore? You say, ye find not these words in the Greek: but what if your Greek books be corrupted? as indeed they are in sundry places. Certainly all the *Latin translations* that I have seen, either printed or written, or old or new, have this whole place even word by word, as I have alleged it<sup>48</sup>. But because you think the Greek is best able to direct you, I will find you also the like sentence in Chrysostom in the Greek. These be his words: *Matrimonium non solum nihil obstat ad philosophandum Deo, si voluerimus esse sobrii, sed etiam magnam adfert consolationem*: “Marriage not only hindereth us nothing from the service of God, if we will be sober, but also bringeth us great comfort.” These words both bear the same sense<sup>49</sup>, and also are found in the Greek. You may confer them at your pleasure.

You say, although it be thus written, “Marriage may

<sup>48</sup> [The Latin editions of 1530 (Basil.) and of 1588 (Paris.) have the passage as bp. Jewel quotes it. In the Greek there is nothing to correspond with the quotation except the short sentence quoted below, p. 52: ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ πλοῦτος δυσχερῶς εἰσάγει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, πολλαχοῦ δὲ οἱ πλοῦτοὶντες εἰσῆλθον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ γάμος.]

<sup>49</sup> [This is hardly correct; inasmuch as the passage from St. Chrysostom's Commentary on Genesis does not appear to refer specially to the marriage of the clergy. The translation also of the words “ad philosophandum Deo,” πρὸς τὴν κατὰ Θεὸν φιλοσοφίαν, by “the service of God,” is loose and inaccurate.]

M. Harding, fol. 305. b.

Chrys. in Genes. hom. 21. [iv. 186.]

so be taken, that it shall be no let unto perfect life," yet it followeth in the same sentence, "but certainly that is a thing very seldom, and of great difficulty." All this, M. Harding, you yourself have already answered. For you say, "It is not in the Greek, and therefore no part of Chrysostom, but shifted in by the falsehood of the printers." This is your answer: it may well be taken against yourself. I grant, there be many impediments in wife, children, servants, family, and worldly cares. But mark your uneven and partial dealing. The same Chrysostom, even in the same sentence, saith thus: "Abundance of riches doth hardly bring a man into the kingdom of heaven: yet oftentimes many rich men have entered into it: so also doth marriage." As marriage hindereth, so doth riches; and no more the one than the other. *Christ calleth riches thorns and brambles.* I do not remember, that ever of *marriage* he said the like. Yet the *pope* restraineth his priests only from *marriage*, and alloweth them benefices, prebends, abbeyes, bishoprics upon bishoprics, with money, and treasure, as much as they list, and thinketh it no hinderance to perfect life. ➔

[Chrysost. in Tim. tom. xi. 600.]

Luke viii. 14. Matth. xiii. 22.

Erasm. contra Bedam, p. 197. [Opp. ix. 421.]  
Cornel. Agripp. contra Loranien. Artic. 18. Dist. 84. Cum in prieterito. In Glossa.

Erasmus saith: "The priests of the Greek church this day, notwithstanding their orders<sup>50</sup>, marry wives." The like writeth Cornelius Agrippa against the Lovanians. Your own Gloss upon the Decrees, as I have alleged before, noteth thus: *Dicunt quod olim sacerdotes poterant contrahere, ante Siricium*: "They say that in old times, before pope Siricius, it was lawful for priests to contract matrimony." Likewise cardinal Cajetan saith: *Nec ratione, nec autoritate probari potest, quod, absolute loquendo, sacerdos peccet contrahendo matrimonium*: "It cannot be proved, neither by reason nor by authority, speaking absolutely, that a priest offendeth God in marrying a wife."

Cajetan. In Quodlibetis. [fol. 61. col. 2.]

How could he have said thus, if he had thought the vow of *chastity* had been annexed of necessity to the order of priesthood?

<sup>50</sup> [Erasmus—"etiam post susceptum ordinem." Harding, in his "Detection," disputes this assertion respecting the Greek church, on the authority of the doctors of the Sorbonne.]

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ “Cardinal Cajetan hath his errors. We are not bound to maintain whatsoever he saith, &c. Like as the order or habit of monks hath chastity annexed unto it, and therefore he that receiveth it is said therewith to make a vow consequently; even so holy order in the west church hath chastity annexed inseparably,” &c. *The answer.* Here is hard shift, M. Harding. Must these matters be proved by friars’ weeds and monks’ cowls? “In the west church” (you say) “chastity is inseparably annexed unto priesthood.” I trow, you mean not true *chastity* indeed, but only the promise and vow of *chastity*. For otherwise both east and west may see by your concubines, and other practices, that your *priesthood* and *chastity* may well go asunder. But if the vow of *chastity* be necessarily annexed unto *priesthood*, as you have told us, why speak you then more of the *west church* than of the *east*? Is their *priesthood* and yours of sundry natures? Why should you thus pester the world with so much vanity? Once again I say, If the *vow of chastity* be necessarily annexed to the *order of priesthood*, how can cardinal Cajetan say, “It cannot be proved, neither by reason, nor by authority, speaking absolutely, that a priest offendeth God in marrying a wife?” ☞

M. Harding,  
fol. 307 b.

So likewise saith Anselmus in a *dialogue* between the master and the scholar, touching these matters: *Desideramus certificari tua solutione super vulgari in toto orbe questione, quæ ab omnibus pene quotidie ventilatur, et adhuc lis indiscussa celatur, scilicet, An liceat presbyteris, post acceptum ordinem, uxores ducere:* “We are desirous by your answer to be certified about this common question, that is now tossed through the world, and as yet lieth undiscussed, I mean, *Whether a priest, being within orders, may marry a wife.*” Hereby it appeareth, that in the time of Anselmus, which was about a thousand years after Christ, *This matter lay in question, and was not yet discussed.*

Anselm. Dial.  
Inquisitione  
prima.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ “Anselm wrote three dialogues, in which he maketh the master and the scholar to talk together. Mo dialogues he never wrote, that may appear by

M. Harding,  
fol. 308. a. b.

the works that are printed in his name: and in these there is no such dialogue touching these matters. There is no such thing at all among all his dialogues. Whether friar Bale, or Illyricus, or some other such gatherer of riff-raff have deceived you, or yourself have used your own invention (I will not call it plain lying), I know not." *The answer.* And will you not call it *plain lying*, M. Harding? There is the more courtesy in your dealing. Such talk becometh you so well, as nothing better. It is your manner to presume boldly before you know. Certainly there is such a dialogue of Anselmus: there is such a dialogue. And although you saw it never, yet have I seen it. And if any your friend, for his better satisfaction, shall desire the sight thereof, I am able to help him<sup>51</sup>. If ye rest only

<sup>51</sup> [In this, as in other instances, bp. Jewel's accurate and extensive acquaintance with MSS. is most satisfactorily vindicated. From the author's mode of expression, it appeared that the MS. was not in his own possession, but in that of a friend: and the Editor was led to conjecture that the owner might be archbishop Parker. This conjecture was confirmed by the allusion to some such work in p. 280 of "The Defence of Priests' Marriages" (with "the Additions" by abp. Parker), a very rare book, a copy of which is in the Bodl. "imprinted at London by Richard Jugge &c." (4to. U. 21 Jur.) "For it is plainly alleged in that solemn treatise, written by Anselm against the lawfulness of priests' marriages, in an old hand to be shewed, intituled '*Contra offendiculum Sacerdotum*,' that monks professed &c."—a reference, for which the Editor is indebted to Dr. Bandinel. The probability was still further increased by finding in the catalogue of the archbishop's MSS. in C. C. C. C. a work of St. Anselm's, entitled *Offendiculum Sacerdotum* (Art. xxxiv. No. 36); and the conjecture was turned into certainty, when, by the kindness of Mr. Power at the request of Dr. Bandinel, a transcript of the

following passage, the exordium of the dialogue in question, was obtained.

"Anselm  
Incipit Offendiculum  
Sacerdotum. } (Rubric)  
Inquisitio Discipuli. }

Crebro cogimur ad hospitium tue sapientie pulsare, et timemus ne aliquando tedio affectus permittas nos foris stare. Sed cum noverimus non esse tuum quod das, sed tibi tantum commissum aliis ad erogandum; exigimus à te nostrum debitum. Desideramus ergo certificari tua solutione super vulgari in toto orbe questione, que ab omnibus pene cotidie ventilatur, et adhuc lis indiscussa celatur. Scilicet si liceat presbiteris post acceptum ordinem uxores ducere; aut si prosit vel liceat Christianis eorum missas audire, vel alia sacramenta ab eis percipere. Presertim cum apostolus nullum excipiens de omnibus viris dicat, propter fornicationem unusquisque uxorem habeat. Melius esse enim nubere quam uri, et tantummodo presbiteros constituendos esse unius uxoris viros, et necesse est ut hec questio à te finiatur, quin ob auctoritatis gravitatem tua sententia ut puta iudicis ab omnibus presteletur.

Solutio Magistri (Rubric)."]

upon the credit of *printed books*, ye may soon be deceived. For there are sundry books written by Anselmus that never were printed. Abbas Trithemius, after he had made a long rehearsal of his books, in the end saith thus: *Alia plura scripsisse dicitur, quæ ad notitiam meam non venerunt*: “Anselmus hath also written many other books, which never came to my knowledge.”

Trithemius,  
de Scriptori-  
bus Ecclesia-  
sticis.

But touching the number and certainty of Anselm's books<sup>52</sup>, I see no cause but Anselm himself may as well be believed as M. Harding. Anselm himself saith he hath written no *dialogues* than those four that you have alleged: as you might easily have seen by his *prologue* before his *dialogue* “De Veritate.” One other *dialogue* he wrote, [Anselm. tom. iii. 65. col. 1.] “De Passione Domini;” the speakers whereof are Anselmus and Maria<sup>53</sup>. He wrote another *dialogue* between the *master* and the *scholar*, beginning thus: *Plura sunt, de quibus tuam diu desidero responsionem*. There is another book of Anselmus, *De Corpore Christi*; and another, *De Conceptione Beatæ Virginis Mariæ*, beginning thus: *Principium quo salus mundi*: which, and other like books, I trow, in your printed Colonial tomes will not be found. There came lately abroad another *dialogue* of Anselm's between the *master* and *scholar*, named *Promptuarium, seu Elucidarium*, printed at Paris by Fredericus Morellus, anno Domini 1560<sup>54</sup>. Your Colonians in their tomes of Anselm's works have set forth one special book of his Epistles, containing in the whole thirteen only epistles, and no mo. Yet notwithstanding I can send you to two several authentic books of Anselm, wherein you may find three hundred threescore and eight of his Epistles<sup>55</sup>. Therefore, M. Harding, if you satisfy yourself only with the *records of Cologne*, you may haply be deceived. You may remember, Anselmus was the *archbishop of Canterbury*, and *metropolitan* of this *realm of England*: whether ever

<sup>52</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 117.]

<sup>53</sup> [This dialogue is printed in the Colon. ed. of 1612. tom. iii. 199.]

<sup>54</sup> [Printed ib. tom. iii. 222.]

<sup>55</sup> [The Epistles published in the Colon. ed. of 1612 in three books amount to 289. In the Paris ed. of 1675, a fourth book is added, containing 106 more.]

he saw the *city of Cologne*, or no, I have not heard. Therefore it were more wisdom for you to seek his books in England, than in Cologne. Nay your Colonians themselves confess, that they have not printed all Anselm's books, but only so many as came to their hands. For thus they write in the *inscription* or *title* of the same: *Operum Anselmi, quæ quidem haberi potuerunt, omnium*: and again in the third tome: *Catalogus opusculorum omnium D. Anselmi, quæ ad hunc usque diem haberi potuerunt.*

Spare therefore your unmannerly speeches of *plain lying*, M. Harding, and learn rather yourself to speak the truth. As for the matter itself, *that the priests of England were commonly and lawfully married in the time of Anselmus*, which was in the year of our Lord, a thousand and fourscore, it is evident by all that have written the story of that age.

You may add further hereto the example of Moses, not the great captain of *Israel*, but a *Christian priest*: who, as it appeareth by the *pope's own records*, being within holy orders, took a wife, and lived with her without any manner offence of law. Your doctors tell you, that until the time of *pope Siricius*, that is to say, for the space wellnear of four hundred years after Christ, it was lawful for all priests to marry without exception, neither vow, nor promise, nor law, nor ordinance, nor other restraint being then to the contrary. Panormitane your principal *canonist* saith thus: *Si clare constet de matrimonio papæ, tunc aut uxor inducitur ad continentiam, aut si noluerit [suppl. continere] reddat debitum, et nihilominus stet in papatu. Quia non repugnat substantiæ papatus, seu clericatus. Nam et Petrus habebat uxorem, cum promoveretur [l. fuit promotus] in papam. Continentia autem processit ex constitutione ecclesiæ*: "If it may appear clearly, that the pope hath a wife," (as having married her before he was *pope*,) "then either his wife shall be persuaded to live single, or if she will not, let the pope yield her marriage duty, and yet nevertheless remain in the popedom still. For marriage duty is not contrary to the substance and office, neither of popedom, nor of

Dist. 84. Cum  
in præterito.

In eadem  
Dist.


Extr. de  
Election. C.  
Licet de vi-  
tand. Abb.  
[Panorm.  
t. 1. pt. 1. fol.  
123. col. 2.]



priesthood. For Peter had a wife when he was promoted to be a pope. As for the rule of single life, it was brought in by the ordinance of the church." And therefore he saith further: *Unde videmus, quod presbyteri Græci sine peccato contrahunt matrimonium*: "We see, that the priests of Græcia, being within orders, do marry wives: and we see, they do it *sine peccato*, without sin, or breach of law, either of God, or of man." He goeth not by blind per-adventure, and by guess, as you do, M. Harding: but speaketh of certainty. "We know it," saith he, "and we see it." Another of your *cardinals*, Nicolaus Cusanus, saith: *In Novo Testamento, post aliquot tempora, visum fuit, irrationabile fore, quod in sacris ordinibus existentes contraherent, similiter et solemniter roventes*: "In the New Testament, after a certain time, it was thought it should not be reasonable for priests, being within holy orders, to contract matrimony: likewise it was thought of them that had made solemn vows." *After a certain time* (saith he) *this decree was made*. He meaneth the time of *pope Siricius*, as we have said. Before which time it was lawful, as well for *priests*, as also for them that had made a solemn vow of chastity, to marry lawfully without restraint.

Nicol. Cus.  
ad Bohem.  
epist. 2.  
[p. 835.]

Thus, M. Harding, you see by your *canonists*, that the *priests of the east church may marry, being within holy orders*: by the ancient *council of Ancyra*, that *deacons*, after protestation made, might lawfully marry: by Chrysostom, that *priests and bishops may so take the state of marriage*, that it shall be no hinderance to any perfection: by *cardinal Cajetan*, that, speaking absolutely, a *priest offendeth not in marrying a wife*, his orders or priesthood notwithstanding: by Anselm, that eleven hundred years after Christ, that is to say, until within one hundred years sithence the Conquest, this matter, notwithstanding it had been much beaten through the world, yet lay still undiscussed: by Panormitane, Erasmus, and Agrippa, that the *priests of Græcia marry this day, and that, sine peccato, without sin*: by others your doctors, that until the time of *pope Siricius* it was lawful for all *priests* to marry. You see that Moses, being a Christian priest, and Eupsy-

chius, being a Christian bishop, and a martyr, took either of them a lawful wife, and so lived in marriage without offence. Yet all this notwithstanding, can you say again without blushing, M. Harding, as you have said, "We deny utterly, that any man, after that he hath received holy orders, may marry?" Or will you say, "It cannot be shewed, that the marriage of such was ever accounted lawful in the catholic church?" 

If ye knew these things before, M. Harding, ye were to blame to dissemble them: if ye knew them not, ye were to blame to control them. I doubt not but it may appear by these few, that sithence the time of Christ's resurrection, sundry priests being within holy orders have married wives: and that not only in the *Greek* church, but also in the church of *Rome*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 3. Divis. 9.*

The *ancient emperor Justinian* commanded, that [Vol. iv. p. 61.] in the holy administration all things should be pronounced with a clear, loud, and treatable<sup>56</sup> voice, that the people might receive some fruit thereby<sup>57</sup>. These men, lest the people should understand them, mumble up their service, not only with a drowned and hollow voice, but also in a strange and barbarous tongue.

M. HARDING.

Justinian the emperor willeth prayers at the holy oblation (which these defenders here translate administration, as being ashamed of their own author, because they hold <sup>a</sup>against the sacrifice of the mass) to be made not in silence, but with an audible voice. Not meaning as though prayers made in silence were unfruitful to the people, as these men would make us believe. And therefore they corrupt his words, as what thing do they not corrupt, that cometh under their hands? They say Justinian made that law, *Ut fructus ex ea re aliquis ad populum redire possit*: "That some fruit might come thereof to the

<sup>56</sup> [Apol. Lat. "expressa."] the edition of Haloander, is  
<sup>57</sup> [Supra vol. ii. p. 43. note <sup>25</sup>, printed at length.]  
 where the original, according to

M. Harding,  
 fol. 280.

In Novel.  
 Constit. 123.  
 [Haloander.]

<sup>a</sup> Untruth,  
 fond and  
 peevish. For  
 Justinian  
 speaketh not  
 of any sacri-  
 fice of the  
 mass.

people," as who should say, <sup>b</sup> no fruit were like to come if prayer were made in silence. But what saith Justinian? His words be: *Quo majore exinde devotione in depromendis Domini Dei laudibus audientium animi efferantur*: "To the intent the minds of the hearers may thereby with the more devotion be lifted up in setting forth the praises of our Lord God." He saith that the loud voice helpeth to more devotion, he saith not, to some fruit, but, with more devotion. Some fruit is always had even by secret prayer, and more fruit sometime than by loud prayer.

Two faults then are committed, or rather two lies made in Justinian's words; one, that for oblation they turned administration, which falsehood Mr. Jewel useth in his printed sermon, and in his replies to M. D. Cole <sup>58</sup>. Whether he be also guilty of this <sup>59</sup>? Another fault is, that for more devotion, they put, some fruit. The third lie is, in that they say, we do whisper all our service, so is the Latin, albeit this good lady liketh better the term of mumbling. I ween few who have the sense of hearing will say with them, that the singing of psalms, hymns, epistle, gospel, grailes <sup>60</sup>, offertories, preface, and such like service used in the catholic church, is whispering, or mumbling <sup>c</sup>. The fourth lie is, where they say, we do it so, lest the people should understand us. <sup>d</sup>We wish that all the people understood all our prayers. But we think it not convenient, in a common profane tongue to utter high mysteries. Therefore we wish they would learn the <sup>e</sup>mystical tongue, and gladly do we teach their children the same.....St. Dionyse the Areopagite scholar to St. Paul, teacheth Timothy, and in him all us, *Communicare ea quæ vim perficiendi habent, cum iis qui perficiunt*: "To communicate those things which have power to make men perfect, with them who make men perfect:" <sup>f</sup> that is to say, to publish priestly office of consecration (for nothing maketh us more perfect) among them only who are priests, and not among others.

Last of all, the fifth lie is, to say that we pronounce our service and our mysteries in a barbarous tongue. <sup>g</sup>As though the Latin tongue were barbarous, and not rather every vulgar tongue. That tongue is most barbarous which is most used of the vulgar sort, most private, most unknown in respect of all.....<sup>h</sup>When England cometh to have a service of their own, a tongue of their own in churches, and hath a church of their own beside the whole, then have they lost their part with the catholic church, whereunto God restore it again.

<sup>58</sup> [Supra vol. i. p. 12. and p. 93. The original words are *την θείαν προσκομίδην*.]

<sup>59</sup> [It must be remembered, that the Apology was published anonymously. Hence Harding's allusions here and elsewhere to

the suspected author.]

<sup>60</sup> [Grailes, i. e. Graduale, the antiphone sung after the Epistle, whilst the deacon is ascending the steps of the ambo, in order to read the Gospel. See Hoffman's Lexicon.]

<sup>b</sup> Untruth. For St. Augustine saith: *Quid prodest locutionis integritas, quam non sequitur intellectus audientis?* [Aug. tom. iii. 73.]

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For M. Harding's own councils express it by these words, *insurrare* and *murmurare*.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth, notorious, and contrary to their own principal position, *Ignorance is the mother of devotion*.

<sup>e</sup> Mystical tongue. A mystical folly of all follies.

<sup>f</sup> Untruth, and a gloss contrary both to the text, and also to the continual practice of the church of Græcia.

<sup>g</sup> Folly. For St. Paul saith, *The tongue is barbarous, that is not known*.

<sup>h</sup> A solemn decree without sense.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O, M. Harding, *we corrupt not such things as come under our hands.* The world seeth, that is your ordinary and peculiar practice: it is not ours. Ye dub us both here and elsewhere with your *lies upon lies.* Such is the civility and courtesy of your speech. Yet hitherto we have not redubbed you with any one *lie.* Sobriety and modesty rather becometh them that speak of God.

Justin. Imper. Authen. Const. 123. We command all bishops and priests to minister the holy oblation, &c. not under silence, but with a loud voice, &c. that the hearts of the hearers may be stirred to more devotion, &c.

August. De Doctrina Christian. lib. 4. cap. 16. [al. 10. tom. iii. 73.]

First ye say, *we have corrupted Justinian's words.* And yet ye know we alleged only Justinian's meaning, and otherwise not one of all his words. Ye say: "Justinian meant not as though prayers made in silence were unfruitful to the people. For some fruit" (ye say) "there is always had even by secret (and unknown<sup>61</sup>) prayer." But what *fruit*, or how much, or how ye know it, or can assure it, ye spare to tell us. Yet St. Augustine saith: *Quid prodest locutionis integritas, quam non sequitur intellectus audientis? Cum loquendi omnino nulla sit causa, si quod loquimur non intelligunt, propter quos, ut intelligant, loquimur:* "What profit is there in speech, be it never so perfect, if the understanding of the hearer cannot attain it? For there is no cause why we should speak at all, if they understand not what we speak, for whose sake we speak, that they may understand us." Again he saith: *Mens mea sine fructu est: hoc ait, quando id quod dicitur non intelligitur:* "My mind is without fruit: this the apostle St. Paul saith, when the thing that is spoken is not perceived." And again: *Si intellectum mentis removeas, nemo edificatur audiendo quod non intelligit:* "Set apart the understanding of the mind, and no man hath fruit or profit of that thing that he perceiveth not." Likewise again he saith: *Quid opus est jubilaré,.....et non intelligere jubilationem: ut vox nostra sola jubeat, et cor non jubeat? Sonus enim cordis intellectus est:* "What needeth us to sing, if we understand not what we sing; to sing with our *voice*, and not with our heart? For understanding is the sound, or voice of the heart."

Aug. in Genes. ad literam, lib. 11. [lib. 12. tom. iii. 302.] cap. 8.

Aug. in Ps. 99. [iv. 1072.]

<sup>61</sup> [The words in parenthesis are added by Jewel. Harding is evidently speaking of the efficacy of secret prayer in obtaining God's blessings, Jewel of its direct effect upon the people's understanding.]

M. Harding telleth us sadly: "The devout people is edified by the Latin prayers, though they understand not one word that is spoken." But St. Augustine saith: "By that thing that he understandeth not, no man is edified." M. Harding saith: "There is always some fruit even by secret (and unknown) prayer." But St. Augustine saith: "There is no fruit in speech, be it never so perfect, if the understanding of the heart cannot attain it." So properly St. Augustine and M. Harding agree together.

These words, *whispering* and *mumbling*, mislike you much. Yet your own friends intreating hereof have often used the same words. In your late *council of Cologne* it is written thus: *Ut presbyteri preces non tantum ore murmurant, sed etiam corde persolvant, nunquam a manibus eorum liber legis, hoc est, Biblia, deponatur*: "That the priests may not only *mumble* up their prayers, but also pronounce them from their hearts, let the *book of the law*, that is to say, the *Bible*, never be laid from their hands."

Conc. Coloni-  
en. cap. 5.  
an. 1536.  
part. 2.  
[Harduin. ix.  
1981.]

Likewise Regino reporteth the words of the *council of Nantes*: *Ridiculum est, muris aut parietibus insusurrare ea quæ ad populum pertinent*: "It is a peevish thing to *whisper* those things to the walls, that pertain unto the people."

Regino 2.  
Concil. Nan-  
netensi. [in  
lib. 2. de  
eccl. discipli-  
nis, p. 96.]

Notwithstanding, whether it be *whispering*, or *mumbling*, or by whatsoever name else it shall please you to call it, that good emperor's commandment and meaning was, that ye should so utter all things in the congregation, *distinctly, and plainly, with loud and open voice*, that the people might understand you, and answer, *Amen*. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *Nos qui in ecclesia divina eloquia cantare didicimus, simul etiam instare debemus, esse quod scriptum est, Beatus populus, qui intelligit jubilationem. Proinde, charissimi, quod consona voce cantavimus, sereno etiam corde nosse et tenere debemus*: "We that have learned to sing in the church the heavenly words of God, must also endeavour to be that thing that is written; *Blessed is the people that understandeth what they sing*. Therefore, dearly beloved, that we have sung together with tuneable voice, we ought also to know and see with pure heart." St. Ambrose, declaring the ecclesiastical order

Authen. Con-  
stitut. 123.

Aug. in Psal.  
18. [Enarr. 2.  
iv. 81.]

Ambro.  
Hexaemer.  
lib. 3. cap. 5.  
[l. 42.]

of his time, saith thus:..... *Responsoriis psalmodum, cantu virorum, mulierum, virginum, parvulorum, consonus undarum fragor resultat*: “With the answering of psalms, and with the *singing together of men, women, maids, and little children, the church soundeth, as if it were the dashing and beating of the sea.*”

Leo de Jeju-  
nio septim.  
mensis, Ser-  
mon. 3.  
[l. 351.]

To like purpose Leo saith: *Totius ecclesie una est oratio, et una confessio*: “The whole church hath one prayer, and one confession.”

Dionys. cap.  
3. [p. 159.]  
Μετὰ παν-  
τός τοῦ τῆς  
ἐκκλησίας  
ἱεροῦ πλη-  
ρώματος.

That ye allege out of Dionysius is vain and childish, as is the rest of your talk, and quite contrary to the *author's* mind, and therefore not worthy to be answered. For Dionysius saith not as you have imagined, M. Harding, that the priest should talk alone in his *mystical unknown tongue*, as a jangling cymbal without sense: but rather telleth you, that by his order the *priest* and the *whole people* should sing together. These be his words: *Percipiens ipse, et aliis tradens divinam communionem, postremo desinit in gratiarum actionem, una cum tota ecclesie multitudine*: “The *priest* both receiving himself the *holy communion*, and also delivering the same unto others, last of all endeth with thanksgiving, *together with all the whole multitude and company of the church.*”

Thus out of one place ye have alleged two manifest testimonies against yourself: the one to condemn your *private mass*: the other to condemn your *mystical prayers in unknown tongue*.

Ye say: “We wish the people would learn the *mystical Latin tongue*: and gladly do we teach their children the same.” Ye say, “the *mystical Latin tongue.*” O vain man, and more vain than vanity itself! Why seek you so fondly to deceive God's people? Who ever taught you these kinds of mysteries? What scripture? what council? what doctor? what father? How know you, that the *Latin tongue*, that every child may so commonly and so easily understand, should be so *mystical*? And wherefore are all other tongues, the Greek, the Hebrew, the Chaldee, the Arabic, the Italian, the French, the Spanish, the Irish, less *mystical* than the Latin? What have these tongues

offended? What hath that tongue deserved? The tongue is nothing else but a tongue. It is the matter and meaning of the words that is *mystical*. St. Augustine saith: *Audimus hæc verba, Beata vita: et rem ipsam omnes nos appetere fatemur: non enim sono delectamur. Nam hoc cum Latine audit Græcus, non delectatur: quia ignorat quod dictum est:.....sicut etiam Latinus, si Græce hoc audierit: quoniam res ipsa nec Græca nec Latina est:.....*“ We hear these words, *Blessed life, or the life to come*. And the thing itself we all confess we desire to have. For we have no pleasure in the sound of the words. For when a Grecian heareth these words spoken in Latin, he hath no pleasure in them, because he understandeth not what is spoken. Neither hath the Latin any pleasure, if he hear the same spoken in Greek. For the thing itself is neither Greek nor Latin.” It were a great *mystery* to reach the bottom of your *mysteries*. St. Paul calleth you, not the *hidiers*, or *couchers*, but the *dispensers* and *stewards of* 1 Cor. iv. 1. *God's mysteries*. Your *mystical* policy is to lead God's people through *mist* and *darkness*. Ye *wish the people would learn the Latin tongue*, which you call *mystical*. No doubt, a worthy and a learned wish. Ye might as good cheap, and as well have wished, that all the whole people, of all countries, would learn to speak Greek and Hebrew. But your meaning is, that until all the *ploughmen*, and *artificers*, and *labourers* of the world be able to understand and to speak your *mystical Latin tongue*, they may not in any wise be allowed to understand any parcel of their prayers.

Lactantius, speaking of the subtle practices and policies of the heathens, saith thus: *Hinc fida silentia instituta sunt ab hominibus callidis: ut nesciret populus quid coleret:* Lactant. lib. 5. cap. 20. “Therefore trusty silence and secrecy was appointed by subtle and false factors, that the people” (still being blind) “should never know what they worshipped.”

This is not the *mystery* of the kingdom of heaven: it is Matt. xlii. 11. rather the *mystery* of iniquity: the same *mystery* that 2 Thess. ii. St. John mentioneth in his Revelations: *In fronte ejus* Rev. xvii. 5. *nomen scriptum est, mysterium: Babylon Magna, mater*

*abominationum et fornicationum terræ*: “A name was written in her forehead, a *mystery*: Great Babylon, the mother of the abominations and of the fornications of the earth.” Of these holy *mysteries*, your *Latin tongue*, as ye have used it, may well and justly be called *mystical*.

Hier. in Ep.  
ad Ephes.  
cap. 5. [iv.  
387.]

St. Hierom saith of your fathers in old time: .... *De domo Dei scenam fecere populorum*: “Of the house of God they have made a stage-play of the people <sup>60</sup>.” And speaking of the Valentinian heretics, he saith: *Barbaro simplices quosque terrent sono, ut quod non intelligunt, plus mirentur*: “With a barbarous unknown sound of words they fear the simple, that whatsoever they understand not they may the more esteem and have in reverence.”

Hieron. ad  
Theodoram.  
[iv. pt. 2.  
581.]

But the *Latin tongue* (ye say) is *not barbarous*: and therein, as your wont is, ye have noted a wonderful great lie in our Apology. Yet unto St. Paul that tongue seemeth *barbarous* that is unknown unto the hearer, be it Latin, be it Greek. Thus he saith: *Nisi sciero vim vocis, ero illi qui loquitur barbarus: et ille qui loquitur, mihi barbarus*: “Unless I understand the power or meaning of the words, I shall be *barbarous* to him that speaketh: and he that speaketh” (in what tongue soever he speak) shall be *barbarous* unto me.” Hereof I had occasion to

1 Cor. xiv. 11.

Art. 3. div. 3.  
[supra vol. ii.  
8.]

Ludov. Vives  
de traden.  
Discip. lib. 3.  
fol. 97. [tom.  
i. p. 463.]

say somewhat in my *former Reply*. St. Augustine saith: *Mallet quisque cum cane suo versari, quam cum homine ignotæ linguæ*: “Any man would rather dwell with his dog, than with a man of an unknown tongue.”

To conclude: ye say, “When England cometh to have a service of their own, and a tongue of their own in churches, then have they lost their part with the catholic church.” Here, M. Harding, a little more reason would have given some credit to your words. For as touching the *public service* of the church, I beseech you, even in your own time of barbarous blindness, what service had the church of England but peculiar and special to her-

<sup>60</sup> [S. Hieron. in Ephes. “Sic  
“cantat servus Domini. . . . ut  
“spiritus malus . . . ejiciatur ab his  
“qui similiter ab eo possidentur,

“et non introducatur in eos, qui  
“de domo Dei scenam fecere po-  
“pulum.”]



self? Touching the variety of tongues, St. Augustine saith : *Astitit regina a dextris tuis in vestitu deaurato, circumdata varietate. Ubi significatur linguarum varietas in omnibus gentibus : quarum tamen una est intus et simplex fides :* August. advers. Judeos, cap. 4. [viii. 31.]

“The queen stood at thy right hand, apparelled in cloth of gold, adorned with variety.’ Hereby is signified the diversity of tongues in all nations: the faith whereof, that lieth within, is one and simple.” Likewise again he saith : *Vestitus reginæ hujus quis est ? Et pretiosus et varius est : sacramenta doctrinæ in linguis omnibus variis. Alia lingua Aphricana [al. Afra] : alia Syra : alia Græca : alia Hebræa : alia illa, et illa. Faciunt istæ linguæ varietatem vestis reginæ hujus. Quomodo autem omnis varietas vestis in unitate concordat, sic et omnes linguæ ad unam fidem. In veste varietas sit, scissura non sit : ecce varietatem intelleximus de diversitate linguarum ? et vestem intelleximus propter unitatem :* “What is this queen’s apparel? It is precious, and full of variety: the mysteries of doctrine in all sundry tongues. There is one tongue of Africa: another of Syria: another Greek: another Hebrew: another this, another that. These tongues make up the variety of the queen’s apparel. But as all the variety of colours in the apparel agreeth in unity, even so all tongues agree in one faith. Let there be variety in the apparel: but rent or cut there may not be. Behold, by the variety we understand the *diversity of tongues*: and by the apparel we understand the *unity* (of the church).” Again he saith : *Distant inter se linguæ : sed linguarum distantie non sunt schismata :* Aug. in Johan. tract. 6. [iii. pt. 2. 331.]

“Tongues are divided one from another: but the division of tongues is no schism or division in religion.” Therefore, M. Harding, why send ye us over this wanton talk? why tell you us, that “when England hath a tongue of her own in the churches, then hath she lost her part with the catholic church.” Behold, St. Augustine saith: “The division of tongues is no division in religion.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis.* 10.

Conc. Carth.  
3. [cap. 47. iii.  
891.]

The old council at Carthage commanded, that nothing should be read in Christ's congregation but the *canonical scriptures*<sup>61</sup>: these men read such things in their churches as themselves know for a truth to be stark lies and fond fables. [Vol. iv. p. 61.]

M. HARDING.

a Untruth.  
For if this old  
council be  
falsified, it  
was falsified  
twelve hun-  
dred years  
ago in the  
council of  
Hippo.

A man were better, I assure thee, good reader, to make two new books than to correct one so full of lies and falsified places as this Apology is. <sup>a</sup>This old council of Carthage is newly falsified by our new clergy. The words of the council are these: *Placuit, ut præter scripturas canonicas nihil in ecclesia legatur sub nomine divinarum scripturarum*: "It hath seemed good unto us, that besides the canonical scriptures, nothing be read in the church under the name of the holy scriptures." They, leaving out these four words, *sub nomine divinarum scripturarum*, "under the name of divine scriptures," would bear men in hand the council willed nothing to be read in the church besides the holy scriptures. Are not these trusty men, to whom ye may commit the charge of your souls for your faith and salvation? Conc. Carth. 3. cap. 47. [iii. 891.]

It followeth in the same decree: *Liceat etiam legi passiones martyrum, cum anniversarii dies celebrantur*: "Let it be lawful also for the martyrdoms of martyrs to be read when their yearly feasts are kept." And yet dare they not only to say, nothing must be read besides the scriptures, but also to allege that very place for that special lie, which saith the contrary. Look in the book thyself, good reader, and see how falsely they handle so holy matters. <sup>b</sup>Another lie is, when they say we read those things in the church which ourselves know to be stark lies and fond fables. When they cannot themselves show that we have any such, it is a vain lying rhetoric to say we doubt not of it, or know it ourselves for a truth, I wonder not if they blush not in belying us, who have belied so many scriptures, councils, and fathers. [Ibid. et iv. 484. c. 13.]

b Untruth.  
For it is cou-  
fessed by the  
best of M.  
Harding's  
own side.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It standeth well with your truth, M. Harding, so often to charge us with *lies* and *falsehood*. I trust it will appear, ye had no great cause to keep so great revel upon so poor

<sup>61</sup> [Concil. Carth. 3. cap. 47. "legatur sub nomine divinarum  
"Item placuit, ut præter scriptu- "scripturarum. Sunt autem ca-  
"ras canonicas, nihil in ecclesia "nonicæ scripturæ," &c.]

a conquest. Indeed these words be not expressly found in the third *council of Carthage*: yet are they found in the *council of Hippo*, which is the abridgment of the third *council of Carthage*, as it appeareth by the title of the same: *Concilii Hipponensis abbreviationes factæ in concilio Carthaginensi tertio*. [Crabb, tom. i. 433.]

The words of the *council of Hippo*, and for so much also of the third *council of Carthage*, be these: *Scripturæ canonicæ in ecclesia legendæ quæ sunt: et præter quas aliæ* Conc. Hipp. cap. 38. [iii. 896.] *[al. aliæ] non legantur*: “The scriptures canonical, which are to be read in the church: and besides which nothing may be read.” Here have you, M. Harding, the plain words of the *council of Hippo*, abridged out of the third *council of Carthage*, *That nothing may be read in the church, but only the canonical scriptures*. Judge you therefore, how just cause ye had so unadvisedly, for I dare not say so unlearnedly, to charge the Apology with *lies* and *falsehood*.

Here may we add the like decree of the *council* holden at *Laodicea*: *Sabbatis evangelia cum aliis scripturis legenda esse censemus*: “We agree, that the *gospel*, with other *scriptures*, be read upon the sabbath day.” If these words seem not sufficient, it followeth further in the same *council*: *Non oportet libros, qui sunt extra canonem, legere, nisi solos canonicos Veteris et Novi Testamenti*: “We may not read any books that be without the canon, *but only the canonical books of the Old and New Testament* <sup>62</sup>.” Conc. Laod. cap. 16. [ii. 567, a.]

To like effect Chrysostom saith: “*Ideo Christus mensas nummulariorum evertit: significans quod in templo Dei non debent esse nummi, nisi spirituales, id est, qui Dei imaginem habent*: “Therefore Christ overthrew the exchangers’ banks, meaning thereby that there may be no coin in the church, but only spiritual, that is to say, that beareth the image of God.” Again he saith: *Lectorum officium erat, in ecclesia sacra legere ex scriptis, vel prophetarum, vel apostolorum*: “It was the *reader’s* office to pronounce Conc. Laod. cap. 59. [ii. 574, c.] Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 38. [Op. imp. vi. app. 140.]

<sup>62</sup> [Concil. Laod. cap. 50. Ὅτι βιβλία, ἀλλὰ μόνα τὰ κανονικὰ τῆς οὐ δεῖ ἰδιωτικὸς ψαλμοὺς λέγεσθαι καινῆς καὶ παλαιᾶς διαθήκης.] ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, οὐδὲ ἀκανόνιστα

holy things unto the people, out of either the *apostles* or *prophets* <sup>62</sup>.”

Erasm. in Hieron. de Eccl. Scrip. Effrem. [Hieron. opp. ed. Erasm. i. 314.]

Erasmus saith: *Apparet non nisi apostolicas literas olim legi solitas in templis, aut certe virorum apostolicæ auctoritatis*: “It appeareth, that in old time nothing was used to be read in the churches but only the apostles’ writings: or at least the writings of such others as were of apostolical authority.” Likewise saith abbas Ansigisus, reporting the *ecclesiastical decrees* of the French kings Lewis and Charles: *In templis tantum canonici libri, id est, sacræ literæ legantur*: “Let there be read in the churches only the canonical books, that is to say, the holy scriptures <sup>63</sup>.” Hereby may you see, M. Harding, if there were any want before, thus many ways it may be supplied.

Ansigisus, lib. 1. cap. 19. impress. Paris. ann. 1550.

“Another lie,” (ye say) “is this, when they say, we read those things in the church which ourselves know to be stark lies and fond fables.” For trial hereof we shall not need to travel far. Your own *books* and *legends* are proof sufficient.

Erasm. in Annotat. in Hieron. de Eccl. Scrip. [Hier. Opp. ed. Erasm. i. 314.]

Erasmus thereof saith thus: *Hodie quorumlibet somnia, imo muliercularum deliramenta leguntur inter divinas scripturas*: “Nowadays every fool’s dreams, yea very women’s doting fancies are read with the holy scriptures.”

Polyd. Verg. in Orat. Dominicam. [in Epist. nuncupat.]

Likewise saith Polydore Virgil: *Multorum divorum vitas recitant, tametsi parum ad fidem scriptas*: “They read many saints’ lives, although not written according to the truth.” Ludovicus Vives, writing of your *Legenda Aurea*, which was the mother of all your devout *ecclesiastical stories or fables*, saith thus: *Nescio cur aurea dici debeat, cum scripta sit ab homine ferrei oris, et plumbei cordis, et plenissima sit impudentissimis mendaciis*: “I see no cause why it should be called the *Golden Legend*, seeing it was written by a man of an iron face, and a leaden heart, and is freight full of most shameless lies.” If ye knew not these things, M. Harding, your friends

[Lud. Viv. de caus. cor. art. lib. 2. Opp. 1. 371. et apud Leonard. [leg. Lud.] Lavat. in Proverb. Salm. p. 134.]

<sup>62</sup> [This passage does not occur *totidem verbis* in the homily. It is rather a note of bishop Jewel’s.]

<sup>63</sup> [Ansigisus; see several ex-

tracts from his *Capitula Caroli Magni et Ludov. Pii*, in the 9th book of the *Catal. Test. Veritatis* per Flaciun.]

will think ye know nothing. Such truths ye read, and publish devoutly and solemnly in your churches. Yet may we neither say, nor think, ye mock the people.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 4. Divis. 1.*

But if there be any that think these above rehearsed *authorities* be but weak and slender, because they were decreed by *emperors* and certain petit bishops, and not by so full and perfect councils, taking pleasure rather in the authority and name of the pope: let such a one know, that pope Julius doth evidently forbid, that a priest in ministering the communion should *dip the bread in the cup*. These men, contrary to *pope Julius' decree*, divide the *bread*, and *dip it in the wine*.

[De Cons.  
Dist. 2. Cum  
omne.]

M. HARDING.

Ye may be sure many men think this your homely stuff not only weak and slender, but also corrupt, venomous, and loathsome. But now by like ye will amend your fault. But how? Surely by going from very evil to as bad or worse, if ye can do worse, than hitherto ye have done. "Julius the pope" (say ye) "doth evidently forbid, that a priest in ministering the communion should dip the bread in the cup." Now verily your former fault of lying is well amended. For where before ye left out, cast in, or changed some of those words, which ye pretend to allege, now ye make every whit new of your own. Where hath Julius these words? I speak not of your false alleging of places in your book's margin. I forgive you the putting of *cum enim nemo*, instead of *cum omne*. These be small and slipper faults, which if they were alone might be winked at in such slipper merchants as ye are<sup>64</sup>. But let us hear what pope Julius saith: .. *...Alios quoque audivimus intinctam eucharistiam populis pro complemento communionis porrigere*: "We have heard also of others, who give to the people the eucharist dipped or steeped, for making up of the communion." It is to be understood, that whereas Christ gave the blessed sacrament of the altar to

<sup>64</sup> [Bishop Jewel has here omitted two other passages from the decree of Julius, (quoted with a long commentary by Harding,) which are nothing to the purpose.]

his apostles, he gave it under both kinds. And when the priests in some countries, either for lack of wine at all times ready, either for some private fancy, used to dip or steep the sacred body of our Lord under form of bread in the consecrated blood, and so to give it to the people; pope Julius findeth fault therewith, for that neither Christ ordained so, nor the apostles left such order to the church. So that Julius meaneth nothing else, but to reprove and reform that use of dipping or steeping the one kind in the other in the administration of the communion unto the people. Read the place who listeth, he shall find the same sense more largely uttered a little after.

But what sense make these defenders a God's name? They say Julius forbiddeth the priests, *ne dum peragit mysteria, panem immergat in calicem*: that in ministering the communion (so the lady turneth) he should dip the bread in the cup. There is no such word in the whole decree. Julius nameth *eucharistiam*, they call it bread. Julius hath <sup>a</sup> *intinctam porrigere populis*, that no priest <sup>b</sup> give the sacrament dipped to the people: they, leaving out, giving it to the people, say, he forbad the priest to dip it. They leave out also the chief cause of the whole, which is, *pro complemento communionis*, "for making up of the communion." For he forbiddeth to give unto the people only the consecrated host dipped in the chalice, as though it were the whole communion, no less than if the blood were given apart. "These men" (say they) "contrary to the decree of pope Julius, divide the bread and dip it in the wine." We in the mass break the host in three parts, not without signification of a mystery: two we receive apart, the third we put into the chalice and receive it together with the blood. What have ye to say against this?..... <sup>65</sup>

<sup>a</sup> A fond vanity. For if he forbid the priest to dip the sacrament, and to deliver it, then he forbiddeth the priest to dip the sacrament.

<sup>b</sup> These mystical significations be mystical folies. Read the answer.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

[Supra vol. 1. p. 424.]

Every part hereof is largely answered in my former Reply to M. Harding. True it is, the fault that Julius here findeth in *dipping* and *ministering* the sacrament, agreeth not fully with the present disorders of the church of Rome. Yet notwithstanding, in condemning the one,

<sup>65</sup> [Harding adds, "Neither is this that Julius reprehendeth. He forbiddeth to give unto the people the blessed sacrament dipped. We neither do it, nor ever have done it. Julius would not the dipping to stand for the supplying of both kinds apart, and for the making up the sacrament. Neither do

our priests in that sense take it, nor to that end use it, but for signification only of a special mystery, and that not of a private fancy or ambition; but by public authority. And therefore that decree of Julius pertaineth not to the reproofs of any thing that now is done in the church."]

he must needs condemn the other. Ye say, we leave out these words: *Intinctam porrigunt eucharistiam populis*: "They dip the sacrament, and deliver the same unto the people." And again these words: *Pro complemento communionis*: "For the accomplishment of the communion." The more matter we have left out, the more have we concealed your faults: and so much the more are you beholden to us. For what meant you, M. Harding, to mention any of all these words? Do you deliver the *sacrament unto the people*? do you make it a *perfect communion*? What needed you to burden yourself with mo abuses, and so much to bewray your folly?

Julius saith: "*They dipped the sacrament* into the cup, and delivered it unto the people." You *dip the sacrament* as they did: but unto the people ye give nothing. Julius saith, "They meant by *dipping* to make it a full and a perfect *communion*." Contrariwise you defraud the people of the *holy cup*, and deliver them only the *half communion*. And therefore ye are much more blameworthy, than ever were they whom Julius reprov'd. For they offended only of simplicity, and you of wilfulness: they only in one thing, you in three things together in one place.

But touching the matter itself, the fault that we find with you, and the fault that Julius found with others your predecessors, is all one. You *dip the bread* into the cup, and so did they. They brake Christ's *institution*, and so do you. And therefore Julius said unto them: *Hoc quam sit apostolicæ et evangelicæ doctrinæ contrarium, et consuetudini ecclesiasticæ adversum, non difficile ab ipso fonte veritatis probatur, a quo ordinata ipsa sacramentorum mysteria processerunt*: "How far contrary this is to the apostolical and evangelical doctrine, and to the custom of the church, it is easy to prove by the fountain of the truth, by whom the mysteries of the sacraments were ordained, and from whom they first proceeded."

Ye think the matter well discharged, for that ye deliver not the *sacrament so dipped* unto the people, but minister it only unto yourself. Here by the way, it were a matter

of skill, to understand by what authority, either of *scripture*, or of *council*, or of *doctor*, it may appear, that it is lawful for the priest so to use and receive the sacrament, and unlawful for the people. If the people may not as safely and as lawfully so receive the sacrament, as may the priest, wherefore then are these words written in your *mass books*, even in the *canon* and *secrets* of your *mass*? *Hæc sacrosancta commixtio corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi fiat mihi, et omnibus sumentibus, salus animæ [al. mentis] et corporis*: “This holy mingling of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto me, and unto all that receive it, the health of soul and body.” Verily these words, *omnibus sumentibus*, cannot by any shift possibly be expounded of one only priest, but must needs be extended unto the people.

Ye would fain tell us of certain *special mysteries*, that ye have found out in the *breaking of the sacrament*, if ye wist what they were. But ye are in case, as sometime was Nabuchodonozor, ye are not able well to tell us your own dream. Sometime ye say, *The bread is broken*: sometime ye say, *The accidents remain alone by miracle, and they are broken*: sometime ye say, *Christ's immortal and impassible body itself is broken*: sometime ye say, *Our eyes be deceived, and nothing is broken*.

Again (ye say) the first piece signifieth the *church trailing* in the world: the second signifieth *the blessed saints in heaven*: the third signifieth *the souls in purgatory*. But pope Sergius, the father of these phantasies, conveyeth his mysteries another way. For the first portion (saith he) signifieth *Christ's body after his resurrection*: the second, *Christ's body walking on earth*: the third, *Christ's body in the grave*. These, M. Harding, be your *holy significations* and *special mysteries*. With such follies and mystical vanities ye mock the world. In old times the bread was not broken to busy men's heads with *significations*, but only to be delivered to the people: as in my former Reply I have declared more at large. St. Augustine saith: *Panis benedicatur et sanctificatur, et ad distribuendum comminui-*

[Canon. in  
Missali Sa-  
risb.]

Dan. ii. 3.

Senten. lib. 4.  
Dist. 12. [A.  
B. C. D.]

Durand. lib.  
4. cap. 53. [f.  
51. No. 20.]

De Cons.  
Dist. 2. Tri-  
form.

Artic. 11. div.  
3. [supra vol.  
iii. p. 119.]  
Aug. epist. 1.  
[ii. 509.]



tur: "The bread is blessed and sanctified, and broken in pieces, to the end it may be delivered."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis.* 2.

Pope Clement saith, it is not lawful for a bishop to deal with both swords: "*For if thou wilt have both,*" saith he, "*thou shalt deceive both thyself and those that obey thee.*" Nowadays the pope chal- length to himself both swords, and useth both. Wherefore it ought to seem less marvel, if that have followed which Clement saith, that is, *that he hath deceived both himself and those which have given ear unto him.*

[† Clem. ad Jacob. ep. 1. Crabb. l. 32.] [Bernard. de Consid. il. 425.]

[Vol. iv. p. 61.]

M. HARDING.

If these fellows had not sworn to belie all the world for main- tenance of their new gospel, they would, at this time at least, have made a true report of St. Clement's words. St. Clement speaketh not of two swords. The place truly alleged hath thus:

<sup>a</sup> *Si mundialibus curis fueris occupatus, et teipsum decipies, et eos qui te audiunt:* "If thou be occupied in worldly cares, thou shalt both deceive thyself and those that listen to thee." The author of this Apology, having spite at the church, which is Christ's fold, and at the pope, the head shepherd, envying at his authority, forgeth a lie upon St. Clement, making him to say, *Si utrunque habere vis:* "If thou wilt have both swords, thou shalt both deceive thyself and those that obey thee." <sup>b</sup> Whereas Clement speaketh no word of the two swords, but of worldly cares, where- with what bishop soever is entangled, shall (as he saith) deceive both himself and others that hearken to him. For which cause these defenders being coupled with yoke-fellows in pretended wedlock, which state wrappeth a man in worldly cares, because such a one <sup>c</sup> careth for the things of the world, how to please his wife, and is divided," as St. Paul saith: it must needs follow, that having taken the office of superintendants, and charge of souls upon them, <sup>d</sup> they have deceived themselves, and daily do deceive so many as hear them, and follow their false doctrine.

<sup>a</sup> These words are partly Clement's, partly St. Bernard's.

<sup>b</sup> Fond and childish. As though a bishop may have the temporal sword, and execute a temporal office without worldly cares.

<sup>c</sup> What cares have they that keep concubines?

<sup>d</sup> Eleven of the twelve apostles, and many holy fathers and bishops, were married, and yet deceived not the people.

1 Cor. vii.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

O what a pleasant grace M. Harding hath to talk of *lies!* A man would think it were some good part of his study. In this place two sundry *authorities*, the one of

Clemens, the other of St. Bernard, I know not by what error, were joined in one, and both alleged and set forth under the name only of Clemens. I grant, there was herein an oversight: but *lie* or *falsehood* there was none, as it shall appear.

The words of Clemens are as you report them. The words of St. Bernard, written unto pope Eugenius, are these: *Planum est, apostolis interdici dominatum. I ergo tu, et tibi usurpare aude, aut dominans apostolatam: aut apostolus dominatum. Plane ab alterutro prohiberis. Si utrunque similiter habere velis, perdes utrunque*: “It is plain, that unto the apostles of Christ lordship or temporal princehood is forbidden. Go thou thy way therefore,” (thus he saith to the pope) “and dare thou to usurp, either the apostleship, being a lord: or a lordship, being an apostle. From one of them undoubtedly thou art forbidden. *If thou wilt indifferently have both, thou wilt lose both.*”

Bern.de Con-  
sid. lib. 2. [ii.  
425.]

Hieron. in  
Sophon. cap.  
1. [iii. 1647.]

Canon. A-  
post. can. 80.  
[ap. Bruns.  
p. 12.]

Matt. vi. 24.

Extrav. Com.  
De Major. et  
Obed. Unam  
Sanctam. [p.  
189.]

Parallpom.  
Urspergen-  
sis. [p. 343.]

Of such St. Hierom writeth thus: *Militantes Christo, obligant se negotiis secularibus, et eandem imaginem offerunt Deo et Cæsari*: “Being the soldiers of Christ, they bind themselves to worldly affairs, and offer up one image to God and Cæsar.” In the *Canons of the Apostles* it is written thus: *Non oportet episcopum aut presbyterum, se publicis administrationibus immittere: sed vacare et commodum se præbere usibus ecclesiasticis. Nemo enim potest duobus dominis servire*: “A bishop or a priest may not entangle himself with worldly offices, but be at rest, and shew himself meet for the use of the church. For no man can serve two masters<sup>66</sup>.” Yet the *pope* this day claimeth the right of *both swords*, not only of the *spiritual*, but also of the *temporal*. And pope Bonifacius VIII., in the great *jubilee*, and in the open sight of the world, when he had one day shewed himself in his *pontificalibus*, apparelled in procession as a *bishop of bishops*, the next day he put upon him the *emperor’s robes of majesty*, and had the *imperial*

<sup>66</sup> [Canon Apost. 80. Εἴπομεν, ρον καθίεναι ἑαυτὸν εἰς δημοσίας ὅτι οὐ χρὴ ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον διοικήσεις κ. τ. λ.]

*crowne upon his head*, and the sword naked and glittering borne before him.

As for pope Clemens, his canon is easily shifted by a pretty *proviso*. For thus saith your Gloss touching the same: *Cessante caussa, cessat effectus: verbi causa, prohibetur, ne presbyteri gerant tutelae [suppl. aliorum], hac causa, ut melius vacent divinis officiis. Hæc causa finalis est. Unde, cessante hac caussa, cessat effectus. Unde, si non vacent divinis officiis, poterunt gerere tutelae*: “The cause ending, the effect endeth too. For example, the law commandeth, that *a priest shall not be charged with the wardship of a child in his nonage*. The cause hereof is this, that he may the better apply his divine service. This is the final cause. This cause removed, the effect giveth place. Therefore if the priest follow not his divine service, then he may have the wardship of a child.” Even so, if the *pope* do not the office of a *bishop*, then may he be a *temporal prince*. But by these means it cometh to pass, even as Clemens saith, *He deceiveth both himself and also them that hear him*.

Touching this vain objection of the *charge and cares of marriage*, it is fully answered before, in a place more convenient.

Extra de Jurjurando. Etsi Christus. In Glossa. [lib. ii. tit. 24. c. 26. Glossa penult.]

Part v. cap. 3. div. 7. [supra vol. vi. p. 47.] And part 2. cap. 8. div. 2. [supra vol. iv. p. 591.]

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis.* 3.

Pope Leo saith, “*Upon one day it is lawful to say but one mass in one church*”<sup>67</sup> These men say daily in one church commonly ten masses, twenty, thirty, yea oftentimes mo. So that the poor gazer on can scant tell, which way he were best to turn himself. Pope Gelasius saith, “It is a wicked deed and subject to *sacrilege* in any man to divide the communion, and when he hath received one kind, to abstain from the other.” These men, contrary to God’s

[Leon. Ep. i. 437.]

[De Cons. Dist. 2. Comm-perimus.]

<sup>67</sup> [This is rather *implied* than *said* by Leo. The exception which he makes, “if the multitude is great,” that the “sacrificii oblatio

indubitanter iteretur,” proves that the rule was generally to have one communion upon one day.]

word, and contrary to pope Gelasius, command, that one kind only of the *holy communion* be given to the people: and by so doing, they make their priests guilty of sacrilege.

M. HARDING.

a A solemn fancy. They must needs be wise men that so will think.

b Here M. Harding confesseth, that he and his fellows can set forth lies.

c Untruth manifest. Read the answer.

<sup>a</sup> There is no small number of men which are moved to suspect that this Apology was devised by some catholic man, intending to mock this new clergy of England, and to put them quite out of estimation and credit. <sup>b</sup> And to that very end this innumerable company of lies to them seemeth of purpose to be set out. For no man having his five wits would think good, for maintenance of his own part, to affirm so many things, the contrary whereof, to his great discredit and shame, by search is easily found. <sup>c</sup> Leo saith clean contrary to that is here in his name avouched, that whensoever a new multitude filleth the church, so as all cannot be present at the sacrifice at once, that the oblation of the sacrifice be without casting any doubt done again.....

In Epist. ad Dioscorum Alexandrinum. [l. 437.]

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I beseech thee, gentle reader, for shortness sake, and for thy better satisfaction herein, to consider my answer made hereunto in my former Reply to M. Harding. Verily Leo speaketh not one word either of *private mass*, or of *sole receiving*, or of any other like superstitious and peevish vanity: but only of the *general communion* of the whole church. His counsel therefore unto Dioscorus is, that if, upon occasion of resort, the multitude of communicants were so great, that they could not have convenient room in the church to receive all together at one *communion*, then the priest, after he had ministered unto the first company, and had willed them to depart forth, and give place to others, and saw the church replenished again with a new company of aftercomers, should without fear or remorse of conscience begin the whole *communion* again, and so minister unto them, as he had done unto the former. More than this out of Leo's words cannot be gathered. Here, M. Harding, have you found a good warrant for the *holy communion*, and a plain condemnation of your *private mass*.

Art. 13. div. 4. [supra vol. iii. p. 199.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. *Divis.* 1.

But if they will say, that all these things are worn now out of use and nigh dead, and pertain nothing to these present times: yet to the end all folk may understand what faith is to be given to these men, and upon what hope they call together their *general councils*, let us see in few words, what good heed they take to the self-same thing, which they themselves, these very last years, (and the remembrance thereof is yet new and fresh,) in their own *general council*, that they had by order called, have decreed and commanded to be devoutly kept. In the last *council at Trident*, scant fourteen years past, it was ordained by the common consent of all degrees, *That one man should not have two benefices at one time.* What is become now of that ordinance? Is the same too so soon worn out of mind, and clean consumed? For these men, ye see, give to one man, not two benefices only, but sundry abbeys many times, sometimes also two *bishoprics*, sometime three, sometime four, and that not only to an unlearned man, but oftentimes also even to a man of war.

In the said *council* a decree was made, that all bishops should preach the gospel. These men neither preach, nor once go up into the pulpit, neither think they it any part of their office. What great pomp and crake then is this, they make of antiquity? Why brag they so of the names of the ancient fathers, and of the new and old councils? why will they seem to trust to their authority, whom, when they list, they despise at their pleasure?

[Concil. Trident. sess. 24. de Reform. cap. 17.]

[Concil. Trident. sess. 24. de Reform. cap. 4.]

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Hereto M. Harding answereth thus: "With what face find they fault? Ye believe none of the councils: sir John Hooper, a martyr of their own canonization: your lying book: your vile stuff: your new upstart church: your heresies: your incredible lies: your malicious lies: your slanderous lies," &c. He is very hardhearted, that will not be moved with so valiant proofs.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 5. Divis. 2.*

But I have a special fancy to commune a word or two, rather with the *pope's* good holiness, and to say these things unto his own face. [Vol. iv. p. 62.]

## M. HARDING.

Here pricketh forth this hasty defender as pert as a pearmonger<sup>67</sup>, and fain would he talk with the pope himself, forsooth, face to face. But sir, I pray you, be not too hasty in taking your journey to Rome. Tell us, before ye go, may not a meaner man serve instead of the pope, for your masship to talk withal? . . . . This fellow hath a special fancy, and will needs to the pope himself, and talk with him of his high matters, presently to his own face. I pray you, sir, may not a poor man hear your tale beforehand? By often telling of it, you shall have it in better readiness when you come there.

Modesty and gravity meet for a doctor: masship.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 1.*

Tell us, I pray you, good holy father, seeing ye do crake so much of all *antiquity*, and boast yourself that all men are bound to you alone, which of all the fathers hath at any time called you by the name of the *highest prelate*, the *universal bishop*, or the *head of the universal church*. [Vol. iv. p. 62.]

## M. HARDING.

What the pope himself will say unto you, when you come before him, I know not. Because you make no haste (I suppose) as yet to go unto his person, may it please you in the mean time to be answered by another man, thus now, till then? Touching

<sup>67</sup> [This proverbial simile should properly run thus: "As pert as a pearmonger's mare." Ray's English Proverbs, p. 281.]

Prefation in Evangelistas. the first part of your first question, <sup>a</sup>read St. Hierom *ad Damasum*, and *adversus Luciferianos*, where he calleth the pope <sup>b</sup>*summum sacerdotem*. And if ye require a word of greater sound, <sup>c</sup>read St. Augustine, where he saith, *In Romana ecclesia semper viguit apostolicæ cathedræ principatus*: "In the Roman church the principedom of the apostolic chair hath always flourished." For the second part, look in the <sup>c</sup>*council of Chalcedon*. For the third, read Victor in his second book *De Persecutione Vandalarum*. And for a full resolution of this whole matter, read mine Answer to M. Jewel's challenge in the fourth article. There shall you find your demand fully answered—

<sup>a</sup> And there shall ye find nothing.  
<sup>b</sup> This name was common to every bishop: and therefore is fondly appropriate to the pope.  
<sup>c</sup> And there is nothing.

Epist. 162. [ii. 91.]

—beside two and thirty great untruths in the same one article.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here it liketh you, M. Harding, for the time, although unworthy, to supply the *pope's* person. Howbeit, as doubting either the sufficiency of your commission, or the discretion of your answer, ye say, "Thus now, till then."

Where we demand of you, which of all the ancient fathers and doctors ever called the pope *summum sacerdotem*, "the highest priest:" ye answer us, St. Hierom so called him in the book *Contra Luciferianos*. For his words be plain: *summus sacerdos*, "the highest priest." But what if it be found that these words belong no more to the pope than to any other particular bishop? Will ye then confess, that either ye were far overseen, or else that ye sought undue means, under the name of St. Hierom, to mock your reader? You say, St. Hierom by these words, *summus sacerdos*, meant only the *pope*. But M. Harding saith, St. Hierom by the same words meant any one *bishop*, whatsoever he were, and not *only the pope*. If you be M. Harding, and if these things be true, then are you of late foully fallen out with yourself.

M. Harding 204. b.  
Hieron. contra Luciferianos. [tom. iv. pt. 2. p. 295.]

For trial hereof, call to your remembrance, M. Harding, your own words, uttered, not elsewhere, but even in this selfsame book. The words of St. Hierom be these: "The safety of the church hangeth upon the dignity of the *highest priest*." Hereupon M. Harding saith: "This peerless authority St. Hierom in that place doth attribute to the bishop of every diocese<sup>68</sup>."

M. Harding directly contrary to himself.

<sup>68</sup> [Supra, vol. v. p. 487, compared with p. 493; and with vol. ii. p. 192.]

And thus, by M. Harding's own exposition, not only the *pope*, but also the *bishop* of any other *diocese*, is called by St. Hierom *the highest priest*. Thus one M. Harding saith, "St. Hierom by these words meant only the pope:" another M. Harding saith, "St. Hierom by the same words meant any one bishop, and not only the pope." It were a deed of charity to resolve your reader, whether of these two contrary M. Hardings he may believe. Verily, here ye allege St. Hierom *for the pope*, whereas, by M. Harding's confession, St. Hierom spake nothing, no not one word, of the *pope*. Such is the weight and credit of your authorities.

But for thy better satisfaction, good Christian reader, it is well known to any mean student in *divinity*, that not only the *bishop of Rome*, but also every other *bishop* within his own diocese was commonly called the *highest priest*, for that, within his own diocese, of all other priests he was the *highest*. Tertullian saith: *Dandi baptismum jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus*: "The *highest priest*, that is, the bishop, hath authority to minister baptism." St. Augustine saith: *Quid est episcopus, nisi primus presbyter, hoc est, summus sacerdos?* "What is a bishop but the first priest, that is to say, the *highest priest*<sup>69</sup>?"

St. Ambrose, writing not unto the *pope*, but unto Felix the bishop of *Comum in France*, saith thus: ..... *Suscepisti gubernacula summi sacerdotii* .....: "Thou hast taken the government of the *highest priesthood*."

Again he saith, speaking likewise of any one bishop: *Vidisti summum sacerdotem interrogantem et consecrantem*: "Thou sawest the *highest priest* examining the people, that was to be baptized, and consecrating the water."

I leave out sundry other like authorities of Origen, of Lactantius, of Athanasius, of Leo, of Victor, of Meltiades, and of others. Evagrius calleth Euphemius, and Gregorius the bishop of Antioch, *summos sacerdotes*, "the highest priests." Ruffinus calleth Athanasius the bishop of Alexandria *pontificem maximum*, "the greatest or highest bishop." By these, I trust, it may appear, that the title

<sup>69</sup> [These Questions are not shewing the opinion of a writer genuine, but they are of value as subsequent to St. Augustine.]

Tertullian.  
de Baptismo.  
[c. 17. p. 230.]

Aug. in  
quest. ex  
utroque Te-  
stam. qu.  
101. [iii. App.  
93.]  
Ambros. lib.  
1. epist. 5.  
[ii. 763.]

† Ambros.  
De his qui  
Initiantur,  
cap. 3. [ii.  
327.]

Evagrius lib.  
3. cap. 32.  
[ed. Lat.  
Muscul.]  
Ruffinus, lib.  
2. [l. lib. xl.]  
cap. 28.



or dignity of the *highest priesthood* was general and common to all *bishops*, and not only closed up and mortised only in the *pope*.

Besides all this, ye bring us a word, ye say, of greater sound: *In Romana ecclesia semper viguit apostolicæ cathedræ principatus*: “In the Roman church the *princehood of the apostolic chair* hath always flourished.” Indeed, *princehood* and *apostolic* be jolly large words, and carry great sound, almost as great as the bell of Frideswide [Frideswide]<sup>70</sup>; unto the sound of which bell ye wished once, in your sermon in Oxford, that your voice had been comparable, that you might, as you said then, “ring out in the dull ears of these papists.” These were your words: ye may not forget them.

But fain would ye have the *bishop of Rome* should be a prince, to make up the sound. Notwithstanding in the *council of Africa* it was decreed thus: *primæ sedis episcopus non appelletur princeps sacerdotum*: “Let not the bishop of the *first see* be called the *prince of priests*.”

But what if the sound of these words weigh no heavier than the former? or what if this word *princehood* be no more peculiar to the *pope*, than is the other of *highest priesthood*? Paulinus writing unto Alypius, not the *great bishop of Rome*, but the poor bishop, as I remember, of *Tagasta*, saith thus: *Deus in civibus civitatis suæ principalem te cum principibus populi sui, sede apostolica collocavit*: “God hath placed thee amongst the citizens of his city, in the *apostolic see*, being a *principal* or a *chief* with” (other *bishops*, that is to say, with) “the *princes of his people*.” Here have you found the *princehood of the see apostolic*, not only in *Rome*, but also in the poor city of *Tagasta*. Likewise St. Chrysostom saith: *Ad orandum nos assidue provocat (Paulus) apostolorum princeps*: “Paul the prince of the apostles calleth upon us to be always praying<sup>71</sup>.” So saith St. Gregory: *Paulus.....obtinuit to-*

<sup>70</sup> [Elsewhere, where this story is reported, this bell is called the great bell of Oseney, whence it was removed to St. Frideswide.]

<sup>71</sup> [Chrysost.... δ τῶν ἀποστό-

λων ἡγεμόν. The Bened. consider the genuineness of this work doubtful. Bp. Jewel quotes from the Latin ed.]

Aug. epist. 162. [ii. 91.]

Dist. 99. Primæ Sedis.

Inter Epistolas Aug. epist. 35. [ii. 34.]

Chrysost. de orando Deum, lib. 1. [ii. 782: ed. Lat. v. 594.] Greg. in 1 Reg. c. 10. lib. 4. c. 4. [iii. pt. 2. p. 250.]

Leo, ep. 62.  
[l. 622.]

*tius ecclesie principatum*: “Paul obtained the *princehood* of the whole church<sup>71</sup>.” So saith Leo: *Juvenalis episcopus, ad obtinendum Palestinæ provincie principatum, &c.*: “Bishop Juvenal, that he might obtain the *princehood* of the province of Palestine,” &c.

Amphilochi-  
us, [p. 224.]

Briefly, your own singular doctor Amphilochius writeth thus, not of the pope, but of St. Basil the bishop of Cæsarea: *Additus est principibus sacerdotum magnus ipse princeps sacerdotum*: “Basil, being dead, was laid with other bishops the princes of priests, being himself the *great prince of priests*<sup>72</sup>.” It was great folly, therefore, M. Harding, these titles thus lying in common, to encroach the same only to the pope. Notwithstanding, ye say, “Thus now, till then.” Verily, when the pope himself shall begin to consider and to weigh your pleading, then will he say he had a very unskilful proctor.

Artic. 4. Di-  
vis. 30. [su-  
pra vol. ii.  
287.] et 32,  
[ibid. p. 310.]

For answer to the rest, I remit you to my first Reply.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 2.

Which of the ancient fathers or doctors ever said, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 62.]</sup> that *both the swords* are committed unto you?

#### M. HARDING.

a Untruth.  
For his au-  
thority is not  
sufficient, as  
it shall ap-  
pear.

Let S. Bernard, writing to a pope, answer for the pope. <sup>a</sup>He <sup>Bern. de Con- sider. lib. 4.</sup> is a sufficient witness. Where yourself do allege him much against the pope, you cannot by the law justly refuse him, speaking for the pope. The spiritual sword you deny not, I trow. Of the temporal sword, belonging also to the pope, thus saith St. Bernard to Eugenius: “He that denieth this sword to be thine, seemeth to me not to consider sufficiently the word of our Lord, saying thus (to Peter thy predecessor), ‘<sup>b</sup>Put up thy sword into the scabbard.’ The very same then is also thine, to be drawn forth perhaps at thy beck, though not with thy hand. Else, if the same belonged in no wise unto thee, whereas the apostle said, ‘Behold, there be two swords here,’ our Lord would not have answered, ‘It is enough,’ but, ‘It is too much. So both be the church’s, the spiritual sword, and the material. But this is to be exercised for the church, and that of the church: that

b Put up thy  
sword: *ergo*,  
the pope hath  
both swords.  
A simple ar-  
gument.

<sup>71</sup> [The genuineness of this work has been disputed.]

<sup>72</sup> [Amphiloch. προσετέθη τοῖς

ἀρχιερεῦσιν, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τοῖς κή-  
ρυξιν, ἢ μεγάλη τοῦ λόγου βροντή.]

by the hand of the priest, this of the soldier, but verily at the beck of the priest, and commandment of the emperor." Thus, touching the pope's both swords, you are fully answered by St. Bernard.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The *pope* hath power to claim authority without shame. Dist. 22. Omnes. Amongst others his unadvised and vain words, thus he saith: *Christus beato Petro, vitæ æternæ clavigero, terreni simul et cælestis imperii jura commisit*: "Christ hath committed unto Peter, the key-bearer of everlasting life, the right both of the *worldly*, and also of the *heavenly empire*:" that is to say, the pope is emperor both of heaven and of earth. And therefore pope Bonifacius VIII., as it is said before, in the sight of the world, ware the *crown imperial* Parallipom. Urspergen-sis. [p. 343. ed. 1569.] Carion. on his head, and commanded the *naked sword* to be borne before him, and proclamation to be made: *Ecce, duo gladii hic*: "Behold, here are the two swords." I mean the same pope Bonifacius of whom it is written, "He entered as a fox: he reigned as a wolf: he died as a dog"<sup>73</sup>. [Anselm. Ryd. in Cat. ann. fol. 81.] Hereof it is written in *concilio Vangionum*: *Utrunque, et imperium, et pontificatum, sicuti Decii et falsorum deorum cultores facitare consueverunt, usurpat*: "The *pope* wrongfully usurpeth both together, as well the worldly empire as the bishopric, as Decius and the worshippers of false gods were wont to do." Aventinus. [p. 350.]

Yet St. Bernard saith, "The *pope* hath *both swords*:" but St. Bernard's authority in this case is but simple. He lived eleven hundred years after Christ's ascension, in the time of king Henry the First, the king of England, in the midst of the pope's rout and tyranny. Howbeit, touching his judgment and credit herein, let us rather hear one of your own doctors. Hervæus therefore saith thus: *Bernardus ponit, quod papa habet gladium materiale in nutu. Sed istud, cum hoc, quod non est magnæ autoritatis, magis est contra eos, quam pro eis*: "Bernard saith that the *pope* hath the material or temporal sword at his commandment. Johan. de Parisiis, de Potestat. Regia, cap. 11. [p. 121.]

<sup>73</sup> [Supra vol. v. p. 409. This is reported in the Paraleip. Urspergensis, as well as by Ryd.]

But this saying of Bernard's, *besides that it is of small force*, maketh also more against them than with them."

Johan. de Parisiis, c. 19.  
[p. 135.]

Again he saith: *Unum istorum gladiatorum Petrus non tetigit, scilicet, sæcularem, qui suus non erat*: "The one of these *two swords* Peter never touched: I mean the *worldly or temporal sword*. For that sword was none of his."

Dist. 10. Quoniam idem.  
[I. Quoniam mediator.]

Likewise ye may find it written in your own *decrees* under the name of St. Cyprian: *Christus actibus propriis, et dignitatibus distinctis, officia potestatis utriusque discret*: "Christ" (hath not committed *both these swords* to one man's hand, but) "by several duties and sundry dignities hath severed the offices of either power." Whereupon your own Gloss saith thus: *Ergo est argumentum, quod papa non habet utrunque gladium*: "This therefore is a proof that the pope hath not both the swords."

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 3.

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, *that you have authority and right to call councils?* [Vol. iv. p. 62.]

#### M. HARDING.

Who hath authority to command the parts of the body, but the head? <sup>a</sup>And that the pope is head, where it is amply declared, ye heard even now. Where you ask, which ever said that the pope hath authority to call councils? if you know not so much, <sup>b</sup>we tell you that Socrates, the writer of the Ecclesiastical History, saith so, not speaking in his own person, but reporting an old rule of the church in these words: *Sed neque Julius interfuit maximæ Romæ præsul, neque in locum suum aliquem destinavit, cum utique regula ecclesiastica jubeat, non oportere præter sententiam Romani pontificis* <sup>c</sup>*concilia celebrari*: "But neither Julius the bishop of great Rome was present" (at the council of Antiochia), "neither sent he any man in his place, whereas the ecclesiastical rule commandeth, that without the advice and will of the pope of Rome, no councils be kept." And as Socrates witnesseth of the calling of councils, so doth Sozomenus witness of the things done in them: *Cum sacerdotali lege constitutum sit, pro irritis haberi debere, quæ præter sententiam episcopi Romani geruntur*: "Whereas" (saith he) "it hath been ordained by a law of bishops, that what things be done" (in any council) "besides the advice and will of the bishop of Rome, they ought to be taken for none, and void." If you will see more for this authority of calling

a Untruth, great and manifest. For this was never yet proved.

b Untruth: for Socrates saith not so.

c Untruth: standing in false translation. Read the answer.

Histor. Tripar. lib. 4. c. 9. [l. 19.]

Lib. 3. c. 10.

councils, read *Rescriptum Julii Papæ contra Orientales: Epist. Athanasii et Ægyptiorum Pontificum ad Felicem Papam*<sup>73</sup>. This matter is also fully answered.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here hath M. Harding brought in a show of great authorities without sense. For answer whereof it may please thee, gentle reader, to consider the fourth article of my former Reply. Notwithstanding, amongst all these words of pope Julius, Socrates, Cassiodorus, and forged Athanasius, there is not one word of power and authority to *call councils*. Only thus much they say: "No decree may pass in *council* without the agreement and consent of the bishop of Rome:" for that he was one of the four principal patriarchs, and ought to have his voice there as well as others. It is a principle ruled in law: *Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus debet approbari*: "That toucheth all must be allowed by all."

But lest you should think this was the *pope's only prerogative*, and belonged to none other besides him, the same Socrates writeth the very like words as well of the *bishop of Constantinople* as of the *pope*. Thus he saith: *Et hoc fecerunt, contemnentes legem, qua cavetur, ne quis eligatur præter sententiam episcopi Constantinopolitani*: "Thus did they, not regarding the *decree*, whereby order was taken that no bishop should be chosen without the consent of the *bishop of Constantinople*." Yet may not M. Harding conclude hereof, that therefore the bishop of Constantinople had authority to *call councils*.

Æneas Sylvius, that afterward himself was pope, named Pius the Second, writeth thus: *His autoritatibus mirum in modum putant se armatos, qui negant concilia fieri posse sine consensu papæ. Quorum sententia, si, ut ipsi volunt, inviolata persistat, ruinam secum ecclesie trahit*: "They that say no council may be kept without the consent of the pope, think themselves marvellously fenced by these authorities. But if their saying hold and take place as they would have it, *it will draw with it the decay and ruin of the church*."

<sup>73</sup> [These are all spurious. Bened. ed. tom. ii. App.]

Artic. 4. Div.  
26. [supra  
vol. ii. p. 260.]

Μη δειν κα-  
νον(ζειν τὰς  
ἐκκλησίας.  
[Socrat. 2.  
c. 17. tom. ii.  
96.]

Regula Juris.

Socr. lib. 7.  
c. 28. [ii.  
p. 377.]

Ἀμελήσαν-  
τες τοῦ νό-  
μου κελεύ-  
οντος παρὰ  
γνώμην τοῦ  
ἐπισκόπου  
Κωνσταντι-  
νουπόλεως  
χειροτονίαν  
μὴ γίνεσθαι.

The four first great councils, of Nice, of Ephesus, of Chalcedon, of Constantinople, and the rest, as it shall afterward more largely appear, were always called by the emperors, and not by the pope. As for the pope, he had not yet the whole world at his commandment, nor any such universal authority to call councils; but rather was commanded himself, as other bishops were, by the emperor's authority, to come to councils, as it shall appear.

Therefore where you would conclude thus, "The pope was head of the church; ergo, he had authority to call councils:" we may rather, and much better, turn your tale backward, and say thus: *The pope had no authority to call councils; ergo, he was not head of the church.*

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 4.

Which of the ancient fathers or doctors ever said, *the whole world is but your diocese?* [Vol. iv. p. 63.]

M. HARDING.

He that said to Peter, "Feed my lambs," and, "Feed my sheep:"<sup>a</sup> which lambs and sheep all Christian men be thorough the world. Johan. xxi.

<sup>a</sup> God knoweth, here is a sheepish reason.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The canonists, that is to say, the pope's pages of honour, have not doubted to infeoff their master with the possession of all the world. One saith thus: <sup>a</sup>*Dominus papa est [suppl. judex] ordinarius omnium hominum*: "Our lord the pope is the ordinary or bishop of all men." Another saith: <sup>b</sup>*Papa totius mundi obtinet principatum*: "The pope hath the princehood of all the world." Another saith: <sup>c</sup>*Papa est episcopus totius orbis*: "The pope is the bishop of the whole world." Another saith: <sup>d</sup>*Papa, etiam cessante negligentia prelatorum, potest conferre beneficia totius orbis*: ".....quia ipse est ordinarius totius mundi": "Though there be no default or negligence in any bishop, yet may the pope bestow the benefices of all the world: for that he is the bishop of all the world." Therefore when the chief deacon investeth or enrobeth the pope at his consecration,

<sup>a</sup> Extr. de Appellation. Ut debitus. [lib. 2. tit. 28. c. 59.] In Glossa. [Si dicit.]  
<sup>b</sup> Extr. [l. in 6to.] de statu Regularium periculos. in Gloss. [lib. 3. c. 16. o.]  
<sup>c</sup> Extra [l. in 6to.] de Pœnis Fellics. In Gloss. [lib. 5. tit. 9. c. 5. p. 628.]  
<sup>d</sup> Extr. de Concess. Præbendæ, et Eccles. non vacantis. Quia diversitatem. Abb. [Panorm. tom. iii. pt. 1. fol. 57. col. 3.]

he saith unto him, *Ego investio te de papatu, ut præsis urbi et orbi*: “I do invest thee with the popedom, that thou mayest rule both the city and the world<sup>74</sup>.” Ceremon. lib. 1.

Of this infinite ambition and inordinate tyranny many good men have often complained. Franciscus Zabarella, being himself a *cardinal of Rome*, saith thus: *Ex hoc infiniti sequuti sunt errores: quia papa occupavit omnia jura inferiorum ecclesiarum: et nisi Deus succurrat statui ecclesiarum, universa ecclesia periclitatur*: “Hereof have ensued infinite errors: for that the pope hath invaded the right of all inferior churches. And unless God help the state of the churches, the universal church is in jeopardy.” Fran. Zabarel. [In Synt. Tractt. fol. 243. col. 1. A.]

The learned lady Anna, daughter unto the emperor Alexius and Irene, in her *story* that she wrote in Greek, among many other things to like purpose, writeth thus: *Papa est dominus totius mundi, quemadmodum Latini quidem putant, et prædicant: est enim etiam hæc pars quædam illorum insolentiæ*: “The pope is the lord of all the world, as the Latins think and speak of him: for this is one piece of their ambition.” Anna in Historia Græca: [p. 31. c.] Ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τῆς ἀλαστονείας αὐτῶν.

This hath been the late wanton claim of the *pope's canonists*. Otherwise the ancient learned fathers have evermore bounded and limited the *pope* within his own particular jurisdiction. Ruffinus saith, the fathers in the *council of Nice* appointed the *pope* to oversee the churches of his own suburbs; *Ut Romanus episcopus suburbicarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat*. Athanasius saith: *Roma est metropolis Romanæ ditionis*: “Rome is the mother church” (not of all the universal world, but) “of the Roman” (particular) “*jurisdiction*<sup>75</sup>.” The bishops in the *council of Rome* write thus to the bishops of Illyricum: *Par est, omnes qui sunt in orbe Romano magistros convenire*: “It is convenient, that all the bishops that be within the jurisdiction of Rome should accord together.” Flavianus, the archbishop of Constantinople, writeth thus to Leo Histor. Eccl. lib. 1. [l. lib. x.] cap. 6. Athanas. ad solitariam vitam agentes. [l. 364.] Sozom. lib. 6. c. 23. [ii. 247.] Πάντας τοὺς ἐν Ῥωμαίων κόσμῳ διδασκάλους δμοφρονεῖν.

<sup>74</sup> [See supra vol. iv. p. 429. According to the Ceremoniary of 1572 (Col. Agripp.) this custom was become obsolete. Fol. 16. b.]

<sup>75</sup> [Athanas. . . . οὐθ' ὅτι μητρόπολις ἢ Ῥώμη τῆς Ῥωμανίας ἐστίν, εὐλαβήθησαν.]

Inter Epi-  
stolas Leon.  
Epist. 9.  
[tom. i. 501.]

the bishop of Rome: *Dignetur sanctitas vestra indicare impietatem Eutychetis omnibus episcopis sub beatitudine vestra degentibus*: “Let your holiness vouchsafe to make known the wickedness of Eutyches to all the bishops that live under you<sup>76</sup>.” To all the bishops, he saith, “that live under you.” Not unto all bishops through the world. St. Hierom, speaking of the usage and order of the *church of Rome*, saith thus: *Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?* “What allegest thou me the custom of one city?” So much he abridgeth the *pope’s jurisdiction*, that he extendeth it not unto the lists and ends of all the world, but restraineth it only to the limits of *one city*. Likewise again, speaking of the *bishop of Rome*, he saith thus: *Non solum unius urbis, sed etiam totius orbis errant episcopi*: “Then not only the bishop of one town,” (which was the *bishop of Rome*,) “but also the bishops of all the world are deceived.”

Hieronymus  
ad Evagrium.  
[iv. pt. 2. 803.]

Hieron. ad-  
versus Vigil-  
lantium. [iv.  
pt. 2. 284.]

Gennadius  
ad omnes  
metropolitana-  
nos, et ad  
papam Roma-  
nam. [ap.  
Epist. Orth.  
Theol. Lat.  
p. 46.]

Thus therefore writeth Gennadius, together with the *council of Constantinople*, unto the *bishop of Rome*: *Curet sanctitas tua universas tuas custodias, tibi que subjectos episcopos*: “Let your holiness see unto” (not all the whole world, but) “all your own charge, and such bishops as be subject unto you.”

By these few we see the *bishop of Rome’s* power was not *universal*, or *infinite*, over all the churches and kingdoms of the world, but certain, and limited within his own *particular jurisdiction*.

As for the reasons ye use for proof hereof, I marvel ye would ever trouble the world with so childish follies. Christ said unto Peter, *Feed my sheep*: ergo, say you, “The whole world is the *pope’s diocese*.” A good sheep would have made a better argument.

<sup>76</sup> [Flavianus Leonī. . . ὥστε καὶ σέβειαν τελοῦσι θεοφιλεστάτοις ἐπι-  
τὴν σὴν ὁσιότητα γνοῦσαν τὰ κατ’  
αὐτὸν, πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν σὴν θεο-  
σκόποις δῆλην ποιῆσαι τὴν αὐτοῦ  
δυσσέβειαν.]



THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 5.

Which of the holy ancient fathers ever said, *that all bishops have received of your fulness?*

[Vol. iv. p. 63.]

M. HARDING.

Besides others, so hath <sup>a</sup>St. Bernard said in his book, *De consideratione ad Eugenium*: where he saith, that he is called in *plenitudinem potestatis*, “into the fulness of power.” a A simple authority.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

There is no folly so vain, but by some shift may be maintained. In your Gloss, M. Harding, it is written thus: <sup>a</sup>*Omnes subjecti sunt motioni papæ, et sunt in illo, quasi membra de membro*: “All men are subject unto the pope’s will, and are in him as members of a member.” a Clemen. lib. 5. [l. lib. 3.] de Hæret. Ad vestrum. [l. ad nostrum]. In Gloss. [lit. p. col. 256.] Another saith: <sup>b</sup>*Ecclesia non habet potestatem aliquam jurisdictionis, nisi a Petro*: “The church hath no power of jurisdiction, but only from Peter.” b Petr. de Palud. de potest. Pap. c Petr. de Palud. de potestate collata Apostol. And again: <sup>c</sup>*A Petro post Christum, spiritualis gratia et potestas derivatur*: “Next after Christ, spiritual grace and power is derived from Peter.” c Durand. lib. 2. [cap. 1. s. 17.] De Ministris et Ordinibus. And therefore another of your doctors saith: *Omnes episcopi descendunt a papa, quasi membra a capite et de ejus plenitudine omnes accipiunt:.....* “All bishops are derived from the pope, as members from the head: and all they receive of his fulness:” that is to say, power of his power, and grace of his grace. All these vanities M. Harding thinketh may be well borne out by two bare words of St. Bernard.

But St. Augustine, many hundred years before Bernard was born, wrote thus: *Nos quidem accipere possumus hoc donum pro modulo nostro: fundere autem illud super alios non possumus. Sed ut hoc fiat, Deum super eos, a quo hoc efficitur, invocamus*: “Indeed we may receive the gift of God according to our portion: but to pour the same upon others we are not able. Notwithstanding, in their behalf we call upon God, that is the worker hereof, that he will do it.” Aug. de Trinit. lib. 15. cap. 26. [viii. 999.]

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 6.

Which of all the ancient doctors ever said, “that <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 63.]</sup> all power is given to you, as well in heaven, as in earth?”

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, undiscreef and vain. For no ancient doctor or father ever uttered so fond words.

<sup>a</sup> All they which speak of the ministerial power, whereby, under Christ, the militant church by him is governed. But if you mean absolutely, as your words seem to sound, so no discreet catholic man ever said, or thought.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, by a pretty distinction of *power absolute*, and *power not absolute*, Christ and his *vicar* are set together to part tenures. Howbeit, what manner of *power* it is that the pope claimeth, his own proctors and counsellors can tell us best. Cardinal Hostiensis saith: *Excepto peccato, papa potest quicquid Deus ipse potest*: “Sin only excepted, the pope hath power to do whatsoever God himself can do <sup>77</sup>.”

Extr. de translation. Episcop. Quanto. Hostien. [tom. 1. fol. 84. col. 1. No. 12.]

M. Harding, fol. 67. a. fol. 67. b.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. “This is false and slanderous. This is a most manifest, and out of all question, foul corruption. Certainly Hostiensis saith not so. But having reckoned certain things wherein the pope hath authority under God, as Christ’s high officer, he concludeth with these words: *Breviter, excepto peccato, quasi omnia de jure potest, ut Deus*: ‘Briefly, excepted sin, he hath power, as a man would say, in all things of right, as God.’ Thus saith Hostiensis, and not as M. Jewel beliech him, &c. It is said by the learned canonists, that the consistory of God, and of the pope, is one consistory, as a bishop’s and his chancellor’s consistory is one and the same consistory. Now let us consider the impudency of this false minister. First he avoucheth his shameless lie boldly, as though where truth faileth, for show of truth, the matter might he stouted out. The words, saith he, be most mani- Addition.

<sup>77</sup> [The exact words in Hostiensis himself are these; “et breviter excepto peccato quasi omnia de jure potest ut Deus:” in Abbas Panthey stand as bishop Jewel reports them in the next page.]

fest, and out of all question : *Excepto peccato, papa potest quicquid Deus ipse potest* : that is to say, 'The pope can do as much as God himself can do, sin excepted.' But what if these words be not most manifest? Is it not then a most manifest impudency so to affirm of them? Is not this minister a minister of lies? &c. First he hath nipt away this word, *breviter*, then this word, *quasi*, which mitigateth and qualifieth the saying: then again those other words of necessary importance, *omnia, de jure, and ut*. Next he corrupted the sentence by putting to these words of his own, *quicquid, and ipse, &c.* Who ever saw one little poor sentence so nipt, so hackt, so hewed and mangled, so turned, and cast in a new mould?" *The Answer.* It fareth with you, M. Harding, as it did sometime with a good honest plain man, that told his friend upon a reckoning that he would not be answered with five pounds, but would have fifteen good nobles, every penny: and that he would not be so mocked. For although there be some alteration in these words, yet in sense and meaning there is as great odds as is between fifteen nobles, and five pound. You say; "I have nipt, and hackt, and hewn these words, and have left out this word *breviter*." Now verily, M. Harding, any wise man may think, this is a very simple quarrel for a man of your learning. For if I had nipt off this word *breviter*, as indeed I have not, yet what would that make to the hacking and hewing of the sense? But you say, I have left out other words besides, as *omnia, de jure, and ut*, words, as you tell us, of necessary importance. I beseech you, M. Harding, if you have any such fancy to these words, put them all in again, and much good may they do you. So shall your sentence be this: *Papa potest omnia de jure, ut Deus potest*: "The pope may do all things of right, as being God: or, as God can do." Methinketh hereby the matter is but coarsely mended. It seems worse than it was before. For thus must you say: *The pope of right may do all things as God may do*. So much have you gained by adding of these necessary and special words, *de jure, and ut*. Notwithstanding, in abbas Panormitanus, out of whom I alleged

[Panorm. in Decretal. tom. 1. part. 1. fol. 123. col. 4. f.]

these words of Hostiensis, ye shall find neither *breviter*, nor *de*, nor *jure*, nor *ut* neither. So necessary is their importance. Thus have you three of your greatest *canons* easily discharged with little ado: unless you will likewise say, that Abbas Panormitanus is also a *false minister*, and *impudently belieith Hostiensis*. Wherein certainly, M. Harding, you have a special grace to speak at pleasure.

Of the other side you say: I have added vehement words of mine own, to enforce the matter. For whereas Hostiensis saith only, *Deus*, "God;" I have imagined him to say, *Deus ipse*, "God himself." And I pray you M. Harding, what difference find you between *God*, and *God himself*? Is *God himself* one, and *God* another? I thank *God*, I know none other *God*, but *God himself*. This then, I trow, must be your meaning: *The pope can do all things* (not that *God himself can do*, for that you say were blasphemy, but) *that God can do*.

Again (you say) I have left out this word *omnia*. But you might easily have seen, that in stead thereof I placed *quicquid*. And I would think, that *quicquid* were as much as *omnia quæ*: unless you can shew us some pretty new *Lovanian grammar* to the contrary.

Once again you say: I have left out this word *quasi*, which word (you say) mitigateth and qualifieth the saying. Then, I trow, this saying is such as hath need of some mitigation. Howbeit indeed this is but a *quasi* quarrel, M. Harding. If your *pope* may not be *God himself*, yet at least ye would have him to be a *quasi God*. It shameth me thus to encumber the world with such vanities. But your importunity, M. Harding, enforceth me further than I would.

The very words in Abbas Panormitanus, reported out of Hostiensis<sup>78</sup>, are these: *Papa et Christus faciunt unum consistorium: ita quod, excepto peccato, potest papa quasi omnia facere quæ potest Deus*: "The pope and Christ

Extr. de translatione prælat. C. Quanto, Abb. [i. Host. tom. 1. fol. 84. col. 1. No. 11. et 12.]

<sup>78</sup> [The reference in the margin should be not to Abbas Panorm., but to Hostiensis himself. The true reference to Abbas is, "Super 1<sup>ma</sup> parte primi Decretal. de Electione, cap. Licet de vitanda, tom. 1. part. 1. fol. 123. col. 4. f.]

make one consistory, or one judgment-seat: so that, sin excepted, the *pope* in a manner may do all things that God may do." These be the words, M. Harding. Let some lawyer turn your books. You shall find them so. And here once again I tell you, you have neither *breviter*, nor *de*, nor *jure*, nor *ut*, nor any other just cause why ye should fare so terribly with poor ministers.

Whereas Hostiensis saith, "The *pope* and *Christ* make one consistory;" "This" (you say) "is well said by the learned canonists: as a bishop's and his chancellor's consistory is one and the same consistory." Your meaning herein, I trow, is this; That *God* is the *bishop*, and the *pope* his *chancellor*: and as there lieth no appeal from the *chancellor to the bishop*, so there lieth no appeal from the *pope to God*, for that the *pope and God have one only consistory*: and the law saith; *Ab uno ad seipsum non est appellatio*.

M. Harding,  
[Detect.]  
67. b.  
Extr. in  
Sexto, lib. 1.  
de Consue-  
tudine, Non  
putamus,  
[tit. 1. c. 2.]

But why shew you yourself so squeamish, and so dangerous in these words, "The pope may do whatsoever God may do?" You may remember, that your *canonists* have moved questions, *Whether the pope be God, or no*. You may remember, that the pope hath suffered himself to be called *God*. For thus one said unto him presently before his face in the *council of Lateran* without rebuke: *Tu es alter Deus in terris*: "Thou art another God in the earth"<sup>79</sup>. You may remember, that the *pope* suffereth his *canonists* thus to publish and to blaze his *Godhead* to the world in printed books: *Dominus Deus noster papa*: "Our Lord God the pope"<sup>80</sup>. Thus, and even with these selfsame express words, hath it been printed often, and in sundry

[Conc. La-  
teran, Har-  
duin. ix. 165.]

Extrav. Jo-  
han. 22. Cum  
inter: in  
gloss. [col.  
140. F.]  
printed at  
Paris, anno  
1513. and at

<sup>79</sup> [This almost incredible impiety was pronounced by Christopher Marcellus in the fourth session of the Lateran council, A. D. 1512. He is addressing Julius in the name of the church. "Cura denique ut salutem quam dedisti nobis, et vitam et spiritum non amittamus. Tu enim pastor, tu medicus, tu gubernator, tu cultor, tu denique alter Deus in

terris." With such a passage as this before them, it is hardly worth the papists' while to dispute the genuineness of the phrase "Dominum Deum nostrum papam."]

<sup>80</sup> [Supra vol. ii. p. 195. note <sup>35</sup>. In further illustration of this blasphemy, see also infra chapter 6. div. 12. (fol. ed. p. 481.)]

mons, anno  
1555.  
De Pœn.  
Dist. 3.  
Quamvis. [in  
glossa.]

places. *Yet have I not heard of any pope that ever found fault with the printing.* You may remember, that whereas St. Augustine saith, *Quis audeat dicere Deo?* "Who dareth to say thus to God? your *canonists* have made up and bettered the matter in this sort: *Quis audeat dicere Deo vel papæ?* "Who dareth to say thus to God, or to the *pope?*" Thus they say, as if there were some equality between the *pope* and *God*. You may remember, it is written in the *Ceremoniary* of the church of Rome: *Modèratio imperii Romani pertinet ad papam, Dei vices gerentem in terris, tanquam ad eum, per quem reges regnant:* "The government of the Roman empire belongeth to the *pope*, being God's vicar in earth, as unto him by whom kings rule, and wear their crowns." And what is he, M. Harding, by whom kings be kings, and have their authority, but only God? You may remember these words were spoken in a *council* holden in *Rome*, in the *pope's* own *palace* of *Lateran*, even in the presence and hearing of the *pope*: *In papa est omnis potestas supra omnes potestates, tam cœli, quam terræ:* "In the *pope* is all manner of power above all powers, as well of heaven, as of earth".....I beseech you, good M. Harding, what power may this be, but only the power of God himself?


Ceremonia-  
rum, lib. 1.  
cap. 2. [fol.  
5. 6.]

Conc. La-  
teran, sub  
Leo. 10. in  
Oratione  
Stephan. Pa-  
tracen.  
[Harduin.  
ix. 1789.]

Fran. Zaba-  
rel. [In Syn-  
tag. Tractt.  
de Imp. fol.  
243. col. 1. B.]

You may remember, Franciscus Zabarella saith: *Papa facit quicquid libet, etiam illicita, et est [al. sic] plus quam Deus:* "The *pope* doth whatsoever he listeth, yea although it be unlawful, and is more than God<sup>80</sup>." Thus you see, M. Harding, your *pope is a God of the earth*: your *pope is Lord and God*: your *pope is he, by whom kings are kings*: your *pope hath power above all powers, either in heaven, or in earth*: your *pope is more than God*. Give these words what sense or incense may like you best: embalm them with your most favourable and sweetest constructions, ye shall never be able to make them savoury: when all your doctrine is sifted, the bottom thereof is this: *Sin only excepted, the pope in a manner may do all things*

<sup>80</sup> [Supra vol. v. p. 392. note 16; and vol. iv. p. 257. note 16. it.]  
Zabarella mentions this blasphemous flattery, only to condemn it.]

that God may do. Therefore, M. Harding, call not the ministers of God's truth, the *ministers of lies*. He hath of long time *ministered lies* unto the world, that, being a wretched sinful man, hath stalled himself in the place of God. And you, forcing all your wits and learning to uphold and sooth him in his blasphemy, must needs be a minister of open lies. 

Stephanus, the bishop of Patraca, in your late *council at Lateran in Rome*, saith thus: *In papa est omnis potestas supra omnes potestates, tam cæli, quam terræ*: "All power is in the *pope* above all the powers, as well of heaven, as of earth." In Conc. Lateran. sub Leone 10. Session. 10. [Harduin. ix. 1789.]

And to make the matter plain, your own Bernard himself saith: *Tibi data est omnis potestas: in qua, qui totum dicit, nihil excludit*: "All manner of power is given to thee: he that saith *all*, excepteth nothing." Citatur in eod. Conc. Lateran. [ibid.]

And Abbot Panormitane saith: *Plenitudo potestatis superat omnem legem positivam* <sup>81</sup>: *et sufficit quod in papa sit pro ratione voluntas*: "The fulness of power passeth all positive law: and it is sufficient in the *pope*, that Will stand in stead of Reason." Extra de Constitution. cap. 1.

This is that power that M. Harding here hath so closely conveyed in under the cloud of his distinction.

But Baldus, that by experience saw the practice hereof, Baldus. saith thus: *Hæc plenitudo potestatis est plenitudo tempestatis*: "This fulness of power is a fulness of tempest <sup>82</sup>."

Another of your doctors saith: *Bernardus nullam potestatem ponit in papa quam non ponit in prælati inferioribus: licet in papa ponat summam*: "Bernard alloweth no *power* unto the *pope*, but he alloweth the same to other inferior bishops. Notwithstanding, he alloweth the greatest *power* unto the *pope*." St. Bernard himself saith to like purpose: *Sic facitendo, probatis vos habere plenitudinem potestatis: sed justitiæ forte non ita*: "Thus doing and dealing, ye shew yourself to have the fulness of power: but perhaps not likewise the fulness of justice." Johan. de Parisiis, cap. 18. [f. cap. 19. p. 134.]

<sup>81</sup> [There is some mistake in this reference; the latter part of the quotation will be found in Extra de Transl. Episcopi: Quo- to: in Glossa.]

<sup>82</sup> [Baldus; the editor has not had access to the works of Baldus.]

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 7.

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 63.]</sup> neither king, nor prince, nor the whole clergy, nor all the people together, are able to be judges over you?

M. HARDING.

a Worthy reasons.

a What sheep shall be judges over their shepherd? For, as the fathers of the most ancient council of Sinuessa said in the cause of <sup>b</sup> Marcellinus the pope, *Nemo unquam judicavit pontificem*: "No man ever judged the pope, nor any prelate his high priest." *Quoniam prima sedes non judicabitur a quoquam*: "Because the first see shall not be judged of anybody."

b This Marcellinus, being pope, had committed open idolatry in making sacrifice unto devils.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

In these two points standeth the *pope's* guard of trust, and the keep and castle of all his power. First, the *church of Rome*, whatsoever way she take, can never err: next, the *pope*, whatsoever he do, may never be called to any reckoning. These two points being granted, the rest is sure. One of your doctors saith thus: *Omne factum sanctissimi patris interpretari debemus in bonum. Et siquidem fuerit furtum, vel aliud ex se malum, interpretari debemus, quod divino instinctu fiat*: "We must expound every act of the *holy father* for the best. And if it be theft, or any other thing that of itself is evil," (as advoutery, or fornication,) "we must think it is done by the secret inspiration of God." Another saith: *Si papa.....innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducat* [suppl. primo] *mancipio gehennæ, cum ipso plagis multis in æternum vapulatueros, hujus culpas arguere præsumat* [al. præsumit] *mortalium nullus*: "If the pope draw infinite companies of people by heaps together with himself into hell, to be punished with him with many stripes for ever, yet let no mortal man presume to reprove his faults."

Johan. de Parisiis, de Potest. Reg. et Papali. [p. 142.]

Distinet. 40. Si papa.

9. Quæst. 3. Cuncta.

Another saith: *Papa solutus est omni lege humana*: "The pope is exempted from all law of man <sup>83</sup>." Another

<sup>83</sup> [There is no such sentence in Caus. 9. Qu. 3: Cuncta.]



saith : *Sacrilegii instar esset, disputare de facto papæ.....* Dist. 40.  
Non nos.  
In Glossa.  
*Facta papæ excusantur, ut homicidia Samsonis : ut furta  
Hebræorum : ut adulterium Jacob :* “ It is a sin as great as

sacrilege, or church-robbing, to reason of any the *pope's* doings. For his acts are excused, as Samson's murders : as the Jews' robberies : and as the advouteries of Jacob.”

Another saith : *Nec totus clerus, nec totus mundus potest papam judicare, aut deponere :* “ Neither all the clergy, nor all the whole world, may either judge, or depose the *pope.*” Petr. de Palude de Potest. Pap. Artic. 4.

And again : *Papa in nullo casu, quamdiu est papa, propter quodcunque crimen potest deponi, nec a concilio, nec a tota ecclesia, nec a toto mundo :* “ The *pope*, while he is *pope*, cannot in any case, for any offence by him committed, be deposed, neither by the general council, nor by all the church, nor by the whole world.” Idem eod. loco.

And all this they are well able to prove by good substantial authority of the scriptures. For thus they reason : “ *The scholar is not above his master : the servant is not above his lord.*” In Epist. Nicolai Papæ. [Crabb. ii. 753.] And again : *The axe boasteth not itself against the carpenter that heweth with it : ergo, No man may accuse the pope.* Inter Decreta Adrian. Pap. [Crabb. ii. 613.] Distinct. 21. Inferior.

Therefore another of your doctors saith : *Judicare de factis papæ, hoc aliqui dicunt esse, tangere montem, et ponere os in cælum :* “ To judge of the *pope's* deeds, this some men say is to touch the holy mount,” (wherein God gave the law, and shewed himself to Moses,) “ and to set the face against the heavens.” And the *pope* himself saith : “ The accusing of him is the sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall never be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come.” Johan. de Parisiis, cap. 20. [cap. 23. p. 141.]

Thus may the *pope* depose *kings* and *princes*, and trouble the whole state of the world, and do what he list, without controlment. Yet may no man dare say unto him, *Sir, why do ye so ?* Therefore the accusers of pope Symmachus said in the presence of king Theodoricus : *Succesores Petri una cum sedis privilegiis peccandi quoque licentiam accepisse :* “ The *pope* maketh his boast, that together with the power of teaching, he hath received free liberty to do ill.” Ennodius. [p. 1622.]

Conc. tom. 1. Pope Marcellinus, whose name ye have alleged out of  
 In Marcel- the *council of Sinuessa*, for defence hereof, was an *apostata*,  
 lino. [Crabb. and had forsaken *Christ*, and being pope in Rome, had  
 184. 189.] made sacrifice unto devils. All this notwithstanding, ye  
 say, No mortal man might accuse him. Thus hath the  
 pope a special prerogative and premunire to forsake *Christ*,  
 and to commit open idolatry, and to give honour and sacri-  
 fice unto devils, without controlment.

Gal. ii. 11. Yet St. Paul accused St. Peter, even unto his face, in  
 Cyprian. [ad the presence of many. And St. Cyprian saith: *Petrus.....*  
 Quintum, *se non vindicavit, seu aliquid insolenter assumpsit, ut dice-*  
 p. 127.] *ret, se primatum tenere, et obtemperari sibi a novellis, et*  
 Niciph. lib. *posteris oportere*: “Peter” (being thus checked openly by  
 17. cap. 26. St. Paul) “neither revenged himself, nor took any thing  
 [ii. 774.] proudly upon him, as to say, that he had the primacy, or  
 Sozom. lib. that others, that were but novices and aftercomers,” (as  
 3. cap. 10. Paul was,) “ought to be obedient unto him<sup>84</sup>.” Mena,  
 [al. 1 t. ii. the bishop of Constantinople, judged and excommunicated  
 107.] pope Vigilius. The bishops of the east church judged  
 Felinus in and excommunicated and deposed pope Julius. One of  
 Repertorio. your doctors saith: *Si papa committat crimen depositione*  
 Dignitas. *dignum, debet puniri, acsi esset unus rusticus*: “If the  
 pope commit an offence wherefore he should justly be  
 deposed, he ought to be punished, as if he were a clown  
 of the country.” Your neighbours of Leodium, in their  
 Concil. tom. epistle against pope Paschalis, write thus: *Remoto Ro-*  
 2. Epist. *manæ ambitionis typho, cur de gravibus, et manifestis, non*  
 Leodien. *reprehendantur, et corrigantur Romani episcopi? Qui repre-*  
 contra Pas- *hendi et corrigi non vult, pseudo est, sive episcopus, sive cle-*  
 chalem Pap. *ricus*: “Setting apart the pride of Romish ambition, the  
 [Crabb. ii. crimes being great and manifest, why may not the bishops of  
 814.] Rome both be reprovèd, and also corrected? He that flieth  
 ψευδής. rebuke and correction is a false man, whether he be priest  
 or bishop.”

<sup>84</sup> [S. Cypr. ad Quint. “Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, et super quem ædificavit ecclesiam suam, cum secum Paulus de circumcissione postmodum disceptaret, vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit, ut diceret se primatum tenere, et obtemperari a novellis et posteris sibi potius oportere.”]

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 8.

[Vol. iv. p. 93.]

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that *kings and emperors, by Christ's will and commandment, receive their authority at your hands?*

M. HARDING.

What is to be answered hereto <sup>a</sup> you may gather of that is alleged before out of St. Bernard, speaking of both swords.

<sup>a</sup> There may you find nothing to prove nothing.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It is evident by the record and general consent of all ancient writers, that the pope hath neither possession, nor foot of lands, nor house to dwell in, nor the name of *universal bishop*, nor charter, nor liberty, nor jurisdiction, but that he hath received, either of the French kings, or of the emperors. Yet would he now bear the world in hand, that the emperor hath nothing, neither lands, nor honour, nor power, nor right, nor sword, nor jurisdiction, but only from him. If any man doubt hereof, besides other testimonies of antiquity, let him read that most vain and childish *donation* that the pope himself hath forged under the name of the emperor Constantine. St. Ambrose saith: *Si non vis esse obnoxius Cæsari, noli habere, quæ sunt mundi. Si habes divitias, obnoxius es Cæsari*: "If thou wilt not be subject to the prince, then possess not the things that be of the world. If thou have worldly riches, then art thou subject unto the prince." Likewise St. Augustine: *Dices, [al. Noli dicere] Quid mihi, et regi? Quid tibi ergo, et possessioni? per jura regum possessiones possidentur*: "Thou wilt say," (as the pope saith,) "What have I to do with the prince? What then hast thou to do with lands? For possessions are holden" (not by the pope's right, but) "by the right of kings and princes."

Niceph. lib. 7. cap. 46. [ed. 1560.]  
Carion. in Bonif. III. [p. 274.]  
Sabel. in Phoca. [Ennead. 8. l. 6.]

Ambr. in Lucam, lib. 9. cap. 20. [l. 1502.]

Aug. in Johan. [trac. 6. iii. pt. 2. 341.]  
Citatur in Epist. Leodien. contra Paschalem. Concil. tom. 2. [Crabb. 814.]

Charles the French king, nephew to Charles the Great, wrote thus unto pope Adrian: *Imperatores jus distinguendorum negotiorum episcopis sanctis juxta divalia constituta*

Citatur ab Illyrico Inter testes Veritat. p. 102. [No. 107.]

*permiserunt: non autem episcoporum villici extiterunt:* “Emperors, by their commissions under their great seals, have granted unto bishops authority to hear causes, but they themselves were never stewards or bailiffs unto bishops.” One of your own late doctors saith: “*Papa habet gladium (civilem) ex commissione et permissione principis:* “The pope hath the *temporal sword or civil jurisdiction*, by the commission and sufferance of the prince.” Therefore it seemeth great folly to say, *The prince hath his sword or jurisdiction only by the commission of the pope.*

Joh. de Paris.  
de Potestate  
Regia, cap.  
19. [p. 135.]

Extra [I. Ex-  
trav. Comm.]  
de Majorit.  
et Obed. U-  
nam sanc-  
ctam, in  
Gloss. [addi-  
tio. p. 192.]

Dist. 96. Cum  
ad verum. In  
Gloss.  
23 quest. 4.  
Quesitum.

Dist. 96. Cum  
ad verum. In  
Glossa.  
[leg. Dist. 93.  
Legimus: in  
Glossa.]

Ceremon. lib.  
1. sect. 5.  
cap. 7. [fol.  
69.]

Bernardus  
De Considera-  
t. lib. 2.  
[cap. 7. ii.  
419. D.]

Your own *barbarous Gloss* saith: *Imperator in temporalibus habet potestatem a solo Deo.....Et imperium fuit, antequam apostolatus esset:* “The emperor in temporal things hath his authority” (not from the pope, but) “from God only. And the empire was, before the apostles were.”

Again: *Imperator non habet gladium a papa,.....sed imperium est a solo Deo:* “The emperor hath not his sword of the pope: but the empire is only from God.” Again:

*Ex sola electione principum, dico, verum esse imperatorem, antequam confirmetur a papa:* “I say, that the emperor is a very right and perfect emperor, by the only election of the princes, yea before he be confirmed by the pope.”

What shall we need no witnesses? Your very *Ceremoniary of Rome* saith thus: *Hoc affirmamus, ante Carolum Magnum, neminem imperii Romani coronam ex manu Romani pontificis Romæ suscepisse:* “Thus we say, that before the emperor Charles the Great (that is, for the space of eight hundred years after Christ) no man ever received the crown of the Roman empire at Rome by the hands of the bishop of Rome.” St. Bernard hereof thus writeth unto the pope: *Esto, ut alia quacunq[ue] ratione hoc tibi vendices: non tamen apostolico jure: nec illud [leg. enim] tibi dare, quod non habuit, Petrus potuit:* “Be it that ye claim this right by some other means: yet by the apostles’ right ye cannot claim it: neither could Peter give you that right that he himself never had.”

The emperor Ludovicus the Fourth saith thus: *Mea*

*potestas non pendet a papa, sed a Deo immediate. Et vanum est, quod dici solet, papam non habere superiorem:* Et Parallipom. Ursperg. in Ludov. IV. [p. 355.]  
 “My power hangeth not of the pope, but immediately of God alone. And it is but a peevish vain tale that they say, the pope hath no superior.” Johannes Major saith: *Bonifacius Octavus.....multum apparenter definivit, quod Romanus pontifex est supra reges in temporalibus: quod tamen oculatissimi theologi dicunt esse falsum:* Joh. Major. 4. Sentent. Dist. 20. qu. 2. [fol. 198. col. 1.] “Pope Bonifacius the Eighth hath concluded with great show of reason, that, even in temporal causes, the pope is above kings. But I may tell you, the wisest divines say, it is but a false tale.” Johannes de Parisiis saith: *In temporalibus, potestas secularis major est potestate spirituali, nec, quoad ista, est ei subjecta in aliquo:* Joh. de Paris. de potest. Regia et Pall. cap. 5. [p. 113.] “In temporal causes the temporal power is greater than the spiritual power, and touching the same, is not subject to it in any point.” Again he saith: *Si imperator habet potestatem suam immediate a papa, ergo, imperator est minister papæ:* Joh. de Paris. cap. 11. [p. 120.] “If the emperor receive his power immediately from the pope, then is the emperor the pope’s servant.”

All these authorities notwithstanding, the pope himself saith of himself: “The emperor hath no right nor authority, but only of me.” And touching the last objection of Parisiensis, that the emperor should be the pope’s servant, he thinketh it may be well admitted without any great inconvenience. For thus saith one of his privy council: *Iste Romanus imperator, est procurator et defensor Romanæ ecclesiæ:* Dist. 96. Si Imperator. in Gloss. “This Roman emperor is” (nothing else, but) “the proctor and steward of the church of Rome.” Cardinal Hostiensis saith: [suppl. *Hostiensis dicit quod*] *imperator est feudatarius Romanæ ecclesiæ:* Lupoldus de Jurib. Regni et Imp. in Proc. [p. 7.] Extrade foro Competen. c. Licet. “The emperor is a vassal or a freedman of the church of Rome.” And pope Innocentius saith: *Imperator tenet imperium a papa. Unde tenetur præstare papæ juramentum homagii, scilicet, quod vasallus præstare solet domino suo:* “The emperor holdeth his empire of the pope. And therefore he is bound to swear homage and fealty to the pope, as the vassal is bound to his lord.” I think the pope

will desire to have no more. The emperor is brought to be his man.

Joh. de Paris.  
de potest.  
Regia et Pa-  
pali, cap. 5.  
[cap. 6. p.  
114.]

Likewise saith Johannes de Parisiis: *Dicunt, quod solus papa est verus dominus temporalium: ita ut possit auferre ab alio, quod alias suum est: et tenet factum ejus, licet peccet. Sed prælati ceteri, et principes, non sunt domini, sed tutores, procuratores, et dispensatores:* “They say, that only the pope is the right lord of temporal possessions: so that he may put any man from his own. And although he offend in so doing, yet his doing taketh place. As for other bishops and princes, they be not lords, but overseers, bailiffs, and stewards.”

Aventinus,  
lib. 6. p. 636.  
[p. 390.]

Therefore pope Adrian namely thus advanced himself above the emperor Fredericus I.: *Imperator per nos imperat: unde habet imperium, nisi a nobis? Ecce in potestate nostra est, ut demus illud, cui volumus: propterea constituti sumus a Deo super gentes, et regna: ut destruiamus, et evellamus, et ædificemus, et plantemus:* “By mean of us the emperor is emperor: for, whence hath he his empire but of us? Behold, it is in our hand to bestow the empire upon whom we list. And to that end are we placed by God over nations and kingdoms: that we should destroy, and pluck up, and build, and plant.” Such proud vaunts the pope maketh of himself, without either shame of the world, or fear of God.

#### THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 9.*

Which of the ancient learned fathers, with so precise and mathematical limitation, ever surveyed and determined you *to be seventy and seven times greater than the mightiest kings?* [Vol. iv. p. 63.]

#### M. HARDING.

A pleasant  
mathematical  
divinity.

Some merry fellow or other, which thought he might be bold to speak mathematically, so he kept himself within compass, and without just reprehension. For whereas the spiritual power so far passeth the temporal, as the soul doth excel the body, and

Clemens. the heavens surmount the earth, as St. Clement saith, and Gre- a By this reason every  
 Con. Apost. gory Nazianzene: a you should not so greatly be offended with simple poor  
 lib. 2. cap. 34. the seventy and seven times greater dignity; and we need not parish priest  
 Nazian. condemn him as an heretic, which would be pleasant in his alle- is seventy  
 Ad pop. Naz. gorism, especially Johannes Andræ in the same place referring and seven  
 [1. 323.] times greater  
 De Major. et than the em-  
 Obed. Solitæ. peror.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“Some merry fellow, I warrant you,” ye say. And thus, now in mirth, now in sadness, ye have of long time mocked the world, and forced *kings* and *emperors* to be your slaves. As for your new doctors, *Jack of Andrew*, Johan. And. and *sir Clement*, as you evermore call him, *the apostles’* Clemens. *fellow*, we weigh them none otherwise than they be worthy. But, touching Gregory Nazianzene, it is true that he saith, “The truth and might of God’s word infinitely passeth all worldly power.” But what maketh all this for the pope, that walloweth only in his temporalities and worldly cares, and as well in preaching God’s word and ministering the sacraments, as also in other spiritual exercises, is as far inferior to any mean priest, as the earth is inferior to the heavens?

Howbeit, that it may appear what *pretty mirth* ye have made herewith, one of your own fellows saith thus: *Ecclesiastici debent judicare per contemptibiles, id est, per laicos, secundum tenorem, et debitum terreni juris*: “The ecclesiastical officers or bishops ought to judge by them that be vile and contemptible, that is to say, by the lay magistrates, according to the tenor and order of the *temporal law*.” Here in your *mirth* and *pleasance*, in comparison of yourselves, ye call *princes* and *temporal magistrates* *vile and contemptible*, and so would ye have them regarded among the people.

Again ye say: *Patet, regnum, sive regimen regale non esse acceptum a Deo. Sed ipsum solum permisit indignatus. Et magis esset acceptum Deo, quod per solum papam mundus in omnibus regeretur*: “It is plain, that the state of *kingdom* or *kingly government* came not from God, for God only suffered it in his anger. And it were more acceptable unto God that the whole world were in all

things governed by the pope alone." It were good, ye should tell us whether ye speak this only in *mirth and game*, or else in earnest and good sadness.

Verily, when ye so proudly compare the *pope* to the *sun*, and the *emperor* to the *moon*, your meaning is, that as the *moon* hath no light but only from the *sun*, so the *emperor* hath no authority but only that he receiveth from the *pope*. Notwithstanding, in this comparison, Isidorus, your own doctor, saith, ye are foully overseen. For thus he writeth: *Per solem intelligitur regnum, et per lunam intelligitur sacerdotium*: "By the *sun* is meant *kingly dignity*, and by the *moon* is meant *priesthood*." Now therefore *Jack Andrew, your merryman*, by this reckoning may cast your accounts backward, and say, *The emperor* is seventy and seven times greater than the *pope*.

Isidorus in  
Glos. in Ge-  
nesim, apud  
Joh. de Paris.  
cap. 4. [cap.  
15. p. 128.]

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 10.

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that more ample authority is given to you than to the residue of the *patriarchs*? [Vol. iv. p. 63.]

#### M. HARDING.

a A whole  
heap of un-  
truths and  
forgeries  
huddled to-  
gether.

b Untruths,  
without any  
word or show  
of truth.

c Untruth.  
For Sylvester  
was dead  
long before  
these mat-  
ters are ima-  
gined to be  
done.

The fathers of the Nicene council, by witness of <sup>a</sup>Julius the First, who then lived, and those of the council of Sardica, <sup>a</sup>Athanasius, and the bishops of Egypt, Thebaida, and Lybia, and the fathers of certain other councils.

Above all other most specially the first Christian emperor <sup>b</sup>Constantine the Great. Who being fully instructed of the most godly and learned bishops of his time, <sup>b</sup>what authority the successor of Peter had by <sup>b</sup>commission of our Saviour Christ, thought good by his <sup>b</sup>imperial commandment and decree, to confirm, ratify, and for his own person to yield unto <sup>c</sup>blessed Sylvester <sup>85</sup>, then pope, and to his successors, bishops of Rome,

<sup>85</sup> [Bishop Jewel's marginal note (c) respecting pope Sylvester's death is incorrect. He has fallen into the same error, supra vol. v. p. 426, (where see the note <sup>39</sup>), and infra p. 586, fol. edit. 1609. Sylvester died A. D. 335, having sat 29 years. The origin of the mistake was a passage in Sozo-

menus, (quoted p. 586, fol. edit.) lib. i. cap. 16 [17.] tom. ii. p. 34, (Reading's edit.), where it is expressly stated that pope *Julius* sent Vito and Vincentius to supply his room at the council of Nice; whereas the council took place in *Sylvester's* time, and eleven years before *Julius's* acces-



the same authority and superiority, not only over bishops and patriarchs, but also power and honour, higher and greater than that of kings or emperors. The words of <sup>d</sup>his solemn decree in that behalf made, are these, which as they are found in sundry other Greek writers, so most plainly in <sup>e</sup>Matthæus Hieromachus: Θεσπίζομεν συμπᾶσι τοῖς σατράπαις καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ τῆς ἡμῶν βασιλείας τὸν Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ διάδοχον τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ κυρίου μου Πέτρου, πλείονα τῆς βασιλείας ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ παρὰ πάντων πολλῶ πλέον ἢ τὸν βασιλέα τιμᾶσθαι καὶ σέβεσθαι, κεφαλὴν τε εἶναι τῶν τεσσάρων πατριαρχικῶν θρόνων, κρίνεσθαι τε παρ' [πρὸς] αὐτοῦ καὶ ψηφίζεσθαι τὰ τῇ ὀρθοδόξῳ συμβαίοντα πίστει. Which in our mother tongue is this much to say: "We give in decree and commandment to all lords, and to the senate of our empire, that the bishop of Rome, and the successor of St. Peter, chief of the apostles, have authority and power in all the world more than that of the empire is, and that he be honoured and worshipped more than the emperor, and that he be head of the four patriarchal seats, and that things appertaining to the right faith be of him judged and determined." Justinian the emperor likewise made an express decree, that the most holy pope of the elder Rome (for these be his very words) be taken according to the determinations of the holy councils, to be the <sup>f</sup>first and principal of all bishops. It were not hard to allege much more for proof hereof, of good and sufficient authority, but in a matter not doubtful this may suffice.

<sup>d</sup> This solemn decree is nothing else but a solemn folly.

<sup>e</sup> For shame: hath the pope none other record to prove his charter by, but only one poor, hungry, forged Grecian, that never saw Rome?

<sup>f</sup> First, and principal in councils, we confess: but lord and master of all other patriarchs, that would be proved.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This is a folly of all follies. Yet is there no folly so great, but by words and countenance it may be maintained. It shameth me to bestow words herein: and so much the more, for that you say *the case is so clear and out of doubt*. I assure you, M. Harding, of all other your innumerable *Lovanian vanities*, concerning the practice of the church, and story of time, this one *vanity* is the *vainest*.

But lest any man by simplicity or ignorance should be deceived, not understanding the mysteries of this *donation* or *charter*, by the judgment of your own doctors, the meaning thereof is this: *Volunt aliqui quod, ratione hujus doni, papa est imperator, et dominus mundi: et quod potest reges instituere, et destituere, sicut imperator*: "Some think, that, by force and virtue of this *donation*, the *pope*

Joh. de Paris. de Potestate Regia, cap. 22. [p. 140.]

sion. See Reading's note in loc., who proves not only that Sozomenus is wrong, but that he con-

tradicts himself. See also Beveridge Annot. in Canon. p. 209, quoted by Reading.]

[Matt. Hier. p. 25.]

[In Anth. de Eccles. tit. coll. 9. tom. v.]

*diadem* were made of silk or of gold. He telleth a tale of the *patriarch of Constantinople*, that he should be bonere and buxum<sup>88</sup> to the *bishop of Rome*; and yet at that time, when, as he imagineth, the *grant* was made, the *city of Constantinople* was not builded, nor any such name as yet known in the world. Now consider also, what a special grace this clerk hath in the Latin tongue. These be his flowers: *Signa et banna: decernere disponenda: concedere permanenda: licentiam dare: equos equitare, &c.* And *clericare*, in his language, is good Latin to make priests. This is such Latin, as, I will not say *Constantine* himself, but *Constantine's cook* would never have spoken.

Concil. tom.  
I. p. 227.  
[ed. Crabb.]  
Phrygium.

And yet is the *marginal gloss* hereupon as good and as substantial as the text. For whereas the text saith: *Contradimus beato Sylvestro.....phrygium nostrum, id est, mitram*: "We deliver unto *blessed Sylvester* our *phrygium*, that is to say, *our mitre*," there shall you find this pretty note in the margin: *Nota quod Phrygium factum est ex pennis pavonum*: "Mark well, that this *phrygium*, or *mitre*, was made of a peacock's tail." No doubt a worthy gift for an *emperor*, and a meet *mitre* for a *pope*. All these things, M. Harding, you know to be true: and yet have you a pen and a mouth to defend them. But, as I said before, it shameth me in so childish a fable to stand so long.

As for your *Greek doctor Hieromonachus*, he shall be stalled together with your *Clemens, Leontius, Amphilo-chius*, and other like your worthy and weighty *doctors*. For shame, what should ye bring us this one silly poor Greek witness, whose name ye never heard before, to testify of *grants* and *conveyances* made in *Rome*? Can your *pope* find out neither *council*, nor *doctor*, nor *father*, nor any other writer of likely record, to help him in so great a case, but only one poor rascal *Grecian*, that knew no more of the matter than you yourselves? It bewrayeth the neediness of your cause. He that durst so lewdly to

<sup>88</sup> ["Complaisant and obedient." In the marriage service according to the Salisbury Manual, A. D. 1490, the woman addresses the man in these words: "I N. take thee N. to my wedded housbande,

to have and to holde from this time forwarde for better for wors, for richer, for poorer, in sicknesse and hele, to be bonere and buxum &c." Cited by Todd in Johnson's dictionary.]

falsify such a *grant*, thereby to intrude himself into the possession of the *empire*, would not blush to falsify some beggarly witness to avouch the same.

Now where ye would seem to say, *The other four patriarchs stood evermore at the commandment of the bishop of Rome*: not only the said three *patriarchs*, which never neither yielded nor knew any such obedience, but also the general practice of the world, will soon reprove you.

Nilus, a Greek writer, saith: *Ut liquidius appareat, papam non imperare aliis omnibus episcopis, legatur sextus canon Synodi Nicenæ, quo diserte præcipitur* [i. *ut videas decretum esse*], *ut aliis ecclesiis Alexandrinus, aliis Romanus, aliis Antiochenus præsit: ut non liceat alteri, alterius provinciam invadere*: "That it may well and plainly appear, that the *pope* hath no *power* or *government* over all other bishops, read the sixth canon of the *Nicene council*. There it is expressly commanded, that the bishop of *Alexandria* shall have the rule over certain churches, and the bishop of *Rome* over certain, and the bishop of *Antioch* likewise over certain; and that it shall not be lawful for any one of them to invade the jurisdiction of another."

The emperor Justinian<sup>89</sup> saith: *Ecclesia urbis Constantinopolitanæ Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur*: "The church of the *city of Constantinople* enjoyeth now the prerogative of *Rome the elder*." Nicephorus saith: *Romano et Constantinopolitano episcopo ex æquo paria sunt et dignitatis præmia et honorum jura*: "The title of dignity and right of honor given to the bishop of *Rome*, and the bishop of *Constantinople*, are one and equal<sup>90</sup>." So likewise it was determined by *decree* in the *council of Constantinople*: *Definimus sedi Constantinopolitanæ paria jura, et privilegia cum sede veteris Romæ*: "We decree, that the see of *Constantinople* shall have rights and privileges equal with the see of old *Rome*<sup>91</sup>." Now consider well this

Nilus De Primatu Romani Pontificis. [lib. 2. p. 29.] καὶ ὡς οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἐτέρῳ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐπιθεῖν. [al. τοῖς ἀλλοτροῖς ἐπιτηδᾶν.]

Cod. de Sacrosan. Eccl. Omni innovatione. [tom. iv. lib. 1. tit. 5. l. 6.] Nicephorus lib. 12. c. 13. [ii. 244.]

Concil. Constant. 2. c. 36. [xi. 960.] τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαβεῖν [al. ἀπολαβεῖν] πρεσβείων.

<sup>89</sup> [This constitution was properly decreed by Honorius and Theodosius.]

<sup>90</sup> [Bishop Jewel appears here to have mistaken the literal meaning of his author's words: see the

original printed supra vol. iv. p. 407. note <sup>90</sup>.]

<sup>91</sup> [This was the Concil. Quini-Sextum, which was not accepted by Rome: supra iv. 407. note <sup>89</sup>.]

*diadem* were made of silk or of gold. He telleth a tale of the *patriarch of Constantinople*, that he should be bonere and buxum<sup>88</sup> to the *bishop of Rome*; and yet at that time, when, as he imagineth, the *grant* was made, the *city of Constantinople* was not builded, nor any such name as yet known in the world. Now consider also, what a special grace this clerk hath in the Latin tongue. These be his flowers: *Signa et banna: discernere disponenda: concedere permanenda: licentiam dare: equos equitare, &c.* And *clericare*, in his language, is good Latin to make priests. This is such Latin, as, I will not say *Constantine* himself, but *Constantine's cook* would never have spoken.

Concil. tom.

1. p. 227.  
[ed. Crabb.]

Phrygium.

And yet is the *marginal gloss* hereupon as good and as substantial as the text. For whereas the text saith: *Contradimus beato Sylvestro .....phrygium nostrum, id est, mitram*: "We deliver unto *blessed Sylvester our phrygium*, that is to say, *our mitre*," there shall you find this pretty note in the margin: *Nota quod Phrygium factum est ex pennis pavonum*: "Mark well, that this *phrygium*, or *mitre*, was made of a peacock's tail." No doubt a worthy gift for an *emperor*, and a meet *mitre* for a *pope*. All these things, M. Harding, you know to be true: and yet have you a pen and a mouth to defend them. But, as I said before, it shameth me in so childish a fable to stand so long.

As for your *Greek doctor Hieromonachus*, he shall be stalled together with your *Clemens, Leontius, Amphilo-chius*, and other like your worthy and weighty *doctors*. For shame, what should ye bring us this one silly poor Greek witness, whose name ye never heard before, to testify of *grants* and *conveyances* made in *Rome*? Can your *pope* find out neither *council*, nor *doctor*, nor *father*, nor any other writer of likely record, to help him in so great a case, but only one poor rascal *Grecian*, that knew no more of the matter than you yourselves? It bewrayeth the neediness of your cause. He that durst so lewdly to

<sup>88</sup> ["Complaisant and obedient." In the marriage service according to the Salisbury Manual, A. D. 1490, the woman addresses the man in these words: "I N. take thee N. to my wedded housbande,

to have and to holde from this time forwarde for better for wors, for richer, for poorer, in sicknesse and hele, to be bonere and buxum &c." Cited by Todd in Johnson's dictionary.]

falsify such a *grant*, thereby to intrude himself into the possession of the *empire*, would not blush to falsify some beggarly witness to avouch the same.

Now where ye would seem to say, *The other four patriarchs stood evermore at the commandment of the bishop of Rome*: not only the said three *patriarchs*, which never neither yielded nor knew any such obedience, but also the general practice of the world, will soon reprove you.

Nilus, a Greek writer, saith: *Ut liquidius appareat, papam non imperare aliis omnibus episcopis, legatur sextus canon Synodi Nicenæ, quo disertè præcipitur* [i. *ut videas decretum esse*], *ut aliis ecclesiis Alexandrinus, aliis Romanus, aliis Antiochenus præsit: ut non liceat alteri, alterius provinciam invadere*: “That it may well and plainly appear, that the *pope* hath no *power* or *government* over all other bishops, read the sixth canon of the *Nicene council*. There it is expressly commanded, that the bishop of *Alexandria* shall have the rule over certain churches, and the bishop of *Rome* over certain, and the bishop of *Antioch* likewise over certain; and that it shall not be lawful for any one of them to invade the jurisdiction of another.”

The emperor Justinian<sup>89</sup> saith: *Ecclesia urbis Constantinopolitanæ Romæ veteris prærogativa lætatur*: “The church of the *city of Constantinople* enjoyeth now the prerogative of *Rome the elder*.” Nicephorus saith: *Romano et Constantinopolitano episcopo ex æquo paria sunt et dignitatis præmia et honorum jura*: “The title of dignity and right of honor given to the bishop of *Rome*, and the bishop of *Constantinople*, are one and equal<sup>90</sup>.” So likewise it was determined by *decree* in the *council of Constantinople*: *Definimus sedi Constantinopolitanæ paria jura, et privilegia cum sede veteris Romæ*: “We decree, that the see of *Constantinople* shall have rights and privileges equal with the see of old *Rome*<sup>91</sup>.” Now consider well this

Nilus De Primatu Romani Pontificis. [lib. 2. p. 29.] και ὡς οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἐτέρῳ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐπιθεῖν. [al. τοῖς ἀλλοτροῖς ἐπιτηδᾶν.]

Cod. de Sacrosan. Eccl. Omni innovatione. [tom. iv. lib. i. tit. 5. l. 6.] Nicephorus lib. 12. c. 13. [ii. 244.]

Concil. Constantin. 2. c. 36. [xi. 960.] τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαβεῖν [al. ἀπολαβεῖν] πρεσβείων.

<sup>89</sup> [This constitution was properly decreed by Honorius and Theodosius.]

<sup>90</sup> [Bishop Jewel appears here to have mistaken the literal meaning of his author's words: see the

original printed supra vol. iv. p. 407. note <sup>90</sup>.]

<sup>91</sup> [This was the Concil. Quinisextum, which was not accepted by Rome: supra iv. 407. note <sup>89</sup>.]

matter, M. Harding. If the *patriarch of Constantinople* were the *pope's equal*, how was he his *subject*? If he were his *subject*, how was he his *equal*? Ye shall hardly force these things to frame together. Therefore, as it is said before, Gennadius, together with the *council of Constantinople*, wrote thus unto the *bishop of Rome*: *Curet sanctitas tua universas tuas custodias, tibi que subjectos episcopos*: “Let your holiness see unto all your own cures, and to the bishops that be subject unto you.”

Gennadius  
ad omnes  
Metropolitana-  
nos, et ad  
Papam Rom.  
[p. 46.]

Cypr. ad Cor-  
nelium.  
Athanasius  
ad Episc.  
Aphrican.

St. Cyprian, Cyrillus, Athanasius, and others, writing either of or unto the *bishop of Rome*, call him, not their *lord* and *master*, unto whom of duty they ought obedience, but their *brother*, and their *fellow-servant*. Yea, the *pope* himself in some cases hath rather offered his obedience unto other bishops. For thus writeth pope Liberius unto Athanasius the *bishop of Alexandria*: *Quæso ut huic confessioni subscribas, ut ego securior efficiar, et tua mandata inhæsitanter obeam*: “I beseech thee to subscribe to this *confession*, that I may be out of doubt, and may do your *commandments without grudging*<sup>92</sup>.” Yet now the *bishop of Rome*, to maintain his title by a writ of right, forasmuch as the *four principal patriarchs* of the world have forsaken him, appointeth out *four of his ordinary chaplains*, and giveth them the names of *four patriarchs*: the first for *Constantinople*; the second for *Alexandria*; the third for *Antioch*; the fourth for *Hierusalem*. And thus, having these four at commandment, in his pleasant fancy, he ruleth and governeth the whole world. In such a solemn bravery the great *cham of Turtary* at this day, after he hath dined himself, soundeth out a trumpet, and giveth all the kings and emperors of the world leave to go to dinner: and in this imagination and jollity, he continueth his claim to the possession of all the world, even by as good right and title as doth the *pope*. And whensoever the *pope* himself, in his own person, openly and solemnly saith his *mass*, he commandeth the *gospel* and *epistle* to be read in

Epistol. Li-  
berii ad  
Athanasium.  
[Inter Athan-  
opp. ii. 668.]

<sup>92</sup> [This epistle is a gross forgery; but it serves to shew, that forged, such expressions were not considered beneath the pope's dignity.]

*Greek.* Whereupon his own *master of ceremonies* saith thus: *Hanc consuetudinem hinc ortam puto, ut appareat Romanam ecclesiam in se continere utramque gentem:* Ceremon. lib. 3. c. 7. [fol. 336.]

“Hereof I think this custom first proceeded, that hereby it may appear, that the *church of Rome containeth in it both nations, as well Greeks as Latins.*”

All this notwithstanding, Antoninus saith: *Hoc Græci non credunt:* “For all this, the Greeks believe it not<sup>93</sup>.” Anton. in Summa pt. 3. tit. 22. cap. 6. §. 1.

The objections of *Justinian*, and of the *council of Sardica*, are answered in my former Reply to M. Harding. Art. 4. Divis. 8. [vol. ii. p. 174.] Art. 4. Divis. 7. [il. 171.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. Divis. 11.

Vol. iv. p. 3.] Which of the ancient holy fathers ever called you *Lord and God?*

M. HARDING.

† Const. A. postol. lib. ii. cap. 30.] None that wise is, so speaketh absolutely: nevertheless, in some certain sense, <sup>a</sup>St. Clement calleth every bishop *Terrenum quendam Deum*, “a certain earthly God,” as it is written, “<sup>b</sup>I have said, Ye are gods,” &c. a A vain forgery. b These words are spoken of princes and magistrates.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

So that ye make not the *pope an absolute God*, ye think, ye may otherwise call him *God* safely and without prejudice. A proper shift to maintain a vain man in the possession of his *Godhead*. In such a pleasant imagination Antiochus, sometime the king of Syria, entituled himself by the name of *God*. So the emperor Domitian used to assign his proclamations, *Dominus Deus vester Domitianus*, “Your Lord God Domitian.” So the emperor Caligula called himself, *Deum optimum maximum, et Jovem Latium, Jupiter of Italy.* So Sapo, the great king of Persia, called himself *Fratrem solis et lune*, “the brother of the Hieron. in Daniel. cap. 3. [l. cap. 11. iii. 1137.] *Ἀπρίοχος ὁ θεός.*”

“Your Lord God Domitian.” So the emperor Caligula called himself, *Deum optimum maximum, et Jovem Latium, Jupiter of Italy.* So Sapo, the great king of Persia, called himself *Fratrem solis et lune*, “the brother of the Suetonius in Domitiano. [c. 13.]

“Your Lord God Domitian.” So the emperor Caligula called himself, *Deum optimum maximum, et Jovem Latium, Jupiter of Italy.* So Sapo, the great king of Persia, called himself *Fratrem solis et lune*, “the brother of the Suetonius [in Calig. c. 22.]

“Your Lord God Domitian.” So the emperor Caligula called himself, *Deum optimum maximum, et Jovem Latium, Jupiter of Italy.* So Sapo, the great king of Persia, called himself *Fratrem solis et lune*, “the brother of the Pompon. Laetus. [fol. 10.]

<sup>93</sup> [Antoninus: “Dicere autem “ Spiritum Sanctum a Filio non  
“ pontificem Romanum vel Ro- “ procedere, ut dicit Thomas in  
“ manæ ecclesiæ non habere uni- “ dicto tractatu contra errores  
“ versalis ecclesiæ primum est “ Græcorum.”]  
“ error similis errori dicentium

Athenæus,  
lib. 7. [p. 289.]

sun and the moon." So the peevish physician Menecrates called himself *Jupiter*: so Nicostratus<sup>94</sup> called himself *Hercules*: so Nicagoras made himself a pair of wings, and would needs be called the god *Mercurius*<sup>95</sup>: so Manichæus the heretic called himself the *Holy Ghost*<sup>96</sup>: so the Romans in old times erected up an image in the honour of Simon Magus the sorcerer, with this inscription or posy: *Simoni sancto Deo*, "In the honour of *Simon the holy God*<sup>97</sup>." By this your so handsome distinction, M. Harding, of *God absolute*, and *God not absolute*, I see not but every of these might well and safely have maintained his title without blame.

Chrys. de  
Spiritu Sanc-  
to. [iii. 808.]  
August. con-  
tra Faustum,  
lib. 13. c. 17.  
[viii. 262.]  
Eus. lib. 2.  
c. 13. [l. 62.]

Certainly in this arrogant vanity, scarcely any of all these was ever comparable to the *pope*. Pope Nicolas saith: *Constat summum pontificem, a pio principe Constantino, Deum appellatum*: "It is well known, that the *pope*, of the godly prince Constantine, was called *God*." Likewise the *pope* was well content to suffer one of his parasites to say unto him in the late *council of Lateran*: *Tu es alter Deus in terris*: "Thou art another *God* in earth<sup>98</sup>." Likewise Cardillus the Spaniard, in defence of the *pope's late chapter at Trident*, oftentimes calleth the *pope Terrenum deum*, "an earthly god<sup>99</sup>;" by the same style and right whereby Holophernes sometime said, *Nabuchodonosor est deus terræ*, "Nabuchodonosor is the *god* of the earth."

Dist. 96. Sa-  
tis evidentior.

Christoph.  
Marcell. in  
Concil. Late-  
ran. sess. 4.  
[Harduin ix.  
1651. b.]  
Cardillus pro  
Concil. Trid.

Judith 5.  
[l. 6. vers. 3.]

Upon the *pope's* own *Clementines* ye shall find the matter thus taken up and qualified with great indifferency and

<sup>94</sup> [Nicostratus: the story is told by Diodorus Siculus, as quoted by Hoffmann in Lexico.]

<sup>95</sup> [Nicagoras: the Editor has not discovered the authority for this statement.]

<sup>96</sup> [S. August. contra Faust. "... hunc Paracletum dicentes "esse Manichæum." The work here attributed to St. Chrysostom is not considered genuine by the Bened. edd., but of great antiquity.]

<sup>97</sup> [Euseb. lib. 2. c. 13. Σίμωνι δέω σαγκτῶ. Valesius in his note

in loc. shews, that this was a mistake of St. Justin's, from whom Eusebius borrowed the story. The inscription was Samnitic, SEMONI SANGO DEO FIDIO (a god of the Sabines). Valesius adds that a statue bearing this inscription has been found.]

<sup>98</sup> [Christoph. Marcellus, supra vol. vi. p. 95, note 79.]

<sup>99</sup> [Cardillus. In the Epistle to cardinal Borromeo occur the words, "In Pontificem Max., aut "potius in terrestrem atque mortalem Deum."]



modesty, and thus specially noted in the margin: *a Papa nec Deus est, nec homo.* And to leave other his like blasphemous and fond styles, in another like gloss ye shall find it written thus: *Uedere Dominum Deum nostrum papam non potuisse statuere, prout statuit, hæreticum censeatur*: “To believe that *our Lord God the pope* might not decree, as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy<sup>1</sup>.” Here have we found by express and plain words, even in the pope’s own authentical and allowed book, *Our Lord God the pope.*

a The pope is neither God nor man. [Clem. In proœmio: in Glossa.] Our Lord God the pope. Extrav. Joh. 22. Cum inter: in Glossa. Impress. Lugduni, an. 1555. Paris, an. 1513.

These things might seem incredible, had not St. Paul foretold us, that the *man of sin* should sit in the *temple of God*, and shew himself as if he were *God*. St. Gregory, writing of *Antichrist*, saith thus: .....*Cum sit damnatus homo, et nequaquam [Ben. leg. nequam] spiritus, Deum se esse mentitur*: “Whereas he is a damned man, and not a spirit, by lying he feigneth himself to be *God*.” Anselmus saith: *Simulabit se religiosum, ut sub specie decipiat pietatis: imo, se Deum esse dicet: et se adorari faciet: atque regna colorum promittet*: “*Antichrist* shall feign himself to be holy, that he may deceive men under the colour of holiness: yea, and he shall call himself *God*, and shall cause himself to be worshipped, and shall promise the kingdom of heaven.” Now tell us, M. Harding, who ever did, or attempted to do these things, but only the *pope*?

Gregor. in Job. cap. 34. lib. 25. c. 20. [tom. i. 807.]

Anselmus in 2 Thess. 2. [ii. 342. D.]

Eusebius saith: *Hoc est argumentum, eos odisse Deum, quod velint se ipsos appellari Deos*: “This is a token that they hate *God*, for that they will have themselves called by the name of *God*.”

Euseb. de Preparation. lib. 7. [c. 17. tom. i. p. 329.] Δείγμα τούτων τῆς θεοεχθρίας, τὸ

Likewise saith the ancient father Irenæus; *Antichristus existens apostata, et latro, quasi deus vult adorari: et cum sit servus, regem se vult præconari*: “*Antichrist* being a renegade, and a thief, yet will be worshipped as a *god*: and being but a slave, yet he will be proclaimed and published as a king.” Therefore although the *pope* be not, as you say, an *absolute God*, or an *absolute Christ*, yet

θέλγειν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς θεοὺς ἀναγορεύεσθαι.

[Irenæus, lib. 5. cap. pen. p. 322.]

<sup>1</sup> [“*Dominum Deum nostrum* note <sup>80</sup>, as well as vol. iii. p. 440, “*Papam*,” see supra vol. vi. p. 95, note <sup>58</sup>; and vol. ii. p. 195, note <sup>35</sup>.]

without any great inconvenience, I trow, he may well be an *absolute antichrist*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 12.*

Which of the ancient holy fathers ever said, that <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 63.]</sup> you are not *a mere natural man, but a certain substance made and grown together of God and man?*

M. HARDING.

A faint excuse.

a A certain divine power in the pope.  
b A sore punishment for open blasphemy.

Can you bring him before his face that shall say so unto him? I warrant you (master defender) he shall either be reproved for his flattering, or proved to understand no more by it than a certain divine power above the natural state of men,<sup>b</sup> or warned that he be more circumspect in his glossing, when heretics are ready to slander the whole church because of one private man's affection.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

He that may call himself *Lord and God*, may easily claim himself to be *more than a man*. In the pope's own Decretals it is noted thus in the margin: *Papa non est homo*: "The pope is not a man<sup>2</sup>." Your Gloss upon the pope's own Clementines allegeth these words out of one of your allowed poets<sup>3</sup>: *Papa stupor mundi*: "The pope is the wonder of the world." And again:

In Sext. de Electione, et Elect. Fundamenta: In Glossa. [llb. 1. tit. 6. c. 17. col. 120. i.] Clement. in proemio. In Glossa. [col. 4. lit. y.]

*NEC DEUS ES, NEC HOMO: QUASI NEUTER ES INTER UTRUNQUE:*

"Thou art neither God nor man: in a manner thou art neither of both, but rather a mean between both."

By the authority of this doctor it appeareth, that the pope is neither *God* nor *man*. *Angel*, I trow, he is not. What other creature ye may make of him, I leave to you further to consider. But *bring him forth* (ye say) *that thus hath spoken*: bring him before the *pope's face*, that he may be punished. For he shall be *warned*, as he is, *to be more circumspect in his glossing*. So cruelly, M.

<sup>2</sup> ["Papa non est homo, sed Dei vicarius."]

<sup>3</sup> ["Inde dixit ille Angelicus in poetria nova, "Papa stupor mun-

di:" et circa finem—"qui maxima rerum, Nec Deus es nec homo," &c.]

Harding, ye punish, and torment, and crucify them that enfeof a poor miserable sinful creature with the glorious name of God immortal.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 13.*

[Vol. iv. p. 3.] Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that you are the only *headspring of all laws*?

M. HARDING.

Whosoever saith it, speaketh not without evident reason, considering that of the principal of every government all laws belonging to the same be deducted and derived.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here have ye brought us a full simple reason, as God knoweth. But to have brought us some authority of *doctor or council*, it had been better. We have no doubt of your pretty reasons. We demanded only, *which of the ancient fathers ever said so*?

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 6. Divis. 14.*

[Vol. iv. p. 3.] Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that you have *power over purgatory*?

M. HARDING.

o that ye would first believe a purgatory, and then should ye understand, what dispensation of loosing and binding is committed to the vicar of Christ. For, as Esay saith, "Except ye believe, ye shall not understand:" and the consequent doctrine must needs be obscure, as long as the principal ground thereof is wickedly denied.

No doubt, it were a worthy matter.

Wisely.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of your *purgatory* phantasies we have sufficiently said before. Where ye wish we would believe there is a *purgatory*, verily we believe constantly whatsoever God hath willed us to believe. St. Paul saith, "Faith cometh by hearing: hearing cometh by the *word of God*:" and thereby only is faith directed. As for your follies and

Rom. x. 17.

mockeries, they are subject to *fancy*, and not to *faith*.  
 St. Augustine saith: *Nemo de Christo credat, nisi quod de se credi voluit Christus*: "Let no man believe of Christ, but that that Christ hath commanded him to believe of Christ." Again he saith: *Constat fidem stultam non prodesse, sed potius obesse*: "It is certain that *foolish faith* doth no good, but rather hurteth." Notwithstanding, though all your lists and gainful territories of *purgatory* were fully granted, yet should it be very hard for you to prove, either by *scripture* or by *doctor*, that the pope beareth any greater authority or sway there, to command in or out at his pleasure, than any other simple priest. Albeit, one of your allowed doctors saith: *Purgatorium est peculiū papæ*: "Purgatory is the peculiar possession of the *pope*:" I trow, as being a college only of his own foundation.

Aug. de Tempore, serm. 145. Feria 3. Paschat. [v. 995.]

† Aug. in Questionibus Veteris Test. qu. 43. [iii. App. 56.]

Angelus Parisiensis.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 15.

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that you are able to *command the angels of God* as ye list yourself? [Vol. iv. p. 63.]

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, manifest, as shall appear.

Nor old father, nor new doctor. And whatsoever he be that shall so tell you, believe him not: he speaketh not catholicly; and you must make no scruple in such matters.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here at last, M. Harding, for shame ye are fain to yield. *No doctor* (ye say) *ever thus said, neither old nor new*. Howbeit, hereto ye have laid a very good exception, with a special saving: "*If any man have so said* (say ye), *whosoever he were, he spake not catholicly*." And yet again ye tell us further, howsoever it be, "*we should never be scrupulous in such matters*."

But what if the pope himself, the *father* of all *fathers*, and *doctor* of all *doctors*, both new and old, have not blushed to say the same? May we say as you say, *The pope himself was not catholic*? or if we so say, will you believe it?

Indeed king Xerxes, the great king of Persia, when he had brought over his huge army into Grecia, sent out his letters of defiance unto the great mount Athos, that is in Macedonia, and commanded him to stand still, and not to stir a foot, nor to work any displeasure, either to himself or to his army, upon pain of his high indignation. Even by like authority, and with as good discretion, the pope hath used to send out his *precepts* and *princely summons*, and to command *angels, archangels*, and all the *powers of heaven*, to come, to go, to fetch, to carry, and to be ready to do his will. Therefore is he the better content to hear his friends tell him thus: *Tibi data est omnis potestas supra omnes potestates, tam cœli, quam terræ. Qui totum dicit, nihil excludit*: “To thee is given all manner of power, above all powers, as well of heaven as of earth. He that saith *all*, excepteth nothing.”

In Conc. Lateran. sub Leone 10. sess. 10. [Harduin ix. 1789.]

Felinus your doctor saith thus: *Nedum circa cœlestia, terrestria, et infernalìa papa gerit vicariatum Christi, sed etiam super angelos, bonos, et malos*: “The pope hath Christ’s lieutenantship, not only over things in *heaven*, over things in *earth*, and over things in *hell*, but also over the *angels, both good and bad*.”

Extra de Constitut. Statuta Canon. Felin. [fol. 9. col. 2.]

Innocentius the pope himself saith: *Vicario Creatoris omnis creatura subjecta est*: “Unto the Creator’s lieutenant every creature is subject.” Your own doctor Antoninus, the archbishop of Florence, saith: *Potestas papæ major est omni alia potestate creata, aliquo modo extendens se ad cœlestia, terrestria, et infernalìa: ut de ea verificari possit quod dictum est, Omnia subiecisti sub pedibus ejus*: “The *pope’s power* is greater than any other power that God ever made: and after a sort stretcheth itself unto things in *heaven*, things in *earth*, and things in *hell*: so that of that *power* the words may be verified, that are written by the prophet David, ‘Thou hast made all things subject to his feet.’” Camotensis<sup>4</sup> saith: *Papa angelis præcipit, et*

Felin. eodem loco.

Anton. in Sum. par. 3. tit. 22. cap. 5. ante §.

Agrippa de vanitate Scientiarum. [cap. 92. de Jure Canonico.]

<sup>4</sup> [For an account of Camotensis, see supra vol. ii. p. 217. note <sup>46</sup>. There is nothing, however, in the 92d chapter of Agrippa (de Jure

Canonico), to shew, that he is using the words of Camotensis—“... quorum (scil. pontif. Roman.) eousque excrevit arrogantia, ut

*potestatem habet in mortuos*: “The pope commandeth the angels” (of God), “and hath power over the dead.” Gregorius Haimburgensis saith: *Ut terminis utar suorum adulatorum, papa angelis habet imperare*: “To use the words of his flatterers, The pope hath power to command the angels.” Therefore if any man happen to die upon the way, as he passeth in pilgrimage towards Rome, pope Clement VI. commandeth the *angels of God* to be at hand, and to carry his soul immediately into heaven <sup>5</sup>.

Hereto, and to all other the like, M. Harding saith, “These popes, these doctors, these fathers, these pages, these parasites, in these points were not catholic.”

Notwithstanding he saith further, “If the pope for his fancy take somewhat upon him, and sometimes be a little over-bold with *God’s angels*, to command them and countermand them at his pleasure, in such cases we ought not to be over scrupulous.”

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 16.

Which of the ancient fathers ever said, that you are the *lord of lords, and king of kings*? [Vol. iv. p. 63.]

#### M. HARDING.

He useth the clean contrary title, calling himself, *Servum servorum Dei*, “The servant of the servants of God.” Yet if he, for the largeness of his jurisdiction, have a number of lords and kings within his fold, although he himself doth not boast of it, yet in a right good sense that title may be given to him.

is a right good sense.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Notwithstanding the pope call himself the *king of kings*, and the *lord of lords*: notwithstanding he say, ‘The emperor

“angelis cœlorum præciperent, et ex inferno sublata præda rapinam facere præsumerent, et in mortuorum manes manuum mitterent,” &c.]

<sup>5</sup> [Agrippa, de Jure canonico, “Nonne Clemens Papa in bulla, quæ hodie adhuc Viennæ, Limonis [Limovis] Pictavii in principibus viligiorum scriniis plumbata ser-

“vatur, præcipit angelis de cœlo, quod animam peregrinantis Romanam pro indulgentiis et decedentis, a purgatorio absolutam ad gaudia perpetua introducant?”

This bull of Clement VI. (Bulla anni Jubilæi, A. D. 1350,) is printed ad calc. Examini Bullæ Papalis, auctore Hoornbeck, from a MS. in the Utrecht library.]

is so far inferior unto him as the *moon* is inferior unto the *sun*: notwithstanding he say, The *emperor* is but his *bailiff*, his *steward*, and his *man*: notwithstanding he say, he hath power to set up and to put down *kings* and *emperors* at his pleasure: yet saith M. Harding, "All this may be spoken in right good sense: for the pope useth a clean contrary title, and calleth himself *Servum servorum Dei*, 'The servant of God's servants.'" Thus he thinketh it sufficient to weigh matters only by title, and not by truth.

Howbeit, all this is but playing under a vizard. The devil seldom sheweth his horns; but rather changeth himself into an *angel of light*. Touching this title, as the *pope* calleth himself a *servant*, even so doth the *emperor* likewise abase himself to the name of a *servant*. If ye doubt hereof, read your own *Gloss* upon your *Decretals*. The words there be these: *Etiam imperator seipsum appellat servum*. Likewise again the same *Gloss* saith: *Papa se servum appellat, et imperator vocat se servum ultimum ecclesie*: "The *pope* calleth himself a *servant*, and the *emperor* calleth himself the *vilest servant* of the church."

All this is nothing else but a politic kind of dissimulation and hypocrisy. For if these be *servants* indeed, I pray you then, who be the *lords*?

Hervæus<sup>6</sup>, one of your own doctors, hereof saith thus: *Dicere quod talia dicunt summi pontifices ex humilitate*,

Extr. de Majoritat. et Obedientia. Solitæ. [col. 402.]  
Dist. 98. [l. 96.] Si Imperat. In Glos. Aventinus in Adriano. [p. 390.]

Extr. in Decret. Gregor. in Proem. In Glosa. Extravag. Joh. xxii. de Præbend. et Dignitat. Execrabilis. In Glosa. [col. 31. b.]

Joh. de Paris. cap. 13. [cap. 14. p. 126.]

<sup>6</sup> [The real author is "Johannes Parisiensis." This is one of the instances in which bishop Jewel confounded the work of Johannes Parisiensis, "De Potestate Regia et Papali," with one by Hervæus, "De Potestate Papæ;" an error upon which Harding animadverted strongly in his Detection, fol. 413, b. The mistake evidently originated in the fact that in the edition consulted by the bishop the two works were printed together in one volume. A copy of that edition is in Lam-

beth library; and it is remarkable, that, in accordance with Jewel's reference in the margin, the passage cited is found in the 13th chapter, whereas in other editions it is in the 14th. The Lambeth copy of Hervæus is not divided by chapters. Supra vol. iv. 119. The references to Hervæus, which in earlier parts of this work were not verified in consequence of the difficulty of finding a copy, will be noticed (as in all similar cases) in the list of authors subjoined to the preface.]

Aug. de Ver-  
bis Apostoli.

*est omnino perniciosum. Et hoc est ponere os in cælum, Philosophus dicit hoc esse peccatum ironiæ, quod opponitur virtuti. Et addit, tales humiles non esse virtuosos, sed timidos, et blanditores. Et Augustinus ait, Cum humilitatis causa mentiris, si non eras peccator antequam mentireris, mentiendo peccator efficeris: "To say that the popes speak these words of humility, it were very hurtful. And this is to set the face against the heavens. Aristotle saith, This is the sin of dissimulation or hypocrisy, which is contrary unto virtue. And saith further, that such humble men are not virtuous, but fearful and flattering. And St. Augustine saith, Whensoever thou speakest untruth under the colour of humility, if thou were not a sinner before, yet by telling untruth thou art made a sinner."*

Epist. Nicolai Papæ.  
[Crabb. tom. ii. p. 753.]  
Inter Decreta Adriani Papæ.  
[Crabb. ii. 613.]  
Concil. tom. i. [Crabb. p. 608.] In purificatione Sixti.

Good reader, pull off this painted vizard: and under this vain title of *servant of servants* thou shalt find a *lord of lords*: and such a *lord*, so *lord-like*, and so princely, as seldom thou shalt find among the heathens. For proof hereof thus the *pope* himself saith: "Neither *emperor* nor *king* may judge the *pope*." And his reason is this: *Non est servus supra dominum*: "For the" (*emperor* being a) "*servant* is not above" (the *pope*, that is) "his *lord*."

Thus ye see, he that so humbly calleth himself the *servant of servants*, if ye touch him, or anger [ed. 1570, *leg. arger*] him, will suddenly change himself into the *king of kings*, and *lord of lords*. For in these words he plainly and expressly calleth the *emperor* the *servant*, and himself the *lord*. And whatsoever be said to the contrary, verily the *pope's exposition* must needs be more authentical than M. Harding's.

Doct. Bonn. in Præfat. in libel. Steph. Gardiner, De Vera Obedientia.

He maketh the *emperor* to hold his stirrup: he maketh the *emperor* to lead his bridle: he maketh the *emperor* to kiss his foot: he maketh the *emperor* to lie down groveling, and setteth his foot on his neck: and yet still calleth himself the *servant of servants*. Few good *servants* will be so homely with their *masters*. Dr. Bonner saith thus: "Notwithstanding the *pope* be a very ravening wolf, dressed in sheep's clothing, yet he calleth himself the *servant of servants*."



THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis.* 1.

Vol. iv. p. 3.] We can also go further with you in like sort. What one amongst the whole number of the old bishops and fathers ever taught you, either to say *private mass*, whiles the people stared on, or to *lift up the sacrament* over your head, in which points consisteth now all your religion? or else to mangle *Christ's sacraments*, and to bereave the people of the one part thereof, contrary to Christ's institution, and plain express words? But that we may once come to an end, what one is there of all the fathers which hath taught you to distribute *Christ's blood*, and the *holy martyrs' merits*, and to sell openly your *pardons*, and all the rooms and lodgings of *purgatory*, as a gainful kind of merchandise.

## M. HARDING.

Your objections of private mass, of lifting up the blessed sacrament, of ministering the communion under one kind, be as common with you as lice be with beggars, and lies with heretics. For indeed your questions be but beggarly and heretical. Touching the same, I have said <sup>a</sup> so much in my answer to M. Jewel, your nearest friend, his challenge, as here to rehearse it again it is needless. You may seek it there. The doctrine of pardons I judge verily you understand not. Here is no opportunity to discuss it. The full treatise of the same requiring a long process, may well to another time be deferred. Of purgatory I have said some deal here before. These be the matters, wherein you and your ignorant fellow ministers gladly show your vile railing and scoffing eloquence. Yet concerning the doctrine of pardons, <sup>b</sup> lest I seem to say nothing, this much I have thought good to say here.

In the sacrament, as well of baptism as of penance, all the bands of sin are loosed, and the whole everlasting pain due to sin is forgiven. At baptism, no temporal pain is enjoined to us, because Christ most freely bestoweth the benefit of his death upon us at that our first entry into the church. <sup>c</sup> But if afterward we abuse his mercy, returning again to filthy sin, Christ would our second, third, and all other reconciliations from thenceforth, to be with due satisfaction, not of his dreadful

Artic. 1. 7. a Note that M. Harding, in his said three articles of answer to M. Jewel, hath published three-score and nine great untruths.

Fol. 117. b And all the same is less than nothing.

c A doctrine full of sundry blasphemies.

anger, (which only his blood, and the sacrament of penance, by due contrition and confession in deed or in vow received, is able to remove,) but with satisfaction of such temporal pain as his merciful justice required both of all others from the beginning, and <sup>d</sup> namely of king David: to whom confessing his fault, <sup>2</sup> Nathan said, “ Our Lord hath put away thy sin, thou shalt not die.” Behold the forgiveness of the mortal sin, and of the everlasting pain due to the same. But yet so is it forgiven, that withal it is transferred into a temporal satisfaction. What was that? It followeth in the story, that, because David through his advoutry and murder had caused the enemies of God to blaspheme his holy name, the child born of the wife of Urias should surely die. And so it came to pass. If the death of a son be so grievous a punishment to a good father, that king David was content to pray, to fast, to lie on the ground, afflicting himself seven days, only to try whether he might, as it were by exchange, buy out this death of his son, and yet so could not obtain his desire: we may be most certain, that the very best friends of God, sinning after baptism, (or circumcision, which in the old law stood in place thereof,) must by ordinary course satisfy with some temporal affliction that just judgment of our merciful Maker and Redeemer, if further grace be not found by some other way. This satisfaction hath been therefore justly called the third and last part of penance: which if it be not fulfilled in this life, undoubtedly it shall be straitly exacted in the world to come in the fire of purgatory. For that sins may be in another world forgiven to those who die not in the deadly bonds of them, <sup>e</sup> our Saviour hath given us to understand, saying, That the sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come: whereof it appeareth, that some other sins may be forgiven in the world to come.

Well, this satisfaction may notwithstanding be fulfilled more than one way. For a man being once by the sacrament of penance justly reconciled to the mystical body of Christ, which is his church, wherein (as the prophet saith) a faithful man is made partaker of all that fear God and keep his commandments: we have in that band of peace such an unity of spirit communicated to us all, that the defect of one may be in spiritual causes <sup>f</sup> supplied out of the plenty of all others his fellow members, according as the apostle saith, <sup>g</sup> “ Bear ye one another’s burdens.” And because the head (which is Christ) is the chief member of all, and far more than all the rest, such influence is from him derived throughout his mystical body, that even his death may as well inwardly by charity, as outwardly by another way also, be applied to us for the pardoning of that temporal satisfaction, which after the sacrament of penance is left unforgiven. And that is by such authority as Christ gave to Peter, saying, “ To thee I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; <sup>3</sup>

<sup>d</sup> King David alleged for proof of pardons.

<sup>2</sup> Sam. xi. 13.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth avouched upon Christ. See the answer.

Matt. xii. 32.

<sup>f</sup> A folly passing all other follies.

<sup>g</sup> A text full wisely applied to prove pardons.

Psal. cxix.

Gal. vi. 2.

Matt. xvi. 19.

and whatsoever thou bindest in earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou <sup>h</sup> loosest in earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." Lo, whatsoever Peter looseth in earth, it shall be loosed in the sight of God. If therefore the pope, who succeedeth Peter, do by just cause loose, not only the mortal sin by the sacrament of penance, but also the band of temporal pain, which remaineth yet due to the sin; it is undoubted, that such pain is loosed in the sight of God. The cause of loosing must be not only the will of the pope, (who is put in authority to build, and not to destroy; to dispense, and not to lavish,) but a reasonable change or recompence substituted in that behalf, such as appertaineth to the honour of God, or to the profit of souls: as maintaining war, and fighting against infidels for the defence of Christendom, recovery of the sepulchre of Christ, succouring widows, orphans, or other poor persons, the building or maintaining of holy places, the visiting of prisons and martyrs' tombs, or any like devout and charitable deeds: which whiles the faithful Christian doth obediently perform, (although otherwise the thing enjoined be not great,) he may obtain remission also of that temporal satisfaction which was left in penance unremitted. This kind of pardon St. Paul gave to that notorious sinner, who at Corinth had his father's wife, and was for that fault separated from the church of God, to be afflicted temporally in his flesh. But when the Corinthians had informed St. Paul of his earnest and true repentance, and had shewed their own favour and good wills toward him, the apostle answereth, "Whom ye forgive aught, I also (forgive). For I also in that I have forgiven, if I have forgiven aught, for your sakes in the person of Christ I have forgiven it." Well, we are assured the apostle speaketh of forgiving such afflictions as the party was in, by reason he was delivered out of the defence of holy church, to that state, where the devil, as St. Chrysostom upon that place noteth, *pro solutione peccatorum*, "for payment of his sins," might vex him: and wherein such persons, being put to their penance, used to remain for a certain space of months or years, until their penance were done and expired. Now the reconciling of the man, not yet having done due satisfaction, before his ordinary time, is a pardon: which the apostle saith he doth give in the person of Christ, as having authority of him to do it: and for the Corinthians' sakes, as who were able by their holy prayers and common sorrow (whereof the apostle speaketh) to make recompence for that which lacked on the behalf of his own satisfaction. If this much do not satisfy any man desiring to be fully resolved herein, let him resort to the Latin works of that holy and learned bishop of Rochester.

h O fond  
man! Christ  
saith, What-  
soever thou  
loosest in  
earth, and  
not in pur-  
gatory.

And thus M.  
Harding  
awaked out  
of his dream.

1 Cor. v.

2 Cor. ii.

In 1 Cor. v.  
hom. 15.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

These objections, ye say, in your pleasant homely comparison, “are as common with us, as lice with beggars.” And yet to my remembrance, neither your *private mass*, nor your *half communion*, was ever touched in this whole Apology more than once before this place: the *lifting up*, or *shewing of the sacrament*, not once at all. Ye should have weighed your advantages better, M. Harding, before ye thus bestowed your loathsome quarrels.

But thought you indeed, M. Harding, (I will not say as you say, that with so *lousy* and *beggarly*, but,) that with so poor and simple stuff ye should be able to mock the world? Many fond tales both you and your fellows have sent us over: but a fonder tale than this tale is, of your *pardons* and *purgatories*, ye have sent us none. I must say to you as St. Augustine sometime said to Julianus, the *Pelagian heretic*: *Necessitate compellitur talibus pannis indui tam magna etiam vestra superbia*: “Your pride, be it never so great, even for very poor need and beggary, is fain to cover itself with such sorry clouts.”

Aug. contr.  
Julian. lib. 5.  
cap. 1. [x.  
627.]

I beseech you, consider how advisedly and reverently ye use God’s *holy word*. Thus you say: “Nathan said unto David, *Our Lord hath put away thy sin: thou shalt not die*.” Christ saith; “The sin against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in the world to come:” or as St. Mark saith; “He that sinneth against the *Holy Ghost*, hath no remission *for ever*; but shall be guilty of *everlasting sin*.” St. Paul saith; “Bear ye one another’s burden:” Christ saith to Peter; “To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” &c.: St. Paul said of him that had lived in shameful incest with his father’s wife; “Let such a one be given over to Satan.” These be your scriptures, M. Harding, full properly applied, and to good purpose: hereof ye full discreetly and learnedly conclude thus: Ergo, *The pope hath a warrant sufficient to grant his pardons, and that as well to the dead, as to the quick.*

2 Sam. xii.  
13.

Matt. xii. 32.

Mark iii. 29.

Gal. vi. 2.

Matt. xvi. 19.

1 Cor. v. 5.

O, M. Harding, God is not to be mocked: fear his judg-

ments: abuse not his *name* or *word* in vain. Full well you know, that neither David, nor Nathan, nor Christ, nor Paul, were pardon-mongers. What should I further say to him, that with so great a countenance, and so much ado, can say nothing? Let St. Augustine briefly answer all these vanities. Thus he saith: *Hoc quid est aliud, nisi diligenter pro humana suspicione contendere, et scripturas sanctas negligenter attendere?* “What thing else is this, but stoutly to strive for man’s fancy, and negligently to consider *God’s holy word?*”

The prophet David, upon whom ye would seem to ground these follies, answereth you thus? *Narraverunt mihi iniqui fabulationes: sed non ut lex tua, Domine:* “The wicked have told me many foolish tales: but, O Lord, their tales are nothing to thy law.” St. Augustine, if he were now alive, would say of you, as he said of other your predecessors: *O vanitas, vendens vanitatem vanitatem audituris vanis et credituris*<sup>7</sup>: “O vanity, selling vanity to them that will hear vanity: and vain are they that will believe it.”

Leo saith: *In hanc insipientiam cadunt, qui cum ad cognoscendam veritatem aliquo impediuntur obscuro, non ad propheticas voces, non ad apostolicas literas, nec ad evangelicas auctoritates, sed ad semetipsos recurrunt:* “Into this folly they fall, that, when they be hindered by some darkness from the knowledge of the truth, go not to the voices of the prophets, nor to the writings of the apostles, nor to the authorities of the gospels: but only have recourse unto themselves.”

Now somewhat to say particularly of the matter, touching your pardons, your own doctor, Sylvester Prierias, master of the pope’s *palace*, writeth thus: *Indulgentiæ auctoritate scripturæ non innotuere nobis; sed auctoritate ecclesiæ Romanæ, Romanorumque pontificum, quæ major est:* “Pardons are not known unto us by the authority of the scriptures; but by the authority of the church of Rome, and of the popes, which is greater than the authority of the scriptures.”

<sup>7</sup> [The Bened. edd. read it “tatem vanitati. Audituri sunt thus: “O vanitas vendens vani- “vani et credituri.”]

Aug. de Civit. lib. 13. cap. 24. [vii. 347.]

Ps. cxix. 85. [Vulg.]

Aug. in lib. 50. Hom. hom. 36. [v. 217.]

Leo ad Flavianum, epist. 10. [l. 478.]

Sylvest. Prier. contra Luther. [Dial. Fund. 3.]

Therefore, M. Harding, by this doctor's judgment, it was great folly to allege so many scriptures for proof of your pardons. For here ye are taught in good sadness, that your pardons can never be proved by any *scriptures*. It had been much better for you to have alleged only the *pope's authority*. For that, as your Sylvester teacheth you, far passeth all the authority of the *scriptures*.

Roffensis  
contra Lu-  
therum  
[apud] Po-  
lydor. de In-  
ventor. lib.  
8. cap. 1.  
[p. 456.]

Roffensis saith: *Ego respondeo, Non satis certo constare, a quo primum indulgentiæ tradi cœperint. Apud priscos vel nulla, vel certe quam rarissima fiebat mentio de purgatorio. Quamdiu autem nulla esset (l. fuerat) cura de purgatorio, nemo quæsit indulgentias. Nam ex illo pendet omnis indulgentiarum æstimatio. Si tollas purgatorium, quorsum indulgentiis opus erit? Cœperunt indulgentiæ, postquam ad purgatorii cruciatus aliquandiu trepidatum est:* "Thus I answer: It cannot well appear from whom *pardons* first began. Among the old doctors and fathers of the church there was either no talk at all, or very little talk of *purgatory*. But as long as *purgatory* was not cared for, there was no man that sought for *pardons*. For the whole price of *pardons* hangeth of *purgatory*. Take away *purgatory*, and what shall we need of *pardons*? *Pardons* began, when folk were a little frayed with the pains of *purgatory*."

Johan. Ma-  
jor, in 4.  
Sent. Dist.  
20. Quæst. 2.  
[fol. 197.  
col. 4.]

Johannes Major saith: *De indulgentiis pauca dici possunt per certitudinem, quia scriptura de illis expresse non loquitur. Nam quod dicitur Petro, Tibi dabo claves, &c. certum est, quod oportet intelligere illam auctoritatem cum sale. Fatuæ ergo et superstitiosæ sunt quædam indulgentiæ viginti millium annorum:* "Of *pardons* little may be said of certainty: for the *scripture* expressly saith nothing of them. Touching that Christ saith unto Peter, 'Unto thee will I give the keys,' &c. we must understand this authority with a corn of salt," (otherwise it may be unsavoury.) "Therefore certain of the *pope's pardons, that promise twenty thousand years, are foolish and superstitious.*"

Veselus. [ap.  
Flac. Illyr.  
in Catal.  
Testium ve-  
ritat.]

Your *school doctors* themselves were wont sometime to say: *Inventio indulgentiarum est pia fraus, et dolus non malus, quo populus officioso errore trahatur ad pietatem:*

“The devising of *pardons* is a godly guile, and a hurtless deceit; to the intent that by a devout kind of error the people may be drawn to godliness <sup>8</sup>.”

Here, M. Harding, you see the antiquity, authority, and best countenance of your *pardons*: that they flowed first out of the sinks of your *purgatory*, as one vanity floweth out of another: you see, that your *pardons* sometimes may be superstitious, and full of folly: you see, that the sale of your *pardons* is a godly guile, and a devout kind of error, to lead the people. This is the fairest colour ye can devise to lay upon it. But miserable is that people, that thus must be led by guile and error.

Alphonsus de Castro saith: *Nulla res est quam minus aperte sacræ literæ prodiderint: et de qua minus vetusti scriptores dixerint. Non est mentio ulla de indulgentiis*: Alphons. de Castro, lib. 8. Indulgentiæ. [pp. 578, et 579.]

“There is nothing, that the *scriptures* have less opened, or whereof the old learned fathers have less written, than of *pardons*. Of *pardons*” (in the *scriptures* and doctors) “there is no mention.”

Of the shameless merchandize and sales hereof many godly men have complained, ye have turned godliness into gain: and, as St. Peter saith, “Through covetousness, by feigned speech, ye have made marts and markets of the people.” One of your own friends saith thus: *In multis brevibus [leg. Habent brevia in quibus] continentur tot indulgentiæ, ut boni viri mirentur, unquam de conscientia papæ, vel alicujus boni viri potuisse illa procedere*: “In many of their books there are contained so many days and years of *pardons*, that good men marvel, that they could ever come 1 Tim. vi. 5. 2 Pet. ii. 3.

Opus Tripart. conjunctum cum Conc. Lateran. lib. 5. cap. 8. [Crabb. ii. 1002.]

<sup>8</sup> [There is some confusion between *Veselus* (Lux Mundi) and Joannes de *Wesalia*, a preacher at Worms. They are both cited by Flacius Illyricus inter *Testes Veritatis*. Both seem to have been premature Reformers: *Wesalia* was condemned by the influence of the Thomists, at Heidelberg, A. D. 1479. Amongst the propositions selected from his works, as printed in *Paral. Urspergensis*, p. 419, are some of very questionable ortho-

doxy: his belief respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost agreed with that of the Greeks. His opinion about indulgences, as stated in the text, corresponds with the account of Illyricus. His contemporary *Veselus* appears to have held nearly similar sentiments; indeed their opinions are so much alike, that it is difficult to believe, that it is not the same person under two slightly differing names.]

out by the consent either of the pope, or of any other good man."

Aug. in  
Epist. Jo-  
han. Tract. 1.  
[iii. pt. 2.  
831.]

To conclude, we will say with St. Augustine: *Fratres, Jesum Christum Justum habemus advocatum apud Patrem. Ipse est propitiatio pro peccatis nostris. Hoc qui tenuit, hæresim non fecit: hoc qui tenuit, schisma non fecit. Unde enim facta sunt schismata? Cum dicunt homines, Nos justissimi:.....nos sanctificamus immundos: nos justificamus impios: nos petimus: nos impetramus:* "My brethren, we have Jesus Christ the Righteous our advocate with the Father. He is the propitiation or *pardon* for our sins. He that held this, never made heresy: he that held this, never made schism. For whereof do schisms come? Hereof they come, when men say," (as now the *pope* saith,) "We are righteous: we do make holy the unholy: we do justify the wicked: we do pray: we do obtain *pardon* for others by our prayer."

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis. 1.*

These men are wont to speak much of a certain secret doctrine of theirs, and of their manifold and sundry readings. Let them therefore bring forth somewhat now, if they can, that it may appear, they have at least read, or do know somewhat. They have often stoutly noised in all corners where they went, that all the parts of their religion be very old, and have been approved, not only of the multitude, but also by the consent and continual observation of all nations and times. Let them therefore once in their life shew this their antiquity: let them make appear to the eye, that the things, whereof they make such ado, have taken so long and large increase: let them declare, that all Christian nations have agreed by consent to this their religion.

Nay, nay, they turn their backs, as we have said already, and flee from their own decrees, and have

[Vol. iv. p. 63.]



cut off and abolished again within a short space the same things, which but a few years before themselves had established, for evermore, forsooth, to continue. How should one then trust them in the fathers, in the old councils, and in the words spoken by God? They have not, good Lord, they have not (I say) those things which they boast they have: they have not that antiquity, they have not that universality, they have not that consent, neither of all places, nor of all times. And though they have a desire rather to dissemble, yet they themselves are not ignorant hereof: yea and sometime also they let not to confess it openly. And for this cause they say, that the ordinances of the old councils and fathers be such, as may now and then be altered, and that sundry and divers decrees serve for sundry and divers times of the *church*. Thus lurk they under the name of the *church*, and beguile silly creatures with their vain glossing. It is to be marvelled, that either men be so blind, that they cannot see this, or if they see it, that they can be so patient, so lightly and so quietly to bear it.

## M. HARDING.

Here is much ado, and as some say, *great boast and small roast*: many words, little matter. The sense of these words (if I be not deceived) resembleth Mr. Jewel's challenging spirit, as like as an ewe resembleth a sheep. What we can bring forth, we say not. <sup>a</sup> Neither think we it necessary at your request, to shew what we have read, and what we know. Boasting and bragging shews, we leave to you: that you require, hath been sufficiently declared otherwheres. All things are not to be said at all times. Yet two of your loud lies, beside other that you make here, I will be so bold as to discover. The decrees of the late Tridentine council, (for that is it you mean,) although they be not yet in all places most exactly observed, yet be they not repealed, cut off, and abolished again, as you say.....

<sup>b</sup> And what a foul lie is that other, where you say, that ourselves acknowledge and confess openly, that the faith and doctrine which we hold is not ancient and universal, for times,

<sup>a</sup> It is good policy for him that hath nothing to shew, to hold his peace.

<sup>b</sup> For trial hereof, consider only the words of Roffensis,

Major, and  
Alphonsus,  
alleged in  
the former  
Division.

places, and consent of all? What else mean we, when we challenge unto us and claim the catholic faith? But this is your accustomed slender rhetoric, when proofs and arguments of truth fail you, to use the figure of impudent lying, and say, that we ourselves confess it to be true, which you impute unto us. Whatsoever you say in this place, we may of right return it ever to you. So we do, and so take you it, &c. And for ought that I can see yet, as your synagogue had of late the beginning, so it is like shortly to make an ending.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of all these words, and others mo, so vain as many, there is not one word worth the answering. What affiance M. Harding and his friends have in their *antiquity*, it may appear by the last Division.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 9. Divis. 1.*

But, whereas they have commanded, that those [Vol. iv. p. 64.] decrees should be void, as things now waxen too old, and that have lost their grace, perhaps they have provided, in their stead, certain other better things, and more profitable for the people. For it is a common saying with them, that, *If Christ himself, or the apostles, were alive again, they could neither better, nor more godly govern God's church, than it is at this present governed by them.* They have put somewhat in their stead indeed: but it is *chaff instead of wheat*, as Jeremy saith, and such things as, according to *Esay the prophet's* words, "*God never required at their hands.*" "*They have stopped up*" (saith he) "*all the veins of the clear springing water, and have digged up for the people deceivable and puddlelike pits, full of mire and filth, which neither have, nor are able to hold pure water.*" They have plucked away from the people the *holy communion, the word of God*, from whence all comfort should be taken, the true *worshipping of God* also, and the

Jerem.  
xxiii. 28.  
Is. i. 12.

right use of sacraments and prayer: and have given us of their own, to play withal in the mean while, salt, water, oil, boxes, spittle, palms, bulls, jubilees, pardons, crosses, censings, and an endless rabble of ceremonies, and (as a man might term them with Plautus) pretty games to make sport withal.

Ludos ludificabiles.  
[Plaut. Casin. iv. 1. 2.]

## M. HARDING.

..... Rail and revel whiles ye will, the church is governed by <sup>a</sup>word and by <sup>a</sup>discipline. If Christ himself or his apostles were alive again, the word, that is to say, <sup>b</sup>the doctrine of our belief, now preached and received in the catholic church, <sup>b</sup>neither should be altered, <sup>b</sup>nor could be bettered. <sup>b</sup>For it is the same he taught himself. And that we doubt not of it, according to his promise, he hath sent the Holy Ghost, to inform the church of all truth. Remember you not who said, I am God, <sup>c</sup>and am not changed? Again, that the word of God remaineth for ever?.....

<sup>a</sup> But the pope useth neither of them both.  
<sup>b</sup> Untruths, without either measure or regard of shame.  
<sup>c</sup> O folly! the change is in you, and not in God.

This being true, it is evident, that we have the sound and weighty wheat which no persecution of tyrants, no blasts of heretics, no contagion of evil manners, for these fifteen hundred years could either blow from the floor of our Lord's barn, the church, or corrupt. We have, according to the apostle's counsel, kept that hath been committed unto us. We have enjoyed the fountain of the water of life.....

Ye charge us sore, that we have plucked away from the people the holy communion, the word of God, the true worshipping of God, the right use of sacraments, and prayer. Whosoever taketh these five away, wherein chiefly standeth our salvation, the same <sup>d</sup>is Antichrist. Were not that ye have already done so much for us, as the world may take you for impudent liars, we would not quietly bear so grievous a matter. But now, that ye have tried yourselves so false of your word, we little esteem it: your railing is no slander.....<sup>9</sup> Lastly, concerning prayer, what hath been ordained by our holy forefathers <sup>e</sup>of all ages, directed with the Spirit of God, for the maintenance and increase of it to God's honour, all that in few years by the instinct of Satan, to promote his kingdom, ye have utterly abolished, and by wicked violence brought the people from <sup>f</sup>devotion to a careless idleness, from speaking to God with hearts and lips, to <sup>f</sup>a spiritual dumbness, from prayers <sup>f</sup>to chapters, from holy thinking to <sup>f</sup>unprofitable hearkening.

<sup>d</sup> The gospel in your mouth. For all these five things the pope hath quite taken away.  
<sup>e</sup> Untruth. For your barbarous unknown prayers, in the time of the ancient learned fathers, were never known.  
<sup>f</sup> Untruths joined with open blasphemy.

Ye cannot abide salt, water, oil, palm, the cross, incense, &c.; no marvel. No more cannot the devil who possesseth you, and

<sup>9</sup> [Here Harding pretends to contrast the Roman practice with that of the protestants in respect to the first four of the five things specified.]

Mal. iii. 6.  
Psal. cxix. 89.

Depositum  
i Tim. vi.

rideth you, and after his own will driveth you from truth, from Christian religion, and from all godliness. Were it so that your spirit could away with those things, then were it not agreeing with his spirit. Until ye give place to the Spirit of God, who may drive out of you the spirit of Satan, we look to hear no better tidings of you.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye were somewhat angry, M. Harding, when ye thus bestirred yourself. It pitieth me in your behalf. "Christ and his apostles" (ye say) "never ruled the church in better order than it is now ruled by the pope and his cardinals." Even so might they have said, that had turned "the house of God into a cave of thieves." One of your friends<sup>10</sup> saith: *Apostolorum temporibus rudis adhuc erat ecclesia*: "In the time of the apostles, the church as yet was rude and barbarous, and out of order." And, being afterward reproved for his blasphemous speech, he answered lewdly in his pleasance:

*RUDIS, INDIGESTAQUE MOLES.*

Others of you say: *Christus in celo præsidet: papa in terris residet*: "Christ ruleth in heaven: the pope in earth." Another saith: *Omnes sanctiones sedis apostolicæ sic accipiendæ sunt, tanquam ipsius divina voce Petri firmatæ*: "All the laws of the apostolic see of Rome must so be taken, as if they were confirmed by the divine voice of Peter himself." Another saith: *Sicut ostium regitur cardine, ita ecclesia Romana regitur consilio cardinalium*: "As the door is ruled by the hook, so is the church of Rome ruled by the counsel of cardinals."

Therefore the pope himself saith thus unto them: *Vos eritis senatores urbis, et regum similes, veri mundi cardines* [al, *cardinales*], *super quos militantis ostium ecclesiæ volvendum,*

<sup>10</sup> [This was Barthol. Latomus; the first assertion occurs in his answer to Bucer's letters, in "Scripta Adversaria Latomi et Buceri" (Argentor. 1544 Bodl.) p. 12. Bucer's reproof follows, p. 37. The expression is vindicated in the "Refutatio calumniosarum insectationum M. Buceri,

Latomo autore," sub tit. "de dispensatione Eucharistiæ"—but the editor sees no traces there of his using the words "rudis indigestaque moles." We have here the germ of the principle of development, to which Romanists, finding antiquity against them, are so often driven.]

Matt. xxi. 13.  
Latomus de Utraque Specie [respons. ad Epist. Buceri, p. 12.]

Jacob. Andree adversus Hosium. p. 70.  
Dist. 19. Sic omnes.

Andreas Barbatus Siculus ad Besaronem. [apud] Palydor. Vergil. de Inventorib. lib. 4. cap. 9.  
Ceremon. lib. 1. sect. 8. cap. 6. [fol. 94. b.]

*et regendum est*: “Ye shall be the senators of my city, and like unto kings, the very hooks and stays of the world, upon whom the very door of the church militant must be turned and ruled.” Such are they, whom St. Hierom imagineth thus to say: *Non est vir in domo. Non est Christus corporaliter in ecclesia. Surgens enim a mortuis, ascendit in cælum: nobisque ministerium gubernandæ ecclesiæ, suam videlicet domum, reliquit*: “My husband is not at home.” (That is to say) “Christ is not now corporally in the church. For, being risen from the dead, he is ascended into heaven: and hath left unto us the government of his church, that is, the whole ordering of his house <sup>11</sup>.”

True it is, as you say, “God is one, and is not changed: and his word endureth for ever.” But the change is in you, M. Harding, and not in God. God’s word is the word of life: your word is the word of vanity. *God the Father* hath not planted it; therefore it shall be plucked up by the roots. God saith by the prophet Malachy: “The lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and the people shall require the law at his mouth: for he is the angel of the Lord of hosts.” *Vos autem recessistis de via, &c.* “But you are gone back from the way: you have offended many a one in the law: you have broken the covenant of Levi, saith the Lord of hosts. And therefore have I made you to be despised.”

Ye have changed the most part of the apostles’ doctrine: and of all that ever they ordained, ye have in a manner left nothing standing. St. Bernard saith of your own church of Rome: *A planta pedis usque ad verticem capitis, non est sanitas ulla*: “From the sole of the foot unto the crown of the head, there is not one whole place.” And yet ye bear us strongly in hand, that *Christ* and his *apostles* never ruled the church in better order, than it is now ruled by the *pope* and his *cardinals*.

All the rest of your empty talk is answered sufficiently before: yet one pang of your eloquence I may not in any wise leave untouched. Thus ye say: “By the instinct

<sup>11</sup> [Hieron. in Proverb. This work is not genuine.]

of Satan ye have brought the people from devotion to careless idleness; from speaking to God with hearts and lips to a spiritual dumbness: from prayers to chapters: from holy thinking to unprofitable hearkening." If I were not well acquainted with your speech, M. Harding, I could not think ye would so unadvisedly bestow your words. I doubt not but even hereby it shall soon appear, whether of us hath wilfully broken the *apostles' orders*, and refused the godly examples of the *holy primitive church of God*. Ye tell us, that the *reading of the scriptures* unto the people, in the church of God, is a *spiritual dumbness*, and a thing unprofitable, as only devised of ourselves, and that, as you say, "by the instinct of Satan," and never before either known or used by any catholic learned father.

So little regard you, what you say. Any man that hath been conversant in the ancient fathers, may easily reprove your folly.

Orig. in Jo-  
sua hom. 15.  
[ii. 431.]

Origen saith:.....*Judaicarum historiarum libri..... traditi sunt ab apostolis, legendi in ecclesiis*: "The books of" (the Old Testament, which are called) "the stories of the Jews were delivered by the apostles to be read in the churches."

Dionysius  
Ecccl. Hierar.  
c. 3. [p. 133.]  
ἁγιογράφων  
δέλτων ἀνά-  
γνωσις.

Dionysius saith: *Deinde ordine habetur sacrorum librorum lectio*: "Afterward follow in order the lessons of the holy books." Justinus Martyr saith: *Die solis omnes, qui in oppidis vel in agris morantur, unum in locum conveniunt: commentariaque apostolorum, vel prophetarum scripta leguntur. Deinde is, qui præest, admonet omnes, et hortatur, ut ea, quæ lecta sunt, bona imitentur. Deinde surgimus omnes et comprecamur*: "Upon the Sunday, the Christian people that dwell in town or country meet together in one place. There the *epistles of the apostles, or the prophets' writings* are pronounced unto us. Afterward, he that is the chief or minister, warneth and exhorteth all the rest, that they will follow those good things that they have heard readen. That done, we rise up all, and pray together."

Justin. Mar-  
tyr Apologia  
2. [p. 83.]

Cyprian. lib.  
2. epist. 5.  
[p. 46.]

St. Cyprian saith: *Lector personat verba sublimia.....: evangelium Christi legit.....: a fratribus conspicitur.....: cum gaudio fraternitatis auditur*: "The reader soundeth out the high and heavenly words: he readeth out the

gospel of Christ: he is seen of the brethren: he is heard with joy of (all) the brotherhood<sup>12</sup>.”

The fathers in the *council of Constantinople* say thus: *Tempore diptychorum cucurrit omnis multitudo cum magno silentio circumcirca altare, et audiebant*: “At the time of reading” (of the chapter) “all the multitude of the people with great silence drew round about the altar or communion-table, and gave ear.”

Conc. Constantinop. 5. Act. 1. [viii. 1066.]

In the *council of Laodicea* it is written thus: *In sabbatis evangelia cum aliis scripturis legi convenit*: “Upon the sabbath day it is convenient that the *gospels* and other *scriptures* be read” (in the church unto the people). Leo saith: *Solemnitati sacratissimæ lectionis subjungatur exhortatio sacerdotis*: “After the solemn reading of the most holy lesson, let there follow the sermon or exhortation of the priest.”

Concil. Laodic. can. 16. [i. §67. a.]

Leo, de Resurrectione Domini, serm. 2. [i. 307.]

St. Chrysostom saith: *Stat minister, et communis minister, et alta voce clamat. . . . Post illam vocem lector incipit prophetiam Esaiæ*: “The minister and common minister standeth up, and crieth out with loud voice” (saying, *keep silence and give ear*). “After that, the reader beginneth the prophecy of Esay.” St. Ambrose saith: *Non possum ego a me facere quicquam: sicut audio, et judico. Audistis [al. audisti] lectum: ego non accuso vos: Moses vos accusat: audistis [al. audisti] lectum: (Christ saith) “I cannot do any thing of myself: as I hear, so I judge. Ye have heard it readen: I accuse you not, it is Moses that accuseth you. Ye have heard it readen.”*

Chrys. in Acta, hom. 19. [ix. 159.]

Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 20. [Horont. li. 1091.]

John v. 30.

St. Augustine saith: *Audistis, cum evangelium legertur: modo, cum legeretur, si intenti fuistis lectioni, au-*

Aug. in Psal. 36.

Aug. in 50. Homil. hom. 49.

<sup>12</sup> [St. Cyprian. This quotation is made up of extracts. St. Cyprian is resting the claims of Aurelius to be appointed reader upon his behaviour as a confessor. “Nihil magis congruit voci, quæ Dominum gloriosa prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare, post verba sublimia quæ Christi

“martyrium prolocuta sunt evangelium Christi legere, unde martyres fiunt, ad pulpitem post catastrum venire, illic fuisse conspicuum gentilium multitudini, hic a fratribus conspici, illic auditum esse cum miraculo circumstantis populi, hic cum gaudio fraternitatis audiri.”]

Aug. de Tempore, serm. 2. [v. App. 33.] *distis*<sup>13</sup>:—*Audivimus in lectione, quæ lecta est, fratres dilectissimi*: “Ye heard, when the *gospel* was read: ye heard erewhile, when it was read, if ye gave ear to the reading: dearly beloved, we have heard in the lesson, that hath been read.”

Hereby, I think, it may appear, that the *reading of lessons and chapters* is no new device in the church of God.

And yet will you tell us, M. Harding, that all this is only a *spiritual dumbness*, and an *unprofitable hearkening*, brought in by the instinct of Satan, to promote his kingdom? or if you dare so to tell us, must we believe you?

1st flor. de Eccl. Offic. lib. 1. c. 10.

Verily Isidorus saith: *Lectio est non parva audientium ædificatio. Unde oportet, ut quando psallitur, psallatur ab omnibus: quando oratur, oretur ab omnibus: quando lectio legitur, facto silentio, æque audiatur a cunctis*: “The lesson” (in the church) “bringeth great profit to the hearers. Therefore, when singing is, let all sing together: when prayer is, let all pray together: and when the lesson or chapter is read, let silence be made, and let all hear together.”

Tertullian, in Apologetico. [c. 39. p. 31.]

Tertullian saith: *Coimus ad literarum divinarum commemorationem: . . . . fidem sanctis vocibus pascimus: spem erigimus: fiduciam figimus*: “We come together to the reading of the holy scriptures: we feed our faith with those heavenly voices: we raise up our affiance: we fasten our hope.”

Tertullian, ad Uxorem, lib. 2. [p. 170. A.]

Again he saith: *Ubi fomenta fidei de scripturarum lectione [al. interjectione]?* “Where is the feeding of faith, that cometh by the open pronouncing and reading of the scriptures?”

Orig. in Leviticum, hom. 5. [il. 214.]

Origen saith: *Non fuisset necessarium, legi hæc in ecclesia, nisi ex his ædificatio aliqua audientibus præberetur*: “It had not been necessary to have these things read in the church, unless thereof might grow some profit to the hearers.”

Leo de Pasione Dom. serm. 19. [l. 299.]

Leo saith: *Sacram Dominicæ passionis historiam evangelica, ut moris est, narratione decursam, ita omnium vestrum*

<sup>13</sup> [There is some mistake in these references, but St. Augustine’s sermons abound with similar passages.]



*arbitror inhæsisse pectoribus, ut unicuique audientium, ipsa lectio quædam facta sit visio*: “I think that the holy story of our Lord’s passion, which we, as the manner is, have read unto you, is so fastened unto all your hearts, that the very hearing itself unto every of the hearers is a kind of seeing.” Chrysostom saith, The manner was, that before every such *lesson* or *chapter*, the minister should say unto the people with a loud voice, *Attendamus*, “Let us mark.”

Chrys. in Acta, hom. 19. [ix. 159.]

St. Augustine saith: *Epistolæ apostolicæ, non tantum illis scriptæ sunt, qui tempore illo, quo scribebantur, audiebant, sed etiam nobis. Non enim ob aliud in ecclesia recitantur*: “The apostles’ epistles were not written only to them that heard them at the same time when they were written, but also to us. For to none other purpose are they read openly in the church.”

August. contra Cresconium, lib. 1. c. 9. [ix. 657.]

This therefore is no *spiritual dumbness*, M. Harding: this is no *unprofitable hearkening*: this is no *instinct* or *work of Satan*. St. Augustine saith: *Vide formicam Dei: surgit quotidie: currit ad ecclesiam Dei: orat: audit lectionem: hymnum cantat: ruminat, quod audit: apud se cogitat: recondit intus grana electa de area*: “Behold God’s emote [emmet]: she riseth daily: she runneth to the church of God: she prayeth: she *heareth the lesson* or *chapter*: she singeth the psalm: she cheweth or remembereth that she hath heard: she museth upon it within herself: and within she layeth up the corns chosen from the floor.”

August. in Psal. 66. [iv. 657.]

Now may you bethink yourself, M. Harding. How can you so vainly say, that the *reading of the holy scriptures* or *chapters* is a new device in the church of God? You see all the ancient learned fathers with one consent bear witness against you. What shall we think is the *work* [ed. 1570, *word*] of God, if the hearing of God’s word be the *work of Satan*? What will you call *spiritual speaking* in the church, if the publishing of God’s holy will be *spiritual dumbness*? Acknowledge your error. Give glory to God. What wise man will believe you further?

But here may you call to mind the *spiritual speeches* and *heavenly sounds* of your churches. There may you

hear, *Ave mater Anna, plena melle canna: Dic nobis Maria, quid vidisti in via?* And at the hallowing of your *Agnos Dei*, in cometh a post in haste and sweating, and telleth the pope, *Domine, Domine, Domine: isti sunt agni novelli, qui annuntiaverunt Alleluia. Modo venerunt ad fontes*" &c. Here is pretty gear to comfort the conscience, as good as a song of *Robin Hood*. Better were it for you to sit dumb in the church of God, than thus to speak.

Durand. lib. 6, Sabbato Sanct. [cap. 79.]

Your churches, your churches, M. Harding, are full, not only of *spiritual*, but also of *corporal* and *horrible dumbness*. Of all that is said or done there, be it never so fond, the poor godly people knoweth nothing. St. August-

Aug. de Gen. ad Liter. lib. 12, c. 8. [iii. 302.]

tine saith: *Si intellectum mentis removeas, nemo ædificatur audiendo quod non intelligit*: "If ye remove the understanding of the mind, no man is edified or taketh profit by hearing that he cannot understand." Chrysostom saith:

Chrys. in Matth. hom. 131.

*Perdiderunt audiendi laborem, et tempus. Nam qui non intelligit quod audit, perdit quod audit*: "They have lost both their labour in hearing, and also the time. For he that understandeth not that he heareth, loseth the thing that he heareth<sup>14</sup>." Therefore the pope himself, in his

In Pontifical. [de ordinat. Lect.]

Pontifical, giveth this special charge unto the *reader*: *Stude lectiones sacras distincte, et aperte proferre ad intelligentiam et ædificationem fidelium*: "Endeavour thyself to pronounce the *holy lessons*" (or *chapters*) "distinctly and plainly" (not to a *spiritual dumbness*, but) "to the understanding and profit of the faithful<sup>15</sup>."

Touching the prayers that the simple people maketh in a tongue unknown, Christ saith: "This people honoureth me with their lips: but their hearts are far from me."

Matth. xv. 8.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 2.

In these things have they set all their religion, [Vol. iv. p. 64.] teaching the people, that by the same God may be

<sup>14</sup> [There is some mistake in the reference, since there are only 91 homilies in Matth.]

<sup>15</sup> ["Studete verba Dei, scilicet "Lectiones" &c.]

duly pacified, spirits be driven away, and men's consciences well quieted.

## M. HARDING.

What shall I say to all this, but that ye lie? I would say, as the manner is, Saying your worships: but that your often and unshamefast lying hath quite taken away from you all opinion of honesty. All Christ's religion which we profess consisteth not in these things, <sup>a</sup> neither by these be men's consciences quieted. By certain of these evil and impure spirits be driven away indeed. Which here by sundry ancient records and testimonies I would declare to be most true, were it not well enough known by daily experience.....But as for you, whereas neither bread, nor water, nor cross driveth you away, it seemeth ye are worse to be conjured than the devil himself. Many of your sect catholic princes have found so stubborn, as they could never yet rid their countries of them but by conjuration of fire.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth.  
For hereby  
ye profess to  
quiet men's  
consciences.  
Read the an-  
swer.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye say, *ye never sought to quiet men's consciences by oil, water, palms, &c.* And therefore ye stand up a tip-toe, and in your familiar manner cry out, *Ye lie.* For short trial hereof, one example may suffice instead of many. Augustine Steuchus, one of your special and worthy doctors, saith thus: *Aquas sale et orationibus sanctificamus, ut ad earum aspersum nostra deleantur [aboleantur] delicta*: "We hallow water with salt and prayers, that by the sprinkling thereof our sins may be forgiven." Read your own *Pontifical*, and ye shall find in the hallowing of your *water*, your *ashes*, your *palms*, your *candles*, &c. this clause evermore in the end: *Ut sint nobis ad salutem animæ et corporis*: "That they may be to us to the salvation of body and soul<sup>16</sup>."

Aug. Steu-  
chus in Li-  
brum Nume-  
ror. cap. 19.  
Sins forgiven  
by holy wa-  
ter.

In Pontifical.

Whereas in the end *ye vaunt yourself of your cruelty*, and so pleasantly make sport with the blood of your brethren, take it not for ill, if I answer you with the words of Solomon: *Viscera impiorum crudelia*: "The bowels

Prov. xii. 10.

<sup>16</sup> [In the Pontificale Rom. "(vel refectionem) corporis et 1520, there are benedictions of "animæ."]  
salt, water, and oil "ad salutem

of the wicked be always cruel." Therein, M. Harding, standeth your greatest puissance. If ye were no better armed with *fire* and *sword* than ye be with *scriptures* and *doctors*, no wise man would greatly fear your force.

We may say of you, as cardinal Cusanus saith of the Turk: *Omnium, quæ in Alchorano continentur, ultima resolutio est gladius*: "The last resolution and trial of all things that are contained in the Alcoran, is the sword."

Nicol. Cusanus, Cribrationis, lib. 3. cap. 3. [p. 916.]

As for us, we may answer you now, as St. Cyprian sometime answered the *heathens*<sup>16</sup>: *Nobis ignominia non est, pati a fratribus, quod passus est Christus: neque vobis [leg. illis] gloria est, facere quod fecit Judas*: "It is no shame for us, to suffer of our brethren the same violence that Christ suffered: neither is it any praise for you, to do the same thing that Judas did."

Cyprian, lib. 1. epist. 3. [p. 80.]

Tertullian saith unto your fathers: *Crudelitas vestra, gloria nostra est: semen est sanguis Christianorum*: "Your cruelty is our glory: the blood of Christians is the seed of the gospel." I pray God, all that innocent blood that hath been shed in this cause be not required at your hands "in the day of wrath, and at the declaration of the just judgment of God."

Tertullian, in Apologetico. [sub fin. p. 40.]

Rom. ii. 5.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 10. *Divis. 1.*

For these, lo, be the orient colours and precious savours of Christian religion: these things doth God look upon, and accepteth them thankfully: these must come in place to be honoured, and must put quite away the institutions of Christ, and of his apostles. And like as in times past, when wicked king Jeroboam had taken from the people the right serving of God, and had brought them to worship the *golden calves*, lest perchance they might afterward change their mind, and slip away, getting them again to Jerusalem to the *temple of God*, there

[Vol. iv. p. 64.]

<sup>16</sup> [Rather "the heretics and schismatics—false brethren;" for this is St. Cyprian's meaning.]

he exhorted them with a long tale to be steadfast, saying thus unto them: "*O Israel, these calves be thy gods.* In this sort commanded your God, you should worship him. For it should be wearisome and troublous for you to take upon you a journey so far off, and yearly to go up to Jerusalem, there to serve and honour your God:" even after the very same sort, when these men had once made the law of God of none effect through their own traditions, fearing that the people should afterward open their eyes, and fall another way, and should somewhence else seek a surer mean of their salvation: Jesu, how often have they cried out, this is the same worshipping that pleaseth God, and which he straitly requireth of us, and wherewith he will be turned from his wrath: that by these things is conserved the unity of the church: that by these all sins be cleansed, and consciences quieted: and that, whoso departeth from these, hath left unto himself no hope of everlasting salvation. For it were wearisome and troublous (say they) for the people to resort to Christ, to the apostles, and to the ancient fathers, and to observe continually what their will and commandment should be. This, ye may see, is to *withdraw the people of God from the weak elements of the world, from the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, and from the traditions of men.* It were reason, no doubt, that *Christ's commandments* and the *apostles'* were removed, that these their hests and devices might come in place. O just cause, I promise you, why that ancient and so long allowed doctrine should be now abolished, and a new form of religion be brought into the church of God.

M. HARDING.

It should have become Scoggin<sup>17</sup>, Patch<sup>18</sup>, Jolle, Harry Patenson<sup>19</sup>, or Will Sommer<sup>20</sup>, to have told this tale much better than your superintendentships. And if ye would needs have played the part yourselves, it had been more convenient to have done it on the stage, under a Vice's coat, than in a book set abroad to the world in defence of all your new English church, ye shall never make any reasonable man believe your scoffing tale..... We esteem little your railing comparison, with your spiteful words, and so much devilish villainy.....

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 10. *Divis. 2.*

And yet, whatsoever it be, these men cry still, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 65.]</sup> that nothing ought to be changed: that men's minds are well satisfied herewithal: that the *church of Rome*, the church which cannot err, hath decreed these things. For Sylvester Prierias saith, that the *Romish church* is the *squire*<sup>21</sup> and rule of truth, and that the *holy scripture* hath received from thence authority and credit. The "*doctrine*," saith he, "of the *Roman church* is the *infallible rule of faith*, from the which the *holy scripture* taketh her force. And *indulgences and pardons*" (saith he) "*are not made known to us by the authority of the scriptures*, but they are made known to us by the authority of the

[Sylvester Prierias cont. Luther. Dial. fund. 3.]

<sup>17</sup> [Scoggin, the author of a book of jests, probably then just published, as it is entered in the Stationers' Register by Thos. Colwell in 1565.]

<sup>18</sup> [Patch: two of cardinal Wolsey's fools bore this name, their real names being Sexton and Williams. In Heylin's History of the Reformation mention is made of another fool called Patch, belonging to Elizabeth; and a similar name is found for a fool in Henry VII's household accounts. The name is probably derived from the motley dress; or per-

haps from the Italian *Pazzo*. (Abridged from Douce's Illustrations of Shakspear, vol. i. 257.)]

<sup>19</sup> [Henry Patenson, Morio, &c. was fool to sir Thos. More: who, after his resignation of the great seal, gave him to the lord mayor. Hence perhaps the origin of the saying, "My lord mayor's fool." See Granger's Biograph. History of England, vol. i. p. 78.]

<sup>20</sup> [See an account of Will Sommers in Granger, vol. i. p. 85.]

<sup>21</sup> [Squire: the old way of writing square: Apol. Lat. "norma."]

*Roman church, and of the bishops of Rome, which is greater than the scriptures.*" Pighius also letteth not to say, that without the license of the *Roman church*, we ought not to believe the very *plain scriptures*. Much like as if any of those that cannot speak pure and clean Latin, and yet can babble out quickly and readily a little some such law Latin as serveth the court, would needs hold, that all others ought also to speak after the same way that Mammetrectus<sup>22</sup> and Catholicon<sup>23</sup> spake many years ago, and which themselves do yet use in pleading in court: for so may it be understood sufficiently what is said, and men's desires may be satisfied: and that it is a fondness, now in the latter end, to trouble the world with a new kind of speaking; and to call again the old fineness and eloquence that Cicero and Cæsar used in their days in the Latin tongue. So much are these men beholden to the folly and darkness of the former times. "*Many things,*" as one C. Plinius. writeth, "*are had in estimation oftentimes, because they have been once dedicate to the temples of the heathen gods.*" Even so we see at this day many things allowed and highly set by of these men, not because they judge them so much worth, but only because they have been received into a custom, and after a sort dedicate to the temple of God.

## M. HARDING.

.....Ye have never done with the church of Rome. I cannot blame you. For so long as that standeth, without ye repent and turn, ye shall never be taken but for such as ye be, schismatics and heretics. But alas, poor souls, what! think ye to overthrow

a So was Christ taken of the Pharisees.

<sup>22</sup> [Mammotrepton, or Mammetractum, a work by Marchesinus, designed to teach the ignorant monks the pronunciation and the meaning of the Latin words in the Bible. There is a copy in the Bodl.]

<sup>23</sup> [Catholicon, sive Januensis, a Latin vocabulary, compiled by Johannes Januensis de Balbis, fl. A. D. 1280: printed by Faust, A. D. 1460.]

b The foundation of the church of God is not Peter, but Christ.

c Untruth. For generally it is contrary to the faith of Peter.

d It is easily found in his book *Contra Lutherum*.

e A commentary beside the text.

f A proper gloss.

g Vanity of vanities. For the scriptures were known and believed before there was any church in Rome.

h It is no hard matter to find it. Read the answer.

that church builded upon the rock <sup>b</sup>Peter, against which hitherto neither tyrants nor heretics, far passing you in learning and honesty of common life, could ever prevail? Trow ye to extinguish that faith of the Roman church, <sup>c</sup>which is the same that was the faith of Peter, for which Christ prayed that it should never fail? <sup>Luc. xxii. 32.</sup> Ye labour in vain. Well may Satan win you: the church which our Lord prayed for, by you shall he never win. Give over therefore your vain and wicked attempts. Trust not in the patches that falsely ye allege out of canonists' glosses, schoolmen, rhyming poets, heretics, and whosoever, be they never so bad. Some ignorant persons may ye deceive, whose sins deserve the same.

What Sylvester Prierias saith, I mind not here to discuss. <sup>d</sup>Neither where he saith that you allege, have you thought good to tell us, lest by perusing the place we should take you in a lie, as we have almost in all your other allegations. The like sincerity you use in alleging Pighius. We bind ourselves neither to the words of Sylvester nor of Pighius. If they err, what is that to us? Let them bear their own burden. If they tell truth, we believe them for truth's sake: if otherwise, we leave that part for you to carp. . . . . If Sylvester Prierias said that for points of belief the doctrine of the Roman church is a squire to try their truth by; the same, <sup>e</sup>being well understood, is right true. Likewise, if Pighius say that the Roman church sheweth unto us which be the approved and undoubted scriptures, and which be not; this is so true, as yourself (I suppose) will yield thereunto. As for that the scripture received from the church of Rome authority, credit, and force, <sup>f</sup>if in your meaning you exclude God, that is your lie, not Sylvester's sentence. If relation be made to us, that we ought not give credit unto it, <sup>g</sup>unless it had been shewed to be holy scripture by the Roman church, which is the true church of Christ, in this sense, be it Sylvester, or who else soever saith it, it is a true saying, and agreeable to St. Augustine, who said, *Ego evangelio non crederem, nisi me catholica ecclesia commoveret autoritas*: "I would not believe the gospel, except the authority of the catholic church moved me." And for that ye allege out of him touching indulgences, truth it is, the full and whole knowledge of them is not plainly opened unto us by express and evident words of scripture, no more than the mystery of the blessed Trinity, baptizing of infants, and many other truths; but rather by the doctrine of the Roman church.

Where you tell us of Pighius, that he letteth not to say, that without the licence of the Romish church (for in that word you please yourself well) we ought not to believe the very plain scriptures; <sup>h</sup>we will proclaim you a liar, until you shew us where he spake so far beside reason and learning. The holy church doth not will us to stay from belief of the scriptures until we have licence: but by all ways and means inviteth and stirreth us to believe the truth in the scriptures uttered. . . . .

Contra Epistolam Fundam. c. 5 [viii. 154.]



## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The greatest weight hereof hangeth upon two of your doctors, *Sylvester Prierias*, and *Albertus Pighius*: whose credit notwithstanding ye would fain otherwise save upright, yet here, as it seemeth, ye are content for shame to give them over. "We bind ourselves" (ye say) "neither to the words of Sylvester nor of Pighius. If they err, what is that to us?" This short and blunt answer, notwithstanding it seem to like well you, yet perhaps Prierias and Pighius it would not like. I see no great cause to the contrary, but either of them might as well renounce your authority, and say of you, *We are not bound neither to M. Harding's words, nor to his fellows*. For that ye doubt the truth of our allegations, read Sylvester Prierias, master of the pope's palace, in his book intituled, "*Contra præsumptuosas Martini Lutheri Conclusiones, de potestate Papæ.*" His words there, amongst others, be these: *Quicunque non innititur doctrinæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, ac Romanæ pontificis, tanquam regulæ Dei infallibili, a qua etiam sacra scriptura robur trahit et auctoritatem, hæreticus est*: "Who-soever leaneth not to the doctrine of the Roman church, and of the bishop of Rome, as unto the *infallible rule of God, of which doctrine the holy scripture taketh force and authority*, he is an heretic."

Sylvest.  
Prier. contra  
Luther. [Dila-  
log. Fund. 3.]

Here, M. Harding, this doctor teacheth you, that the authority and credit of the *scriptures* hangeth of the allowance of the *pope*, as without which the *scriptures* of God should be no *scriptures*.

Again he saith: *Authoritas Romanæ ecclesiæ, Romanique pontificis major est, &c.*: "The authority of the Roman church, and of the bishop of Rome, is greater" (than the authority of God's word). If this suffice you not, M. Harding, I know not what thing may suffice you.

As for that is here alleged of Pighius, it is the very sound and sense of the greatest part of his common place, *De Ecclesia*. Of whose judgment herein M. Calvin writeth thus: *Pighius ait, Nullius scripturæ auctoritate, quantum*

Albert. Pigh.  
in locis Com-  
munib. De  
Eccles.

*libet clara, nostro quidem iudicio, et evidentis, adversus claram consonantemque orthodoxorum patrum sententiam, et adversus communem ecclesiæ definitionem, aliquid credere cuiquam licere:* “Pighius saith, that no man may lawfully believe any thing by the authority of any scripture, be the same in our judgment never so plain and evident, against the clear and agreeable judgment of the catholic fathers, and against the common determination of the church.” By which he meaneth only the *church of Rome*. Therefore, M. Harding, it may please you now a little to spare your voice, and to stay your *proclamation*.

But forasmuch as ye seem so little to esteem these two doctors, Prierias and Pighius, being otherwise, not long sithence, the chief leaders and captains of all your bands, ye may therefore join others to them, to better their credit, and to increase the company. And forasmuch as we speak of the *church of Rome*, let us hear the judgment of a *cardinal* of the *church of Rome*, notwithstanding otherwise alleged before.

Nicol. Cusanus ad Bohæmos, ep. 2. [p. 834.]

Cardinal Cusanus therefore hereof saith thus: *Hæc est omnium, &c.*<sup>23</sup> “This is the judgment of all them that think rightly, that found the authority and understanding of the *scriptures* in the allowance of the *church*: ..... and not contrariwise, lay the foundation of the *church* in the authority of the *scriptures*..... There be no commandments of *Christ*, but such only as so be taken and holden by the *church*..... Therefore the *scriptures follow the church*: but *contrariwise, the church followeth not the scriptures.*” Like-

Johan. Maria Verract. Editus est ann. 1561. [ed. 1544. tom. 1. fol. 163. b.]

wise saith Johannes Maria Verractus: *Humiliter confitemur, ecclesiæ auctoritatem esse supra* [l. *super*] *evangelium* [l. *evangelia*].....: “We do humbly confess, that the *authority of the church is above the authority of the gospel*<sup>24</sup>.” Likewise

<sup>23</sup> [See the Latin, supra, vol. v. p. 305.]  
534. The last sentence is from the 7th epistle ad Bohem. (p. 858). “Sequuntur ergo scripturæ ecclesiæ (quæ prior est, et propter quam scriptura), et non e converso:” quoted supra, vol. iv.

<sup>24</sup> [Verractus (Verratus). “Cur evangelium Lucæ discipuli est receptum, et evangelium Bartholomæi apostoli est rejectum? nisi humiliter confiteatur, &c.” See Flacii norma Concil. p. 420.]

Albertus Pighius saith: *Apostoli quædam scripserunt: non ut scripta illa præessent fidei, et religioni nostræ; sed potius, ut subessent.*—*Scripturæ sunt muti iudices: scripturæ sunt veluti cereus nasus:* “The apostles have written certain things: not that their said writings should rule our faith or religion; but rather that they should be under, and be ruled by our faith. The scriptures are dumb judges: the scriptures are like a nose of wax.”

Albert. Pigh.  
Hierar. lib. 1.  
cap. 2.

Albert. Pigh.  
in Controversiis de Eccles.

By these and other like unreverent and godless speeches, they seek to lead the poor simple deceived people from the holy scriptures and voice of God, to the authority of their church: by which church they understand only the pope and his cardinals of the church of Rome.

But ye say: “These be the priests of the house of Levi: Deut. xvii. 9. the pope is the judge for the time, in the place that our Lord hath chosen.” Some others of you say: *Papa est tota ecclesia virtualiter:* “The pope is by power and virtue the whole church<sup>25</sup>.” Whatsoever these shall happen to say, we may not swerve from their judgment, neither to the right hand nor to the left hand. Whereupon the Hebrew Gloss noteth thus: *Si dixerint tibi, quod dextra sit sinistra, aut quod sinistra sit dextra, talis sententia tenenda est:* “Although they tell thee, that thy right hand is thy left hand, or that thy left hand is thy right hand, yet such a sentence must be holden as good.”

Hervæus de  
Potest. Pap.  
cap. 23. [His  
præmissis.]

Nicol. Lyra  
in Deuter.  
cap. 17. [1.  
1557.]

St. Augustine, ye say, holdeth hard of your side. He saith: *Non crederem evangelio, nisi me ecclesiæ catholicæ autoritas commoveret:* “I would not believe the gospel, except the authority of the catholic church moved me.” These few poor words have been tossed of your part, and wrung, and pressed to the uttermost, to yield out that was never in them. For hereby ye would fain prove, that the authority of the church, whereby ye evermore understand your church of Rome and none other, is above the authority

August. contra  
Epist.  
Fundam.  
cap. 5. [viii.  
154.]

<sup>25</sup> [The passage is in Hervæus, but the edition which the Editor has consulted at Lambeth is not divided into chapters. Jewel has more than once founded Hervæus with Johannes Paris., misled probably by their being printed in the same volume.]

of *God's word*: that is to say, that the *creature* is above the *Creator* that made heaven and earth.

But what if St. Augustine, as he saith, "*I believe the gospel because of the church,*" have likewise said, "*I believe the church because of the gospel?*" Then, I trow, ye must turn your tale, and say, *The gospel is above the church.*

Aug. in Ps.  
57. [iv. 545.]

His words be plain: *Ex ore veritatis ecclesiam agnosco participem veritatis*: "By the mouth of" (*God*, that is) "*the truth*, I know the *church* that is partaker of the *truth.*"

Aug. de Unit.  
Eccles. cap.  
3. [cap. 2.  
ix. 341. 338.]

Again he saith: *Nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis ecclesiam sanctam demonstrari*—: *ecclesiam quæ- rere debemus in verbis Christi, qui est veritas, et optime novit*

Aug. contra  
Crescon.  
Grammat.  
lib. 1. c. 33.  
[ix. 407.]

Aug. de  
Unit. Eccles.  
cap. 16. [ix.  
369.]

Aug. eodem  
loco. [ib. 372.]

*corpus suum*—: *ecclesiam sine ulla ambiguitate sancta scriptura demonstrat*—: *in scripturis sanctis ecclesia manifeste cognoscitur*—: *ecclesiam, sicut ipsum caput, in*

*scripturis sanctis canonicis debemus agnoscere*: "I would the church should be shewed, not by the decrees of men, but by the heavenly oracles, or words of *God*: we must seek the church in the words of *Christ*, which is the truth, and best knoweth his own body: the *holy scripture* sheweth us the church without doubting: in the *holy scriptures* the church is plainly known: we must know the church by the *holy canonical scriptures*, as we know" (*Christ*, that is) "the head."

Chrys. in  
Matth. hom.  
49. [Op. im-  
perf. vi. App.  
204.]

Likewise saith Chrysostom: *Nulla modo cognoscitur..... quæ sit vera ecclesia, nisi tantummodo per scripturas*: "It is not any ways known, which is the *true church of Christ*, but only by the *scriptures.*"

And thus forasmuch as we know both *Christ* by the *church*, and the *church* by *Christ*, the one giving evidence to the other, by this reckoning, M. Harding, and by your shifting of turns, we must sometimes place *Christ* above the *church*, and sometimes the *church* above *Christ*.

Howbeit, St. Augustine's mind was not to commence an action between *Christ* and his *church*, in comparison of their dignities, or for trial and keeping of their bounds, or to teach us, that the *truth of God* taketh authority of the *church*: but only to shew us that the *church* is a witness

to *God's truth*. And certainly it hath great weight of persuasion to move the conscience of any man, to see so many kingdoms and countries to join together in the profession and obedience of one *truth*. And I doubt not, but even this day many thousands are the sooner led to humble themselves unto the gospel of Christ, for that they see the whole world, that is to say, the whole *church of God*, is contented so willingly and so humbly to embrace the same. David, to testify the *truth* and certainty of the *gospel*, saith thus: "The sound of the apostles went out into all the earth, and the words of them into the ends of all the world. This is the turning of the right hand of God." Psal. xix. 4.  
Rom. x. 8.  
Ps. lxxvii. 10.

Therefore St. Augustine saith unto Faustus the heretic: *Cur non potius evangelicæ authoritati, tam fundatæ, tam stabilitæ, tanta gloria diffamatæ, atque ab apostolorum temporibus, usque ad nostra tempora, per successiones certissimas commendatæ, te non subdis?* "Why doest thou not rather submit thyself unto the authority of the gospel, being so grounded, so stablished, preached and published with so great glory, commended and delivered unto us by most certain successions from the time of the apostles until our time?" Aug. cont.  
Faus. lib. 32.  
cap. 19. [viii.  
461.]

Likewise in this same place by you alleged St. Augustine saith: *Ego non crederem evangelio, nisi me catholicæ ecclesiæ commoveret autoritas. Quibus ergo obtemperavi dicentibus, Credite evangelio, cur eis non obtemperem dicentibus, Noli credere Manichæo?* "I would not believe the gospel, unless the authority of the catholic church moved me. Seeing therefore I have obeyed them saying to me, *Believe the gospel*, why should I not also obey them saying unto me, *Believe not Manichee?*" August. contra Epist.  
Fundam.  
cap. 5. [viii.  
154.]

Thus the consent of the *church* beareth witness to the *gospel*; without which witness, notwithstanding, the *gospel* nevertheless were the *gospel* still. Therefore Chrysostom saith; *Si dixerint.....in ipsis veris ecclesiis.....Christum apparuisse, nolite eis credere dicentibus ista de me: quia non est digna divinitatis meæ notitia hæc:* "If they shall tell you that Christ hath appeared, yea even in the very" Chrys. in  
Matthæ.  
Homil. 49.  
in Oper.  
Imper. [vi.  
app. 209.]

true churches, yet believe them not saying thus of me: for this is no meet knowledge for my Godhead."

To conclude, M. Harding, we will say to you, as St. Augustine sometime said to the Donatian heretics, advancing their only *church in Africa*, even as you now advance only your *church of Rome*: *Nos post vocem Pastoris nostri, per ora prophetarum, per os proprium, per ora evangelistarum nobis apertissime declaratam, voces vestras non admittimus, non credimus, non accipimus*: "After the voice of our *Shepherd*, uttered most plainly unto us by the mouths of the prophets, by his own mouth, and by the mouths of the evangelists, if ye bring us your own voices, we allow them not, we believe them not, we receive them not."

Aug. de Unitat. Eccles. cap. 11. [ix. 359.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 1.*

Our *church*, say they, cannot err. They speak that (I think), as the Lacedæmonians long sithence used to say, that it was not possible to find any adulterer in all their commonwealth: whereas indeed they were rather all adulterers, and had no certainty in their marriages, but had their wives in common amongst them all: or, as the *canonists* at this day, for their bellies' sake, use to say of the pope, that forso much as he is lord of all benefices, though he sell for money bishoprics, monasteries, priesthood, spiritual promotions<sup>26</sup>, and part with nothing freely, yet because he counteth all his own, *he cannot commit simony, though he would never so fain*. But how strongly and agreeably to reason these things be spoken, we are not as yet able to perceive, except perchance these men have plucked off the wings from the *truth*, as the *Romans*<sup>27</sup> in old time did

[Vol. iv. p. 66.]

Summa Angel. in diction. Papæ. [leg. in dictione Simonia, No. 6.]

Theodoricus de Schismate. [lib. 2. cap. 32.]

Plutarchus.

<sup>26</sup> [There is no word in the Latin which corresponds to the words "spiritual promotions."]

<sup>27</sup> [This anecdote is generally related of the Athenians. Vid. Pausan. lib. iii. p. 245. ed. Lips.]

proine<sup>28</sup> and pinion their goddess *Victoria*, after they had once gotten her home, to the end that with the same wings she should never be able to flee away from them again.

## M. HARDING.

Toward the end of your Apology, sir defender, whosoever you be that pieced it together, you do but trifle. Of like your stuff is spent. For here little say you, that you have not said already. Wherefore I crave pardon of the reader, if, according to the slenderness of matters objected, my <sup>a</sup>confutation seem also slender. Sir, you do now but patch pieces together, which you have gathered out of your note books, into the same infarced, some out of the canonists, some out of the schoolmen, and them not of the greatest estimation, most of all out of humanity books, wherein you be prettily seen. And that seemeth to be your chief profession. As for divinity, there appeareth no great knowledge in you. . . . . What ye rehearse of the Lacedæmonians, it pertaineth to your own companies no less than to them, I mean only your apostates, monks and friars, priests and nuns. . . .

<sup>a</sup> This is good plain dealing. For indeed this answer is very slender.

You find great fault in the canonists that be at this day, and name in your margin, *Summa Angelica*, the author whereof died many years past. If he, Theodoricus, whatsoever he was, or any other canonist offend you, as for his belly's sake speaking of the pope, that should set your teeth on edge; what pertaineth that to us, who defend the catholic faith, not the sayings of every canonist? You were best, seeing you make so much ado with them, to article their errors, and either write a railing book against them, which ye <sup>b</sup>can easily do, or send one of your best learned superintendents to Bononia, there in open school with disputations to confute them. And so doubtless ye shall either convert them, which were a worthy act; or prove yourselves fools, which were great pity.

<sup>b</sup> With M. Harding's good instructions.

But to answer your objection, we say first, that you allege *Summa Angelica* falsely. Nothing is found sounding to that ye burden the pope withal, in the place by you quoted, *in dict. papa*. Next, whereas it is written in *Summa Angelica*, *In curia Romana titulus de simonia non habet locum*; you, sir defender, either not knowing what followed, or of malice abusing the place, have reported the same as if it were precisely said without any distinction. Whereas indeed the selfsame sum useth this distinction, saying, *Verum est in iis quæ sunt simoniaca de jure positivo solum: sed non in iis quæ sunt simoniaca de jure divino*: whereby he

In dict. Simon. [cap. 5. No. 6.] Ver. utrum Authoritas. [fol. 27r. col. 4.]

1696. The editor has not found <sup>28</sup> [“Proine,” i. q. “prune:” any authority in Plutarch for bi- obsol.] shop Jewel's statement.]

c A worthy distinction. Hereby the pope may sell bishoprics and benefices without simony. d This kind of simony standeth only in selling of orders and sacraments, &c. e Untruth, shameless, as shall appear.

meaneth, that the pope is not under the rules of simony concerning <sup>c</sup>such laws and pains as himself or his predecessors have made in that behalf. For they have made many things belonging thereto, as you may well know yourself, who are so prettily seen in the canon law, as it may appear by the often and cunning allegations which you bring out of the Glosses. But concerning <sup>d</sup>that simony which properly is so called, the pope is no less subject thereto by the true judgment of *Summa Angelica*, <sup>e</sup>which you have shamefully belied, than any other man.

You jest at God's blessed truth always remaining in his holy church, and profanely resemble it to a bird proined and pinioned, that it fly not away. As though the church kept truth with such policy as the old Romans are fained to have kept their goddess Victory. Well sir, we tell you in sadness, we are assured of the truth, that it is in the church, and that it shall never depart from thence. And if ye call this, cutting away of her wings, that it never fly from the church, we grant they be cut in such sort as she shall keep the church for ever, as her own nest. And will you know who telleth us this? Even God himself, saying in his prophet Esay to Christ of his church: "I will make this covenant with them, saith our Lord: My spirit which is in thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, <sup>f</sup>shall not depart from thy mouth, and from the mouth of thy seed, and from the mouth of thy seed's seed, saith our Lord, from this time forth for evermore." . . . . . Isai, lix. 21.

f Full discreetly and well applied, as if these words had been meant of the pope and his successors.

Against this truth, whatsoever ye bring in reproof of popes' lives, whom notwithstanding most impudently ye belie, what indiscreet sayings or flatteries soever ye burden the canonists with, all turneth to nothing. The truth remaineth unshaken: your spirit of lying, scoffing, and malice, thereby is decyphered.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here ye say, "Sir defender is prettily seen in humanity: for that" (ye say) "seemeth to be his chief profession." Verily, M. Harding, we are well pleased to take such, and so much learning as you may spare us. We contend only for *truth*, and not for learning. Whatsoever our *learning* be, if it may please God to use it to his glory, it shall be sufficient, be it never so little. Howbeit, had you not had some good liking in your own *learning*, ye would not upon so simple occasions have upbraided others.

Touching that sundry of your doctors have said, the *pope* cannot commit *simony*, first it shall be necessary in that behalf to consider the estate and practice of the *church of Rome*. St. Bernard, writing unto pope Eugenius, saith:



[suppl. *An non*] *limina apostolorum ambitio jam plus terit, quam devotio.* [suppl. *An non*] *vocibus ambitionis vestrum toto die resultat palatium:.....ambitio in ecclesia per te regnare molitur:* “The apostles’ entries or gates in Rome are now more worn with *ambition*, than with *devotion*. All the day long your palace ringeth with the sound of *ambition*. By thy means *ambition* seeketh to reign in the church of God.” Again he saith: *Sacri gradus dati sunt in occasionem turpis lucri: et quæstum æstimant pietatem:* “The holy degrees, or ecclesiastical rooms, are given over to occasion of filthy gain: and the same gain they count holiness.” Ludovicus Vives saith: *Romæ cum omnia prope vendantur et emantur, nihil tamen agas sine lege, ac formula, atque etiam sanctissimi juris:* “At Rome, notwithstanding all things be bought and sold, yet may ye do nothing there without form and order, and that of most holy religion.”

Your own Gloss saith: *Roma est caput avaritiæ. Ideo omnia ibi venduntur* <sup>28</sup>: “Rome is the head of covetousness. Therefore all things there are bought and sold.” Whereas also Johannes Andreae, your great *canonist*, noteth this verse, alluding (to) the name of Rome:

*ROMA MANUS RODIT: QUOS RODERE NON VALET, ODIT.*

Durandus saith: “Simony so reigneth in the church of Rome, as though indeed it were no sin.” To be short, these two verses were commonly spread of pope Alexander:

*VENDIT ALEXANDER CLAVES, ALTARIA, CHRISTUM.*

*VENDERE JURE POTEST: EMERAT IPSE PRIUS:*

“Pope Alexander maketh sale of his keys, of his altars, and of Christ himself.

Well may he sell these things: for he himself paid well for them.”

Notwithstanding, ye doubt not but all this by a pretty sorry distinction may soon be excused. For thus ye say:

<sup>28</sup> [These words are found in but they are omitted in the Paris edition of 1612, after the papal revision.]

Bernardus, de Consideratione, lib. 3. [tom. II. 427.]

Bernard. in Conversione Pauli, Sermon. 1. [III. 656.]

De Civit. Del. lib. 18. cap. 22. Vives. [II. 387.]

In Sexto, de Electio. et Electi potest. Fundamenta. [in marg. ed. Lugd. 1572.] in Glossa. [Ibid.]

[et apud Johann. Andr. in 6tum, fol. 31. col. 2.] Durandus, de modo celebrandi Concil. lib. 20. [7. Rubr. 20. fol. xxiv. col. 4.]

Muscul. in Johan. cap. 6. [p. 246.]

Summa Angel. In Simonia. [cap. 5. No. 6. fol. 271. col. 4.]

*Verum est in iis quæ sunt simoniaca de jure positivo solum : sed non in iis quæ sunt simoniaca de jure divino.* “Whereby” (ye say) “the author meaneth, that the pope is not under the rules of simony, concerning such laws and pains as he himself or his predecessors have made and provided in that behalf.” And therefore, as your modest manner is, ye say, we have falsely alleged and shamefully belied *summa angelica*. But why do you not better open the several parts of your *distinction*, M. Harding? why do ye not better teach us to understand, what is *simony by law positive*, and what is *simony by the law of God*? and why do ye not declare each part by plain examples? Seeing you thus to steal away in the dark, we have some cause to doubt your dealing.

Extr. de Officio Judicis delegat. Ex parte N. In Glossa. [col. 315. d.]

Howbeit, to make the matter plain, your own Gloss saith thus: *Simoniaca de sui natura sunt, quæ Novo aut Veteri Testamento prohibita sunt: ut, emere vel vendere sacramenta. Simoniaca de jure positivo sunt, quæ solum sunt spiritualia ex constitutione ecclesiæ: (ut sunt tituli beneficiorum ecclesiasticorum<sup>29</sup>), &c.*: “These things are *simoniacal of their own nature*, that are forbidden in the Old and New Testament: as to *buy or sell sacraments*. These things are *simoniacal by law positive*, which are spiritual only by the ordinance of the church. Such are the *titles of all ecclesiastical benefices and dignities*: as be *bishoprics, deaneries, abbeyes, archdeaconries,*” &c. Thus, M. Harding, if your *pope sell sacraments*, which will yield him but little money, he may be charged with *simony*. But if he sell *bishoprics, deaneries, abbeyes, archdeaconries, prebends, parsonages*, never so many, yet by the shift of your pretty *distinction*, no man may charge him. For all these things are *spiritual* only by the *pope’s own positive law*, that is to say, *by the ordinance of the church*. And think you not so good a *distinction* was well worth the finding out? One of your own company, speaking hereof, saith thus: *O Petre, quantam animarum multitudinem*

Aureum Speculum. [pt. 2. cap. 1. p. 139.]

<sup>29</sup> [The words in parenthesis are not in that Gloss.]

*catervatim transmisit et transmittit ad infernum hæc superstitialis et damnanda distinctio ? [suppl. Quæ] Multis est occasio, et viam aperit ad ruinam damnationis æternæ: " O Peter, Peter, how many souls hath this superstitious and damnable distinction sent by heaps, and yet doth daily send into hell? It is an occasion unto many, and openeth the way unto the fall of everlasting damnation."*

To make the matter plain, Baldus saith: *Simoniam non cadit in papam recipientem*: " Though the pope take money, yet no *simony* can touch him." In like sort saith his fellow Bartolus: *Papa non dicitur facere simoniam, conferendo beneficia et dignitates, accepta pecunia*: " The pope is not said to commit *simony*, although he take money for the benefices and dignities of the church."

Theodoricus saith: *Papa non potest committere simoniam. Sic tenent juristæ. Quia simonia excusatur per auctoritatem ejus*: " The pope cannot commit *simony*. So hold the *canonists*. For *simony* by his authority is excused<sup>30</sup>."

Felinus saith: *Ista Glossa videtur dicere, quod papa non committit simoniam in recipiendo pecuniam pro collatione beneficiorum: ex quo non ligatur propriis constitutionibus. ....Tamen moderni tenent indistincte, quod papa non involvatur crimine simoniæ: et ita ego teneo: et sic est servanda communis opinio.....Ergo papa potest dictam prohibitionem simoniæ, firmatam in universali ecclesia, limitare respectu apostolicæ sedis.....Et si diceres, Requiritur in talibus apparens causa, dico hic esse causam apparentem. Nam cessante tali reddito, qui maximus est, attentata hodierna tyrannide, Sedes apostolica contemneretur*: " This *Gloss* seemeth to say, that the pope committeth not *simony*, receiving money for the bestowing of benefices: forasmuch as the pope is not bound to his own constitutions. Yet nowadays the lawyers hold, without any such distinction, (*of law positive and law of God*,) that the pope cannot in any wise come within the danger of *simony*: and so

*f. de Offic. Prætoris, L. Barbarius, col. 2.*

*ff. Eod. Titulo, Ead. L. Bartol. [p. 77.]*

*Theodor. de Schismat. inter Urban. et Clem. lib. 1. [f. lib. 2.] cap. 32.*

*Felin. de Offic. Judicis delegati, ex parte N. [fol. 191, 192.]*

A just and a reasonable cause wherefore the pope may sell bishoprics, deaneries, abbeyes, &c.

<sup>30</sup> [Theodoricus reports this substantially as the opinion of many jurists, not as his own.]

I myself do hold: and so the common opinion must be holden. Therefore, notwithstanding the law that forbiddeth *simony* take place in the whole universal church, yet in respect of the *apostolic see of Rome*, it may be restrained. But thou wilt say, In such cases there ought to be some apparent cause: I tell thee, that there is a cause apparent. For this revenue, (of *simony*), which is very great, being once cut off, considering the tyranny that now is, the *apostolic see* would be despised." By this authority it appeareth, the *pope* is not able to maintain his estate and countenance, nor to save all things upright without *simony*.

Extr. de Si-  
monia, cap. 1.  
No. 5. fol. 18.  
Ab. [Panor.  
tom. iii. pt. 2  
fol. 90. col.  
1.]

Panormitane saith: *Etsi papa accipiat pecuniam pro collatione alicujus prælaturæ, aut beneficii, tamen dominus cardinalis ait, Non committitur simonia*: "Notwithstanding the *pope* take money for the bestowing of a bishopric, or of a benefice, yet my lord cardinal saith, There is committed no *simony*." Archidiaconus Florentinus saith: *Papa recipiendo pecuniam, non præsumitur animo vendendi recipere; sed ut illa pecunia ad usum suum convertatur: cum papa sit dominus rerum temporalium, per illud dictum Petri, Dabo tibi omnia regna mundi*: "The *pope* receiving money (for bishoprics or benefices) is not thought to take it by way of sale; but only to turn the same money to his own use. For the *pope* is lord of all worldly goods, as it appeareth by the words of Peter," (which words notwithstanding Peter never spake, for they were spoken by Satan,) "Unto thee will I give all the kingdoms of the world."

Archidiacon. in  
Tract. de Hæ-  
resi. ver. Et  
quia tanta  
est: citatur  
a Felin. de  
Offic. Judi-  
cis. delegat.  
Ex parte N.  
[fol. 192.]

[ibid.]

Again, Felinus saith: *Quod datur papæ, datur sacrario Petri: nec est proprium papæ: sed prodest danti, tanquam facienti opus piissimum*: "Whatsoever is given to the *pope*," (for *bishopric* or *benefice* by way of *simony*), "it is given to *St. Peter's treasury*. Neither is it the *pope's* own several goods. But it is available to the giver, as unto one that doth a most godly deed." Such a special grace hath the *pope*. Of most *devilish vice* he is able to make most *godly virtue*. And for the better furtherance of the matter, *St. Peter* must be made accessory to the *simony*.

Hostiensis saith: *Papa potest vendere titulum ecclesiasticum, ut episcopatum, abbatiam, &c.*: “The pope may sell any ecclesiastical title or dignity, as a bishopric, or an abbey, without danger of *simony* <sup>31</sup>.”

But what speak we of the pope? Your *cardinals* themselves, by your favourable constructions and godly orders, are likewise privileged to commit *simony* safely, and freely, and without blame. Panormitane saith: *Cardinalis pro palafreno a nobili viro recepto, non præsumitur committere simoniam*: “A cardinal, for receiving a palfrey of a nobleman,” (for a *benefice* or a *bishopric*,) “is not thought to commit *simony*.”

Thus whereas Christ drove *buyers* and *sellers* out of the church, you by your proper distinctions have received in *buyers* and *sellers*, and thrust out *Christ*. St. Hierom saith: *Per nummularios significantur beneficii ecclesiastici venditores, qui domum Dei faciunt speluncam latronum*: “By the exchangers are signified the sellers of ecclesiastical benefices, which make the house of God a den of thieves.” In your own *Decrees* it is written thus: *Tolerabilior est Macedonii.....hæresis, qui asserit Spiritum Sanctum esse servum Patris et Filii. Nam isti faciunt Spiritum Sanctum servum suum*: “The heresy of Macedonius, that said the *Holy Ghost* is servant and slave to the Father and to the Son, is more tolerable than is the heresy of these *Simonists*. For these men make the *Holy Ghost* their own servant <sup>32</sup>.”

Yet ye say ye are well assured, that the *truth is in the church of Rome, and shall never depart from thence*, notwithstanding any disorder or fault whatsoever there committed. And for proof thereof ye allege, as ye say, the words of God himself in the prophet Esay. Albeit, in that whole *prophet* there is not one word expressly mentioned of the *church of Rome*. Such a phantasy, as it appeareth, was sometimes in the heretics called the *Manichees*. For thus they said: *A principibus gentis tenebrarum.....lumen,*

Extr. de Simon. cap. 1. Hostien.

Extr. de Simon. Etsi questiones. [Panorm. tom. iii. pt. 2. fol. 96. col. 2.]

Hieronymus.

1. Quest. 1. Eos qui.

1s. lix. 21.

Aug. de Natura Boni, cap. 46. [viii. 516.]

<sup>31</sup> [There is no such passage in Hostiensis super <sup>5</sup>to Decretal. de Simonia, cap. 1.]

<sup>32</sup> [This passage is not cited with verbal accuracy.]

*ne ab iis aufugeret, tenebatur*: “The princes of the nation of darkness held fast the light, lest it should flee from them.” For even so doth the *pope* and his *cardinals* hold the *truth*, as the *princes* or *powers of darkness* held the *light*. And what are the *popes* and their *cardinals*, but only the *powers* and *princes of darkness*? It was hard dealing for you to bind *Christ* in recognizance not to depart from the *pope*. Ye should rather have bound the *pope* not to depart from *Christ*.

Hieronym. in  
Michæ. cap.  
3. [iii. 1520.]

St. Hierom saith: *Prophetæ Hierusalem non habent in ore prophetiam: et in domino requiescunt, et dicunt, Non venient super nos mala. Quorum causa speculatorium Dei hostili aratro dividitur: et locus, quondam pacis, ruinis plenus fit: et templum Domini in vepres spinasque convertitur, et est habitaculum bestiarum*: “The prophets of Jerusalem have never a word of prophecy in their mouths. Yet they rest themselves upon the Lord, and say, There shall no evil come upon us. For their sakes the watch tower of the Lord is turned up with the enemy’s plough: the place of peace is full of ruin: the temple of the Lord is turned into briars and thorns, and is become a stable of wild beasts.”

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis.* 2.

But what if Jeremy tell them, as is afore re-<sup>[Vol. iv. p. 66.]</sup> heard, that these be lies? What if the same prophet say in another place, that the self-same men, who ought to be *keepers of the vineyard*, have brought to nought and destroyed the *Lord’s vineyard*? How, if Christ say, that the same persons, who chiefly ought to have a care over the *temple*, have made the *Lord’s temple* a den of thieves?

#### M. HARDING.

Here come you in with your what ifs, which commonly you use when other rhetoric faileth you. We tell you plainly without any ifs, that <sup>a</sup>Jeremy meant of you and such as you be, and calleth your whole newfangled doctrine, *Verba mendacii*, “the

<sup>a</sup> Learnedly proved.

words of lying," earnestly giving warning, that men give no credit to them. His other rebuke pertaineth also to you. .... When were ever such thieves in the church of God as ye are? .....

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 12. Divis. 1.*

[Vol. iv. p. 67.] If it be so, that the church of Rome cannot err, it must needs follow that the good luck thereof is far greater than all these men's policy. For such is their life, their doctrine, and their diligence, that for all them the church may not only err, but also utterly be spoiled and perish. No doubt, if that church may err, which hath departed from *God's words*, from *Christ's commandments*, from the *apostles' ordinances*, from the *primitive church's examples*, from the old fathers' and councils' orders, and from their own *decrees*, and which will be bound within the compass of none, neither old or new, nor their own, nor of others, nor man's law, nor God's law; then it is out of all question, that the *Romish church* hath not only had power to err, but also that it hath shamefully and most wickedly erred in very deed.

M. HARDING.

A man would have thought you would have brought some substantial argument, whereby to prove that the church erreth. Neither make you excuse in that you speak of the Roman church and the church. But all your proofs depend upon your ifs, which being denied, you have no more to say. "No doubt" (say you), "if that church may err, which hath departed from God's word, from Christ's commandments, &c.—then it hath erred in very deed." But sir, what if a man deny your supposal, and stay you in your first if? What have you to prove it? All that you have said hitherto, we know, and of little force it is. But "no doubt," say you, "if that church may err, which hath departed from God's word," &c. Yea, forsooth, if all ifs were true, then if heaven fell we should catch larks: and if a bridge were made between Dover and Calais, we might go to Boulogne a-foot, as William Somer once told king Henry, if it be true that I have heard say.

The church of Rome is the whole catholic church.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here is nothing else, but only the *canonization* of poor William Somer. While your books, M. Harding, shall live, all his sage saws shall never die.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 12. Divis. 2.*

But say they, “ye have been of our fellowship, but now ye are become forsakers of your profession, and have departed from us.” It is true: we have departed from them, and for so doing, we both give thanks to Almighty God, and greatly rejoice on our own behalf. But yet for all this, from the *primitive church*, from the *apostles*, and from *Christ*, we have not departed. True it is, we were brought up with these men in darkness, and in the lack of the knowledge of God, as Moses was brought up in the learning and in the bosom of the Egyptians. “*We have been of your company*,” saith Tertullian, “*I confess it, and no marvel at all: for*,” saith he, “*men be made, and not born Christians.*”

Tertullian. in  
Apologetico.  
[c. 18. p. 17.]

## M. HARDING.

By this whole  
discourse,  
Christ and  
his apostles  
may be con-  
demned.

..... We say (as ye report) that ye have been once of our fellowship, but now ye are become apostates and forsakers of your profession, and have wickedly departed from us. By the name of *us*, we mean not some one particular company, but Christ's catholic church. We say of you, as St. John said of the like, whom he calleth Antichrists: *Ex nobis exierunt, sed non erant ex nobis. Nam si fuissent ex nobis, permansissent utique nobiscum:* “They are departed from out of us, but they were not of us. For if they had been of us, they had doubtless remained still with us.”

But what is your answer hereunto? It is desperate, foolish, and lying. First, ye confess the thing, and not only that, but also thank God for it, and greatly rejoice in it. And therein ye follow the worst sort of sinners, of whom Solomon saith: *Latan-tur cum male fecerint, et exultant in rebus pessimis:* “They be glad when they have done evil, and rejoice in the worst things that

33 [“De vestris fuimus. Fiant non nascuntur Christiani.”]



are." Ye have divided the church of God, ye have rent our Lord's net, ye have cut his whole-woven coat, which the wicked soldiers that crucified him could not find in their hearts to do. Dionysius Alexandrinus writing to Novatus the great heretic, who did as ye have done, saith thus unto him, as Eusebius reciteth, whereby ye may esteem the greatness of your crime: "Thou shouldest have suffered whatsoever it were, that the church of God might not be divided. And martyrdom suffered for that the church should not be divided, is no less glorious, than that which is suffered for not doing idolatry. Yea, in mine opinion it is greater: for there one is martyred for his own only soul, and here for the whole church." Thus it followeth, that by your apostacy, and by you dividing of God's church, ye have done more wickedly, <sup>a</sup>than if ye committed idolatry.

"But yet for all this" (say they) "from the primitive church, from the apostles, and from Christ, we have not departed." What can be said more foolishly? Why, sirs, <sup>b</sup>is not the primitive church and this of our time one church? Doth it not hold together by continual succession till the world's end? What, hath Christ mo churches than one? Is the primitive church quite done, and now must there begin a new? Is not Christ, his apostles, and all true believers, in what time or place soever they live, his one mystical body, whereof he is the head, all other the members? As Christ is one, the Holy Ghost one, one faith, one baptism, one vocation, one God: so is the church one, which began at the first man, and shall endure to the last: whereof the living part on earth, before the coming of Christ into flesh, was sometime brought to small number: after his coming, and after that the apostles had preached and spread the gospel abroad, the number neither was ever, nor shall be other than great (though sometime accounted small in respect of the unbelievers) until the coming again of the Son of man, at what time he shall scantily find faith, specially that which worketh by charity in the earth. Against which time busily ye make preparation.

For some part of excuse of your forsaking the church, ye say, ye were brought up with us in darkness, and in the lack of knowledge of God, as Moses was among the Egyptians: for that ye bring out of Tertullian, helpeth you nothing at all. I pray you, sirs, what darkness mean ye? Speak ye of sin? We excuse not ourselves. But when took ye out the beam of your own eyes, that ye espy the mote of our eye? It were well ye proved yourselves honest men, before ye required us to be angels. If ye mean the darkness of ignorance, as peradventure ye do, and the lack of knowledge of God: now that ye are departed from us, and have set chair against chair (I see not cause why to say, altar against altar), what more and better knowledge of God have ye than we have, and ever have had? Do we not know the articles of our belief? Tell us, which do we lack? "This is life

<sup>a</sup> A good excuse of idolatry.

<sup>b</sup> Yes verily: even as the house of God and the cave of thieves were all one temple. Matt. xxi. 13.

Here M. Harding layeth out his heaps of learning.

everlasting" (saith our Saviour in the gospel), "to know thee God alone, and whom thou hast sent Jesus Christ." So far as God lighteneth our understanding with the supernatural light of John xvii. his grace, this much we know. For which Peter the son of Jona was accounted blessed of Christ, the same we sinful papists, Matt. xvi. 16. through God's grace, also know and confess. The commandments of God we know: what is good, what is evil: which be sins, which be virtues, what is to be followed, what is to be shunned: so far as is behoveful, we be not ignorant.

What is the darkness then, for which ye would needs begone from us? And what is that worthy knowledge ye have won by your departure? Tell us, that we may buy the books, and go to school with you. Truly, without ye have some hidden and secret knowledge, which ye have not uttered to the world hitherto, as we believe ye have not, being such boasters as ye are; we see little cause ye should twit us of ignorance, and brag of your own knowledge. This we see full well, they that run away from us to your side, be they monks or friars, tinkers or tapsters, cobblers or bodgers, white or black, by and by in your synagogues they be great rabbins. And ye the superintendents admit them to be your ministers and preachers of the word, and tell them they can do well, and they believe no less themselves. But the people take them for such as they knew them before they took such degree, and many times for their good behaviour, they forget their holy ministry, and christen them by their common name which was not given them at the font. Yet all this proveth not either our ignorance or your marvellous and rare knowledge. Neither shall ye ever be able to prove to any man of learning and judgment, that in any liberal sciences or right knowledge of the scriptures, ye are comparable to the learned men of the catholic church. Though about fifty years past and upward, for a space the studies of eloquence and of tongues were intermitted, yet then, and before those times, was there no small number of men, who had profound knowledge of all good arts, and specially of the holy letters. I report me to Thomas Walden, who very learnedly confuted the heresies of your great-grandfather John Wickliffe; to Alcuinus in the great Charles' time; to Beda before that; all three Englishmen: to Anselm and Lanfranc, bishops of England, though strangers born; to St. Thomas of Aquine, St. Bernard, Rupertus, and hundreds mo, which here is no place to reckon. Were not they, by confession of all, great clerks? do not the best learned of our time, in obscure matters, fetch light of them? To say the truth, in comparison of their clear light, your ill-savouring snuffs may scanty seem to yield a dark smoke. Many talk of your painted sheath, who, were they learned indeed, would soon perceive neither that to be very fresh and gay: for as for your sword, what rusty and beggarly metal it is, the wiser part of the world seeth. <sup>c</sup>Therefore ye shall do

c A very learned and a worthy conclusion. But woe be to them that call *light* darkness, and *darkness* light: Isa. v. 20.

well, sirs, to speak no more of the darkness and ignorance of the catholic church, and to boast less of your great cunning and knowledge.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Your head was very idle, M. Harding, when it could so easily yield us such idle talk. If ye think it in no case to be lawful to depart from them, whatsoever they be, that bear the shew and countenance of the *church*, then must ye needs condemn the *apostles* and *prophets*, and most specially *Christ* himself. But let us consider, from what company we are departed: so may the causes of our departure the better appear. For the pope himself saith not nay, but upon just considerations, *any church may leave the church of Rome*. His own words be these: *Nulli agere licet, sine discretione justitiæ, contra disciplinam Romanæ ecclesiæ*: “Without discretion of justice, it is lawful for no man to do any thing contrary to the order of the church of Rome.” By this, the pope’s own decree, *with discretion of justice*, it is lawful to do contrary to the orders of the church of Rome.

But for a short and general view of that whole *church* in this behalf, St. Bernard saith thus: *Parum est nostris pastoribus, quod non servant nos, nisi et perdant.....Non parcunt suis, qui non parcunt sibi, perimentes pariter, et pereuntes*: “It is not sufficient for our bishops that they save us not, unless they also do destroy us: sparing not themselves, they spare not their people. They do both perish themselves, and kill others.” Again he saith: *Non custodiunt hoc tempore sponsam, sed perdunt: non custodiunt gregem Domini, sed mactant et devorant*: “They keep not this day the spouse of God, that is, his church, but they destroy her: they keep not the flock, but they kill and devour.” He that writeth *Paralipomena Urspergensis*, in the story of the *council of Constance*, saith thus: *Spiritum extinguebant: prophetias aspernabantur: Christum in membris suis persequebantur: eratque plane persecutrix ecclesia*: “They oppressed the Spirit of God: they defied the voices of the prophets: they persecuted

Dist. 12. Non  
decret. in  
Rubr.

Bernard. in  
Synodo Re-  
mensi. [il.  
750.]

In eadem  
Synod.

Paralipom.  
Ursperg. p.  
396. [ann.  
1414. p. 373.]

Christ in his members. And indeed the church was given to work persecution."

Æneas. Syl.  
in epist. ad  
Casparrem  
Schlickium.  
[p. 539. c.]

Æneas Sylvius, that afterward was pope Pius II., saith:  
*Refriguit charitas, et fides omnis interiit:* "Charity is waxen cold, and all faith is dead."

Paralipom.  
Ursperg. in  
Clen. V.  
[A. D. 1303,  
8qq.]

In the life of pope Clemens V. it is written thus: *Hic fuit publicus fornicator. Ab eo tempore defecit omnis disciplina et religio in cardinalibus, et tres radices vitiorum, superbia, avaritia, luxuria, validissime dominantur:* "This pope was an open whoremaster. From that time forward, all kind of discipline and religion decayed in the *cardinals:* and three roots of vices, *pride, avarice, and lechery,* mightily bare the sway."

In Conc.  
Trid. Anto-  
nius Mari-  
narius. [p.  
46. col. 2.]

Antonius Marinarius, at your late *chapter at Trident,* saith thus of the *church of Rome:* *Si evangelica fides nostræ vitæ regula esset, re ipsa Christiani essemus. Nunc titulo et ceremoniis vocamur Christiani:* "If the faith of the gospel were a rule unto our life, then should we be Christians in very deed. As now by titles and ceremonies we bear only the name of Christians." To like purpose

Nicol. Cusa-  
nus Excitat.  
lib. 9. [p. 651.]

saith Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of Rome: *Si recte respicimus, omnis religio Christiana, paucis demptis, degeneravit in apparentiam:* "If we mark it well, all our Christian religion, a few excepted, is grown out of kind unto a show."

Conc. Tri-  
dent. episc.  
Bitont.  
[Crabb. iii.  
979.]

At the said *chapter, the bishop of Bitonto* said thus, as I have reported before: *Quibus turpitudinum monstris, qua sordium colluvie, qua peste non sunt fœdati, non corrupti in ecclesia sancta, et populus, et sacerdos? A sanctuario Dei incipite: si ullus jam pudor, si ulla pudicitia, si ulla superest bene vivendi vel spes, vel ratio:* "With what monsters of filthiness, with what villany, with what pestilence be they not corrupted and defiled in the *holy church,*" (of Rome,) "as well the priest as the people? Begin even with the sanctuary of God, if there be any shame, if there be any regard of honesty, if there be any hope, or way to live well."

Franc. Ze-  
phyrus in  
Apologeti-  
cum Tertull.

Another saith: *O nos miseros, qui Christiani dicimur!*

*Gentes agimus sub nomine Christi*: “Miserable are we that are called *Christians*. We live as *heathens* under the name of *Christ*.” Another saith: *O lugenda Roma, quæ nostris majoribus clara patrum lumina protulisti: nostris temporibus, monstrosas tenebras, futuro sæculo famosas, offudisti!* “O miserable Rome, which in the time of our elders hast brought forth the lights of worthy fathers, but in our days hast brought forth monstrous darkness, shameful and slanderous to the time to come<sup>34</sup>!” Petrarcha calleth Rome *a school of error, and a temple of heresy*<sup>35</sup>.

Arnulphus, aut Bernardus in Concill. Remen.

Petrarch. in Rhythmis Italicis: [3 Part. fol. 137. a.] Schola d' Errori: e Tempio d' Heresia. Hermannus Riddus. [p. 145.]

Brigitta, whose words and prophecies ye have in revelation, saith in her *Revelations: Christus sumet benedictionem a clero Romano, et dabit eam alteri genti facienti voluntatem Domini*: “Christ shall take his blessing from the clergy of Rome: and shall give the same unto a people that shall do his will.”

By these few, we may conceive the whole state of the church of Rome, which only church, above all others, M. Harding telleth us, is so founded in the truth, that it never can have power to be deceived.

We have departed therefore *from shepherds that spoiled the flock: from bishops that destroyed the church: that oppressed the Spirit of God: that defied the voice of the prophets: that persecuted Christ in his members: that both perished themselves, and killed others: that wallowed in monsters of filthiness: that lived as heathens, under the name of Christ: that were void of charity: void of faith: void of discipline: void of religion: that were Christians only in titles and ceremonies: from whom Christ had withdrawn his blessing: to be short, we have departed from the temple of heresy, and from the school of error.*

This, M. Harding, is the beauty and face of your *Roman clergy*: this is that blessed company that we have forsaken.

Yet, say you, “It had been better to have died than to

<sup>34</sup> [This is cited probably from 1608,) where this passage occurs.]  
Flacii Test. Veritatis, by whom an account of this speech of Arnulphus, Episc. Aurelian. is given in p. 1560, (of the edition of

<sup>35</sup> [This passage is quoted by Flac. Test. Verit. lib. 18. p. 1769 ed. 1608.]

have broken the unity of such a church." For your friends tell you, that without the *obedience of the bishop of Rome, there is no hope of salvation.* Notwithstanding, your own *Clemens*, whom ye commonly call the *apostles' fellow*, saith thus: *Schisma efficit, non qui ab impiis secessionem facit, sed qui a piis:* "He maketh no schism or division in the church, that departeth from the wicked: but he that departeth from the godly." And therefore he addeth further: *Luici, cum iis qui contraria sententiae Dei dogmata defendunt, nolite societatem habere, neque participes illorum impietatis fieri. Ait enim Dominus, Recedite de medio horum hominum, ne cum eis pereatis:* "Ye laymen, have ye no fellowship with them, nor be you partakers of their wickedness, that defend *doctrines contrary to the doctrine of God.* For our Lord saith, Depart from the midst of this people, lest ye perish together with them."

Pope Pius II. saith: *Resistendum est quibuscunque in faciem, sive Paulus sive Petrus sit, qui ad veritatem non ambulat evangelii:* "We must withstand any man unto the face, be it Peter, be it Paul, if he walk not after the truth of the gospel <sup>36</sup>."

St. Augustine saith: *Ne catholicis quidem episcopis consentiendum est, sicubi forte falluntur, et contra canonicas scripturas aliquid sentiant:* "We may not agree, no, not with the catholic bishops, if they happen to be deceived, and think any thing contrary to the canonical scriptures."

Therefore *cardinal Cusanus'* advice by the *counsel of St. Gregory*, whom he allegeth, is, "If vices have grown in the church, through overmuch obedience towards the prelates, that we favour them not, but withstand them:" *Ut si qua vitia ex nimia obedientia exorta sint.....non foveantur sed eis resistatur:* in which words it is to be noted, that the people may yield *too much obedience* and reverence towards their prelates.

St. Chrysostom saith: *Ex ipsis veris ecclesiis frequenter exeunt seductores. Propterea nec ipsis omnino credendum est, nisi ea dicant, vel faciant, quae convenientia sint scripturis:*

<sup>36</sup> [This oratio of Æneas is found in Urspergens. Chronicon et Paraleip. Basil. 1569. p. 412.]

De Majorit. et Obedient. Unam Sanctam. Subesse Romano Pontifici, est de necessitate Salutis. [p. 192.] Clemens Apostolicar. constit. lib. 6. cap. 4.

[Ibid.]

Æneas Sylvius ad Rector. et Universitatem Coloniaen. [apud] Paraleipom. Urspergens pag. 435.

Aug. de Unitate Eccl. cap. 10. [ix. 355.]

Nicol. Cusan. de Concordant. lib. 2. cap. 25. [p. 757.]

Chrys. in Mat homil. 49. [Op. imp. vi. app. 209.]

“Even out of the very true churches oftentimes there come deceivers. Therefore we may not in any wise believe, no, not them” (notwithstanding they be the true churches of God), “unless they speak or do such things as be agreeable to the scriptures.”

Anselmus, a late writer, expounding these words of St. Paul, *Tunc revelabitur ille iniquus*, saith thus: *Romanus pontifex, qui tenet nunc ecclesias, teneat illas, donec de medio fiat: id est, donec ab ipsa Romana ecclesia, quæ est medium et cor ecclesiarum, fiat iniquitas, ob quam ab ea multæ discedant ecclesiæ*: “Let the bishop of Rome that now holdeth the churches, hold them still, until it be taken away from the midst: that is to say, until wickedness be wrought of the church of Rome, that is the midst and heart of churches: for which wickedness many churches shall depart from her.”

St. Ambrose saith: *Nullus pudor est, ad meliora transire*: “It is no shame to go to the better.” St. Augustine saith unto Faustus the heretic: *Ille me quondam de gremio tuo error excusserat. Expertus fugi, quod experiri non debui*: “That error shook me once out of thy bosom. Being taught by proof, I have fled that thing that I should not have proved.”

Ambrosius Ansbertus, one of your own doctors, saith: *Per Hieremiam prophetam dicitur, Exite de medio ejus populus meus, et salvet unusquisque animam suam ab ira furoris Domini. Nequaquam enim in hac vita de medio civitatis reprobæ, id est, de medio malorum, quos Babylon illa significat, electorum aliquis valet exire, nisi detestando, quod ab ipsis agitur, et agendo, quod ab ipsis detestatur*: “The prophet Jeremy saith, O my people, go forth from the midst of them, and save every man his own soul from the rage of our Lord’s fury. For none of the elect of God can in this life go forth from the midst of that wicked city, that is to say, from the midst of the evil, which that *Babylon* signifieth, but by defying that they do: and by doing that they defy.” And whereas ye would so fain dazzle our eyes, and cover your deformities with the name of the church, St. Cyprian saith: *Non est pax*,  
Ambr. in Epist. ad (Theodos. et) Valent. [tom. ii. p. 834.] August. contra Faust. lib. 15. cap. 3. [viii. 273.]  
Ambr. Ansbertus in Apocal. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 43.]  
Cyprian. de Lapsis, Serm. 5. [p. 186.]

*sed bellum: nec ecclesiæ jungitur, qui ab evangelio separatur:* “It is no peace, but war: neither is he joined to the church, that is divided from the gospel.”

St. Chrysostom saith: *Mihi civitas non habens pios cives, omni villa vilior est, et quacunque spelunca ignobilior:* “A city that hath not godly citizens is unto me viler than any village, and more loathsome than any cave.” And this he saith of the city of *Antioch*, which, by express words, he more esteemeth than the city of *Rome*.

We grant, we have departed from you, upon such occasion, and in such sort, as Moses sometime departed from out of Egypt: or, as St. Augustine departed from the Manichees. Howbeit, in very deed, you have rather departed from out of us. Chrysostom saith: *Sic de ista Nova Hierusalem, id est, de ecclesia, qui spirituales Christiani fuerunt, relicta corporali ecclesia, quam perfidi occupaverant violentia, exierunt ab illis. Magis autem illi exierunt a nobis, sicut Johannes exponit. Non enim ille de ecclesia exire videtur, qui corporaliter exit, sed qui spiritualiter veritatis ecclesiasticæ fundamenta reliquit. Nos enim ab illis exivimus corpore: illi a nobis animo. Nos (enim) ab illis exivimus loco: illi a nobis fide. Nos apud illos reliquimus fundamenta parietum: illi apud nos reliquerunt fundamenta scripturarum. Nos ab illis egressi sumus secundum aspectum hominum: illi autem a nobis secundum judicium Dei.....Relicta est autem deserta, ex quo de illa corporali ecclesia spiritualis exivit: id est, de populo suo, qui videbatur Christianus, et non erat, populus iste exivit qui non videbatur, et erat. Magis autem, secundum quod diximus, illi a nobis exierunt, quam nos ab illis:* “Even so, touching this *New Jerusalem*, which is the church, they that were spiritual Christian men, leaving the bodily church, which the wicked by violence had invaded, departed out from them: or, as St. John expoundeth it, they rather departed out from us. For he seemeth not indeed to depart from the church, that *bodily* departeth: but he, that spiritually leaveth the foundations of the ecclesiastical truth. We have departed from them in *body*: they have departed from us in *mind*. We from

Chrys. ad  
populum  
Antiochen.  
hom. 17. [ii.  
176.]

Chrys. in  
Mat. homil.  
49. [leg. hom.  
46. Op. imp.  
vi. app. 195.]

[Ib. p. 197.]



them, by *place*: they from us, by *faith*. We have left with them the foundations of the walls: they have left with us the foundations of the scriptures. We are departed forth from them, in the sight of man: they are departed from us, in the judgment of God. But now, after that the spiritual church is gone forth, the bodily church is left forsaken: that is to say, from that people, that seemed to be a Christian people, and was not, this people is gone forth, that seemed not outwardly, but was so indeed. Notwithstanding, as we have said before, they have rather departed from us, than we from them."

Ye say, your *church of Rome*, that now is, and the *primitive church*, is all *one church*. Even so the *moon*, both in the full and in the wane, is all *one moon*. Even so Jerusalem, as well under David, as under Manasses, was all *one city*. The *holy place*, whether the *majesty of God*, or the *abomination of desolation* stand in it, is all *one place*. The *primitive church*, say you, and the *church of Rome that now is*, is all *one church*. Therefore we say, the *church of Rome* that now is, in truth and religion, ought to agree with the *primitive church*.

Whether the *church may be brought to a few in number*, <sup>[Supra v. 473.]</sup> or no, we had occasion somewhat to say before. The ancient father Irenæus saith:.....*Quemadmodum ibi in plurimis eorum, qui peccaverunt, non bene sensit Deus: sic et hic multi sunt vocati: pauci vero electi*: "As in the *Old Testament*, in many of them that offended, God was not pleased: even so now in the *New Testament*, many are called, and few are chosen." In consideration whereof, St. Hierom crieth out in an agony within himself: *Tanta erit sanctorum paucitas*: "So small shall be the number of holy men." One of your own doctors saith, as it is alleged <sup>[Supra v. 475.]</sup> once before: *Licet in hoc bello dæmonum cadant religiosi principes, et mitites, et prælati ecclesiastici, et subditi,..... semper tamen manent aliqui, in quibus servatur veritas fidei, et justificatio bonæ conscientiæ. Et si non nisi duo viri fideles remanent in mundo, tamen in illis salvaretur ecclesia, quæ est unitas fidelium*: "Notwithstanding in this war of devils, both the godly princes, and soldiers, and <sup>Iren. lib. 4. cap. 46. [p. 265.]</sup> <sup>Hier. in Esa. lib. 8. cap. 24. [iii. 210.]</sup> <sup>[fol. cccxi.]</sup>

ecclesiastical prelates, and subjects be overthrown, yet evermore there remain some, in whom the *truth of faith* and the righteousness of good conscience is preserved. And notwithstanding *there were but two faithful men* remaining in the world, yet even in them, the *church of God*, which is the unity of the faithful, should be saved."

But, for that we say, *we were brought up among you in darkness and ignorance*: ye enter out of season into a needless discourse of comparison of learning. "In the liberal sciences," (ye say,) "we are not comparable to the learned men of your side." It was not our meaning, M. Harding, to call the bright beams of your *liberal learning* into question. It appeareth, ye would fain have it blazed and magnified to the uttermost, and no way to be disgraced. We meant only the knowledge of God, and the open profession of his holy word: in comparison of which knowledge, all other knowledge whatsoever is mere darkness.

Howbeit, touching any kind of the *liberal* and *learned sciences*, there was no great cause, why ye should either so highly rouse yourself in your own opinion, or so greatly disdain others. Ye may remember, that your *provincial constitutions* begin with these words, *Ignorantia sacerdotum*.

De Sum. Tri-  
nitat. Lynde-  
wode.

It were no great mastery to charge the chief doctors of your side with some want of *learning*. Ludovicus Vives saith: *Ut quidque his superioribus saculis minus tritum fuit studentium manibus, ita purius ad nos pervenit*: "For the space of certain hundred years past, the less any book came into" (your learned) "students' hands, the purer and better it came to us." Meaning thereby, that every thing was the worse for your learned handling. Of Thomas, Scotus, Hugo, and others, of whom ye seem to make so great account, your own friend Catharinus saith: *Scholastici multa inrudite comminiscuntur*: "These school doctors imagine many matters unlearnedly." Erasmus saith: *Portenta quæ nunc passim legimus in commentariis recentium interpretum, tam impudentia, et insulsa sunt, ut videntur suis ea scripsisse, non hominibus*: "The mon-

Ludov. Vives  
de Causis  
corrupt.  
Artium, lib.  
5. [Opp. i.  
47.]

Catharinus  
adversus Do-  
minicum a  
Solo.  
Erasm. in  
Scholis in  
Hieron. ad  
Marcelliam.  
[Hieron.  
Opp. ed. E-  
rasm. iii. 79.]

strous follies that we commonly read in the commentaries of the late interpreters," (whereby he meaneth the very crop and the worthiest of all your scholastical *learned doctors*.) "are so far without shame and so peevish, as if they had been *written for swine, and not for men.*" One of your doctors saith: *Apostolus, dicitur ab apos, quod est argumentum, vel præeinentia, et stolon, quod est missio: quasi præeinenter missus.* Another saith: *Apocrisarii, dicuntur nuntii domini papæ. Nam crisis dicitur secretum: (et apos dicitur nuntius)*<sup>37</sup>. Another saith: *Cathedra est nomen Græcum et componitur a cathos, quod est fides, et edra, quod est sponda.* Another saith: *Eleemosyna, dicitur ab eleis, quod est, misereri, et mois quod est aqua.* Peter Crab, in his late *scholies* upon the *councils*, saith thus: *Mulieres συννεσάκτους, id est, cohabitantes sacculos:* and so by his high learning, like a clerk, he turneth *women* into *sacks*. Likewise again he saith: *Phrygium factum est ex pennis pavonum.* Of your *liberal learned clergy* one saith thus: *Nec verba canonis intelligunt, nec quæ sint verba consecrationis sciunt:* "They understand not the words of their canon: neither know they which be the words of consecration." And therefore he that forged the *rule of monks*, under the name of St. Hierom, chargeth them in any wise to pronounce every word distinctly and warily, lest by their foolish utterance they should make the angels to fall a laughing.

These few may serve you for a taste. Hereby, M. Harding, it may appear, your *clergy* have [ed. 1570, hath] no great cause to make such triumph of their *learning*. Howbeit, we upbraid you not herewith: nor was this the cause of our departure. Ye hold both *faith*, and *learning*, and *church*, and *religion*, by inheritance. *Christ hath once prayed for Peter:* therefore your *faith* and *learning* can never fail. Yet notwithstanding your late books, freight with so many uncivil and vain speeches, (for of your often *untruths* I will say nothing,) savour more of choler and stomach than

Erasm. ad Archiep. Tolet. [August. Opp. ed. Basil. 1528, tom. i. p. 8.]

Extr. de Elect. et Elect. potest signif. in Gloss.

Manipul. Curat. p. 101. [fol. 167, a.]

Inter Decr. Felicis pap. Concil. tom. i. p. 168.

[Crabb. i. 227.]

In Donat. Constantini. Crabb. i. 227.]

Herm. Ridus. [p. 142.]

Hieron. in Reg. Monac. Ne ad risum provocentur Angelici Spiritus. [cap. v. 33. tom. v. p. 440.]

<sup>37</sup> [The words between brackets are not there.]

Hieron in  
Proverb. liib,  
2. cap. 19. [v.  
564.]

of *learning*. St. Hierom saith: *Doctrina viri per patientiam noscitur. Quia tanto quisque minus ostenditur doctus, quanto convincitur minus patiens*: “A man’s *learning* is known by his patience. For the less patient a man sheweth himself to be, the less he sheweth to be his *learning*”<sup>38</sup>.” Therefore, M. Harding, your impatient demeanour and unkindly heats may call your *learning* into question.

Acts viii. 20.

1 Cor. ii. 2.

1 Esdr. iv. 40.

1 Cor. xiii. 8.

Matt. xiii. 11.

Would God ye would humble your *knowledge*, and make it obedient to the *knowledge* of God. Otherwise, that Peter said unto Simon Magus, of his money, may likewise be said unto you, of your knowledge: *Thy knowledge be with thee to thy destruction*. Our *learning* is the *cross of Christ*: of other *learning* we make no vaunts. God is called the *God of truth*, and not of *learning*. St. Paul saith: “All kind of *learning* shall be abolished and consumed to nothing.” God make us all “learned to the kingdom of heaven.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 13. *Divis.* 1.

But wherefore, I pray you, have they themselves, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 67.]</sup> the citizens and dwellers of Rome, removed and come down from those *seven hills*, whereupon Rome sometime stood, to dwell rather in the plain, called the *field of Mars*? They will say, peradventure, because the conduits of water, wherewithout men cannot commodiously live, have now failed, and are dried up in those hills. Well then, let them give us like leave in seeking the *water of eternal life*, that they give themselves in seeking the *water of the well*. For that water verily failed amongst them.

Jer. xiv. 3. “*The elders of the Jews*,” saith Jeremy, “*sent their little ones to the waterings: and they, finding no water, being in miserable case, and utterly lost for thirst, brought home again their vessels empty.*” “*The*

<sup>38</sup> [This Commentary on the Proverbs is not genuine.]

*needy and poor folk,"* saith Esay, "*sought about for* Isa. xii. 17. *water, but nowhere found they any: their tongue was even withered for thirst.*" Even so these men have broken in pieces all the pipes and conduits: they have stopped up all the springs, and choked up the fountain of living water with dirt and mire. And as Caligula, many years past, locked up fast all the garners and storehouses of corn in Rome, and thereby brought a general dearth and famine amongst the people; even so these men, by damming up all the *fountains of God's word*, have brought the people into a pitiful thirst. They have brought into the world, as saith the prophet Amos, *a hunger, and a* Amos viii. 11. *thirst: not the hunger of bread, nor the thirst of water, but of hearing the word of God.* With great distress went they scattering about, seeking some spark of heavenly light to refresh their consciences withal: but that light was already thoroughly quenched out, so that they could find none. This was a rueful state: this was a lamentable form of *God's church*. It was a misery to live therein, without the gospel, without light, and without all comfort.

## M. HARDING.

Well and wittily reasoned, forsooth..... No, no, sirs, if it were that wholesome water of eternal life which ye thirst after, a ye a Untruth. For we are not departed from the catholic church. would never have departed from the high hill, the catholic church, and come down into the valleys, where ye find the dirty puddles of fleshly pleasures, where the devil behemoth, as Job saith, *dormit in locis humentibus*, "sleepeth in moist places."..... All were not starved for hunger and thirst of that water of God's word. Therefore ye speak both slanderously, and ignorantly for divines, where ye say, that we had broken in pieces all the pipes and conduits, that we had stopped up all the springs, and choked and dammed up all the fountains of living water with dirt and mire.....

Yet unawares, or ignorantly, they call that faithless and pagan state a lamentable form of God's church, whereas they should

have accounted it no church at all. For where is no word of God, no light, no gospel at all, how can there be any church? Without these, any multitude is no more a church, than without Christ a man is a Christian, than a dead man is a man. And thus with malicious slandering, not with learned reasons, with their own affirmations, not with apt allegations, have they gone about to prove that these many hundred years the church hath erred. But thanks be to God, all this wind shaketh no corn. When all these hasty blasts be blown over, the church of God shall stand still unmoved, upon the rock Christ builded it on, and appear glorious in her stedfastness and truth, maugre the gainsaying of all heretics, and shall appear to them terrible, as *Cantic. vi. 4.* a strong army set in battle array.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye begin out of season to play with your *allegories*, and mystical phantasies. Your *catholic church of Rome*, you say, is the *mount*: worldly pleasure is the *vale*. By which comparison we must believe, that the *pope* and his *cardinals*, sitting on high upon the *mount*, pass their time there only in fasting, and prayer, and in all manner poverty, and penury, and straitness of life, and have utterly abandoned all worldly pleasures. Notwithstanding some have said: *In Cardinalibus superbia, avaritia, luxuria validissime dominantur*: "In the cardinals of Rome, pride, avarice, and lechery are in their greatest courage." Howbeit, touching as well this, as other your like follies concerning the church, I will not say, ye keep your wont: but I must needs say, ye do but trifle.

Paralip. Ur-  
sper. in Cle-  
ment. g. [ad  
ann. 1303.  
p. 345.]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 13. Divis. 2.*

Wherefore, though our departing were a trouble <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 68.]</sup> to them, yet ought they to consider withal, how just cause we had of our departure.

M. HARDING.

Indeed, our charity is such, as we confess it to be a grief unto us to see you play the part of rebellious children, to use presumption for submission, contempt for obedience, spite for love. Yet sith that ye are desperate and incorrigible, as by your departing from us the church felt some anguish and trouble, so

now that ye are gone, it is relieved, as the body is eased, when after a purgation it hath avoided evil humours. . . . . Now say your best.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We are not gone from the *church of God*, M. Harding : we are gone only from you that have so unreverently abused the church. “But ye feel good ease” (ye say) “and are well relieved by our departure, as” (to use your homely comparisons) “a sick body is relieved by a purgation.” God of his mercy grant, that ye may likewise be purged of all the rest of our brethren in other countries. So shall ye feel more ease, and be better relieved.

St. Hierom saith : *Hebræi dicunt*, [l. *autumant*] *quod ea nocte qua egressus est Israel (ex Ægypto), omnia in Ægypto templa destructa sunt, sive terræ motu, sive ictu fulminum. Spiritualiter autem dicimus* [l. *discimus*], *quod egredientibus nobis ex Ægypto, errorum idola corruant, et omnis perver-sarum doctrinarum cultura quatiatur* : “The rabbins or Hebrew doctors say, that the same night that *Israel departed out of Egypt*, all the idolatrous temples in *Egypt* were destroyed, either by earthquake or by lightning. But hereof we learn in a spiritual sense, that when we depart out of *Egypt*” (that is to say, from the company of *idolaters*) “the *idols of error* fall to the ground, and all the honour of false doctrine is shaken down.” Such relief, M. Harding, we trust ye shall find by our departure.

Beda expounding these words of the Apocalypse, “*Come forth from her, my people, and be not partakers of her sins*,” saith thus : *Inducit discessionem, quæ est ruina Babylonis : cum enim Lot discesserit a Sodomis, Sodomæ funditus tollentur* : “St. John speaketh of the departure, which is the ruin and fall of Babylon. For when Lot shall depart out of Sodom, then shall Sodom utterly be overthrown.”

Again he saith : *Post hæc audivi vocem, Alleluia : laus, et gloria, et virtus Deo nostro. Hæc nunc ex parte dicit ecclesia. Tunc autem perfecte dicet, cum discessio facta fuerit* : “After this I heard a voice, ‘*Alleluia* : praise, and glory, and power, be to our God.’ This song the church

in part singeth already: but then shall she in deed and perfectly sing it, when departure shall be made" (from *Antichrist, or Babylon*).

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 14. Divis. 1.*

For if they say, It is in no wise lawful for one to leave the fellowship wherein he hath been brought up, they may as well in our names, and upon our heads, likewise condemn the *prophets*, the *apostles*, and *Christ* himself. For why complain they not also of this, that *Lot* went quite his way out of *Sodom*, *Abraham* out of *Chaldea*, the *Israelites* out of *Egypt*, *Christ* from the *Jews*, and *Paul* from the *Pharisees*? For except it be possible there may be a lawful cause of departing, we see no reason, why *Lot*, *Abraham*, the *Israelites*, *Christ*, and *Paul*, may not be accused of sects and seditions as well as others.

M. HARDING.

Yet bring ye nothing to the purpose. Your proofs be so weak, and hang so evil together, that we may well tell you (which *Irenæus* objected to heretics), that ye make a rope of sand. We say not, it is in no wise lawful for one to leave the fellowship wherein he hath been brought up: but contrariwise, <sup>a</sup>if the fellowship be naught and wicked, every one is bound to eschew it. "Depart from *Babylon*, my people, and be not ye partakers of her sins," saith the heavenly voice to *St. John*. <sup>b</sup>Therefore the examples ye bring help nothing your cause.

*Lot* went out of *Sodom*, *Abraham* of *Chaldea*, the *Israelites* of *Egypt*, *Paul* from the *Pharisees*, by *God's* special warning. Where ye say, *Christ* went from the *Jews*, unless ye refer it to his stepping aside from them for a while, ye should rather have said, the *Jews* went from *Christ*. But whereto pertaineth this? Though ye were so malicious as to compare the catholic church to *Sodom*, to *Chaldea*, to *Egypt*, to the *Jews* and *Pharisees*; yet, I ween, ye are not so proud as <sup>c</sup>to compare yourselves to *Lot*, to *Abraham*, to *God's* peculiar people, to *Paul*, to *Christ* himself. These departings we allow, and *God* required them: yours we blame, and *God* detesteth.

a Thus much confessed is sufficient.

b A sudden conclusion.

c A vain folly. For a good man may follow *Christ* without presumptuous comparison.

[Vol. iv. p. 68.]

Apoc. xviii. 4.



## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We compare not ourselves, M. Harding, neither with Lot, nor with Abraham, nor with Paul; least of all with Christ himself. But we humbly submit ourselves, both in life and in doctrine, to be guided by their examples. And thus, I trust, we may lawfully do without just note of presumption. St. Chrysostom saith: *Data est tibi potestas divinitus imitandi Christum, ut possis illi similis fieri. Noli expavescere hoc audiens. Timendum enim tibi potius est, si similis illi fieri negligas*: “Thou hast power given thee from God to follow Christ, that thou mayest be like unto him. Be thou not afraid to hear this thing. Thou hast more cause to fear, if thou refuse to be like unto him.” Likewise saith the ancient father Origen:.....*Si quem imitari volumus, propositus est nobis Christus ad imitandum*: “If we desire to follow any man, Christ is set before us, that we should follow him.”

Chrys. in  
Matth. hom.  
79. [vii. 756.]

Origen. iii  
Ezechiel.  
hom. 7. [iii.  
382.]

But if it be so proud a part, as you say, in religion and life to follow Christ, what is he then that claimeth to himself *Christ's authority*, and calleth himself even by the name of *Christ*? Ye know who is well contented to hear himself thus saluted: “Touching primacy, *thou art Abel*: touching government, *thou art Noah*: touching the patriarchship, *thou art Abraham*: touching order, *thou art Melchisedec*: touching dignity, *thou art Aaron*: touching authority, *thou art Moses*: touching judgment, *thou art Samuel*: touching power, *thou art Peter*: touching anointing, *thou art Christ*.” These words, I trow, M. Harding, may somewhat seem to savour of pride. Your *pope* is well contented to take the name, not only of *Peter*, but also of *Christ*.

Bernard. de  
Considerat.  
lib. 2. [cap. 8.  
ii. 428.]

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 2.

And if these men will needs condemn us for heretics, because we do not all things at their commandment, whom (in God's name) or what kind of

men ought they themselves to be taken for, which despise the commandment of *Christ*, and of the *apostles*?

M. HARDING.

Our frailty concerning life we accuse and lament, and commend ourselves to God's infinite mercy. Touching belief and necessary doctrine of faith, rail ye at us never so much, we neither despise the <sup>a</sup>commandments of Christ, nor the <sup>a</sup>traditions of the *apostles*.....

a Untruths, notorious and manifest unto the world.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis.* 3.

If we be *schismatics* because we have left them, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 68.]</sup> by what name then shall they be called themselves, which have forsaken the *Greeks*, from whom they first received their faith, forsaken the *primitive church*, forsaken *Christ* himself, and the *apostles*, even as if children should forsake their parents?

M. HARDING.

Whosoever depart from the catholic church, they be schismatics: ye have departed from the catholic church of <sup>a</sup>these nine hundred years: *ergo*, ye be schismatics. The first proposition ye will not deny; the second yourselves confess: the conclusion then must needs be true. If we say the same, blame us not. Neither say we that only, but also that ye are heretics. Whereby the measure of your iniquity is increased. The same crime ye would impute unto us, if ye wist how. If ye have no more to lay to our charge, but that we have forsaken the *Greeks*, ye shall not be offended with the world, if it give us the title, name, and estimation of catholics, as heretofore. For (remember yourselves) we have not forsaken the *Greeks*, but the *Greeks* in some points have forsaken us. By the name of us, always I understand the catholic church, even the holy Roman church, whose faith we profess, and with whom we communicate.

a Here M. Harding yieldeth us the first six hundred and threescore years, that is to say, the whole time of the apostles and holy fathers of the church.

b Read the answer.

<sup>b</sup>And how standeth it with your learning, that we received the faith first from the *Greeks*? For where ye say, we have forsaken the *primitive church*, yea *Christ* himself, and the *apostles*, ye have told us this so often, that now we take them to be but words of course, and a common blast of your railing spirit. The Roman church received the faith from Jerusalem, <sup>c</sup>and not from Greece, as the rest of the world did, according to the prophecy,

c Untruth, as shall soon appear.

Is. II. 3.

*De Sion exhibit lex, &c.* As for the land of Britain, our native country, if the faith were first brought hither by Joseph of Arimathea, and his fellows, as by old tradition we are told, <sup>d</sup> then was the church here first planted by faithful Jews, and not by Greeks.....<sup>39</sup>. This being true, we marvel what ye mean to charge us with forsaking the Greeks, specially where ye say, we first received the faith from them. Which is no truer than that we received our English language from them.

<sup>d</sup> Certainly we received not our faith first from the church of Rome.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

It were no shame for you, M. Harding, to confess that the *church of Rome* first received her *faith* from the *churches of Græcia*. Neither are they so utterly *void of learning*, that have said the same. Rather I marvel what *learning* can lead you so unlearnedly to say the contrary. St. Augustine saith: *Terra Græcorum, unde ubique desti-* Aug. epist. 178. [ii. app. 44.]  
*nata est fides*: "The land of *Græcia*, from whence the faith into all places was sent abroad<sup>40</sup>." Again he saith: *Radix Orientalium ecclesiarum, unde evangelium in Africam venit*: Aug. epist. 170. [ii. 119.]  
"The root of the East churches, from whence the gospel came into *Africa*." St. Chrysostom saith unto the people of Antioch: *Christianorum nomen velut ex quodam fonte hinc incipiens, omnem mundum inundavit*: Chrysostom. ad Popul. Antiochen. Homil. 4. "The name of *Christians* beginning first from this city of *Antioch*, as from a spring, hath flowed over the whole world." The *bishops of the East* wrote thus unto *Julius the bishop of* Tripur. Hist. lib. 4. cap. 16.  
*Rome*: *Ad ecclesiam Romanam ab Oriente prædicatores dogmatis advenerunt*: "The preachers of Christian doctrine came from the East, to the *church of Rome*." Like- Sozo. lib. 3. cap. 7. [ul. 8. ii. 103.]  
wise St. Basil saith: "The gospel of the kingdom springing εἰ καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἕω ἐνεδήμησαν αὐτῇ οἱ τοῦ δόγματος εἰσηγηταί.  
up *first in the church of Græcia*, was from thence published abroad into all the world<sup>41</sup>." Eusebius saith: .....*Lucis virtus et sacræ religionis lex, beneficio Dei, quasi e sinu Orientis profecta, cunctum simul orbem sacro jubare illustravit*..... : "The power of the light, and the law of holy religion, by God's benefit springing out, as it were, from Basil. in epist. ad episc. per Italiam et Galliam. [iii. 374.]  
Euseb. de Vita Const. Orat. ii. [i. 568.]

<sup>39</sup> [Here occurs an allusion to king Lucius, and to Theodorus.]

<sup>40</sup> [The Bened. regard this letter as spurious.]

<sup>41</sup> [S. Basil. Τάχα δὲ ὁ καὶ μάλ-

λὸν ἐστὶν εἰκάσαι, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων τόπων ἀρξάμενον εἰς πᾶσαν ἐξῆλθε τὴν οἰκουμένην, διὰ τοῦτο κ. τ. λ.]

the bosom of the East, hath shined over the whole world together with a blessed beam<sup>41</sup>." The emperor Justinian<sup>42</sup> saith: *Constantinopolis religionis et fidei mater perpetua*: "Constantinople is the everlasting mother of faith and religion." And likewise again: *Sacrosancta Constantinopolitana civitatis ecclesia, mater pietatis nostræ, et Christianorum orthodoxæ religionis omnium*: "The most holy church of the city of Constantinople, the mother of our holiness, and the mother of all Christians of the catholic faith<sup>43</sup>."

In like sort the church of Constantinople, even until this day, entituleth itself: Ἡ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκκλησία, ἡ μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ὀρθοδόξων, καὶ διδάσκαλος: "The church of Constantinople, the mother and mistress of all that be catholic<sup>44</sup>." To be short, if ye will not believe any of these, yet at least ye may believe your own fellows. The bishop of Bitonto, in your late chapter at Trident, uttered these words, as it may well appear, with lusty courage: *Eia igitur Græcia mater nostra, cui id totum debet quod habet Latina ecclesia*: "O therefore our mother Græcia, unto whom the Latin church, or the church of Rome, is beholden for all that ever she hath."

These things, M. Harding, being true, we marvel what should move you to deny, that ye first received the faith from the church of Græcia. Touching the matter itself, it is written thus in your own councils: *Si Græci per quandam scissuram dividuntur a Latinis, ita Latini a Græcis. Et ideo videtur, quod si Græci debent dici schismatici propter hujusmodi divisionem, eadem ratione et Latini: præterea Græci magis servant antiquas consuetudines apostolorum, et discipulorum Christi, in barbibus, &c.*: "If the Greeks by a certain division be sundered from the Latins, even so be the Latins sundered from the Greeks. And therefore it seemeth, if the Greeks in respect of this

Cod. de Sacrosanct. Ecclesiis, [lib. 1. tit. 2.] L. Jubemus. §. Scientes. Cod. in eod. tit. [lib. 1. tit. 2. lex 16.] L. Decernimus.

Epist. Eccl. Constant. nopolit. ad Eccl. Prag. Gen.

Concil. Trident. [Crabb. iii. 982.] Oratio Episcopi Bitontini.

In Opere Tripart. lib. 2. cap. 1. [leg. cap. 10.] in 2. tom. Concill. [Crabb. p. 992.]

<sup>41</sup> [This passage is an extract from Constantine's letter to Alexander and Arius.]

<sup>42</sup> [Properly the emperors Leo and Anthemius.]

<sup>43</sup> [Yet surely Justinian never

meant to say, that Rome had derived the faith from Constantinople.]

<sup>44</sup> [This epistle, dated 1451, will be found in Le Moyne's "Varia Sacra," tom. ii. p. 294.]

*division* ought to be called *schismatics*, that then the *Latins* also ought so to be called in like case. Furthermore, the *Greeks* do more duly keep the old customs of the apostles, and of Christ's disciples, touching beards, &c., than do the *Latins*."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. *Divis.* 1.

For though those *Greeks*, who this day profess religion, and the name of Christ, have many things corrupted amongst them, yet hold they still a great number of those things which they received from the *apostles*. They have neither *private masses*, nor *mangled sacraments*, nor *purgatories*, nor *pardons*. And as for the titles of *high bishops*, and those glorious names, they esteem them so, as whosoever he were that would take upon him the same, and would be called either *universal bishop*, or the *head* of the *universal church*, they make no doubt to call such a one both a passing proud man, and a man that worketh despite against all the other bishops his brethren, and a plain heretic.

M. HARDING.

As ye have oftentimes belied us, <sup>a</sup>so now ye belie the poor <sup>a</sup>Untruth. Greeks. So little are ye able to say somewhat, and therein to <sup>As it shall plainly appear.</sup> say truth. For they have mass commonly without company to communicate with the priest, which ye call private mass. So <sup>b</sup>is it all Greece over, so is it in Asia, in Syria, in Assyria, in <sup>b</sup>Untruth, Armenia, and wheresoever the religion of Christ is professed: as <sup>as large as manifest.</sup> among the Greeks in Venice I myself and divers of our countrymen have seen it commonly practised. Likewise pray they all for the dead, and think them to be relieved by the prayers, oblations, alms, and deeds of charity done for them by the living. Which mind and opinion implieth that faith <sup>c</sup>which the church <sup>c</sup>Untruth. holdeth of purgatory. <sup>For the Grecians never received these fantasies of purgatory.</sup>

But though (say ye) those Greeks have many things corrupted, yet hold they still a great number of those things which they received of the apostles. And wilt thou know, reader, what they be? Forsooth they have neither private masses, nor mangled sacraments, nor purgatories, nor pardons. Is not the wit of this defender to be commended, that maketh a man to hold that

which he hath not? Those Greeks hold still, saith he. What hold they? Marry they have not this and that. This is a new kind of holding, for a man to hold that he hath not. If they hold still, then have they still. But they have not, saith he. Then how hold they? A man may by the rules of this new logic thus reason: The Turks, Saracens, Jews, infidels, idolaters, yea the sheep of Cotswold also, if ye will, have neither private masses, nor communion under one kind, nor purgatories, nor pardons: *ergo*, they hold a number of things which they received from the apostles. The antecedent is true. Whosoever denieth the consequent, must count this defender's logic very simple. What if one should make this argument; This defender hath neither good logic, nor very fine rhetoric, nor profound philosophy, nor the right knowledge of divinity: *ergo*, he holdeth many heresies? Though both the antecedent and consequent be true, yet is the argument naught. For by like reason one might conclude an honest unlearned catholic man to be an heretic, which were false and injurious. Such is the logic, such are the topics of this new negative, and ablative divinity, for so may we worthily call it. Negative, in respect of their blasphemous tongues, denying sundry weighty points of our faith: ablative, in respect of their wicked hands, casting away, throwing down, and taking away many good things, pertaining to the maintenance of Christian religion, and God's honour. Put them from their negatives, and from their ablatives, then in what case shall they stand?

O so merrily  
this man  
playeth with  
his fancy.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

I am ashamed the world should be cumbered with so childish follies. "This defender's wit" (ye say) "is to be commended. He maketh a man to hold that he never had. And what hold they?" (say you). "Marry they have not this and that. This is a new kind of holding, for a man to hold that he hath not. If they hold still, then have they still. But they have not: then how hold they?" Now surely, M. Harding, I trow, we shall *have* and *hold* a merry man. So pretty sport ye can make yourself with *having* and *holding*. It were great pity ye should ever be otherwise occupied. *Hannibal of Carthage*, when he had heard *Phormio* the orator talk pleasantly a long while together, being afterward demanded what he thought of his eloquence, made answer in his homely sort: *Multos se vidisse deliros senes: sed qui magis quam Phormio deliraret, vidisse neminem.*

Cicero de  
Oratore 2.  
[cap. 18.]

But somewhat to yield unto your pleasure, why may not a man *hold* that he never *had*, as well as *lose* that he never *had*? In the *learned Glosses* upon your *Decrees* ye may find this note amongst others: *Nota, quod aliquis dicitur perdere quod nunquam habuit*: “Mark well this: A man may be said to *lose* that he never *had*.” And yet ye say commonly in the schools: *Privatio semper præsupponit habitum*: “The *losing* of a thing always presupposeth the *having* of the same.” Or to answer you in plainer wise, why may not a man as well *hold nothing*, as you may talk so much, and yet *say nothing*? Galen said sometime to one that spake then in such substantial manner as you speak now: *Accipe nihil, et tene fideliter*: “Take nothing, and keep it safely, and hold it fast<sup>44</sup>.”

Dist. 17.  
Concilia: in  
Glossa.

Galenus.  
[Eplt. Adag.  
p. 909.]

But to leave your follies and silly toys, M. Harding, with your *Turks*, and *Saracens*, and *sheep of Cotswold*; we say not, The Greeks *hold* still that they never *had*: but we say, They *hold* still that they ever *had*. Your *private masses* and your *demi-communions* they *hold* not: for they *had* them never. The *holy* and *whole communion* in both kinds they *hold* still: and sithence the *apostles'* time they have had them ever.

“They pray also for the dead: and therein” (ye say) “is implied your faith of purgatory.” I will not here touch the simplicity of your *rhetoric*, or *logic*, M. Harding: but only wish you to have better regard to your *divinity*. For ought that I can see, *prayer for the dead*, and your phantasy of *purgatory*, were never so straitly coupled together, but that they might well and easily go asunder. The Grecians, as they *pray for the dead*, so do they *pray for the apostles*, for the *patriarchs*, for the *prophets*, and for the *blessed Virgin, our Lady*: as you may soon perceive by St. Basil's and by St. Chrysostom's *liturgy*. Yet I think ye would not have your reader believe, as an article of your faith, that the *apostles of Christ*, the *patriarchs*, the *prophets*, and the *blessed Virgin, Christ's*

Liturgia Basil. [ed. Lat. p. 44: ed. Gr. p. 59.]  
Liturg. Chrysostom. [ed. Lat. p. 69: ed. Gr. p. 98.]

<sup>44</sup> [“Nihil cape, serva bene:” (attributed by Janus Cornarus to Galen) in Epitome adagiorum.]

*Mother*, are still in *purgatory*<sup>45</sup>. Whatsoever other opinion the Grecians have of the dead, certain it is, they could never yet be brought to believe your *purgatory*.

[Roff. contr. Luther. apud Polydor. de Invent. lib. 8. cap. 1. [p. 456.]

Roffensis, one of your greatest doctors, as I have said before<sup>46</sup>, saith thus: *Purgatorium Græcis usque ad hunc diem non est creditum*: “The Grecians until this day believe not *purgatory*.” Thus, M. Harding, I know not whether by your *logic* or by your *divinity*, (for both are marvellous,) ye would fain force your poor Greeks to hold that thing that they never had.

Another proper pastime ye make yourself with your *negatives* and *ablatives*. And wherefore, it were hard to tell, saving that, I see, ye were well disposed, and well it became you to be merry. <sup>47</sup>The ancient learned fathers, having to deal with impudent heretics, that in defence of their errors avouched the judgment of all the old bishops and doctors that had been before them, and the general consent of the primitive and whole universal church, and that with as good regard of truth, and as faithfully, as you do now, the better to discover the shameless boldness and nakedness of their doctrine, were oftentimes likewise forced to use the *negative*, and so to drive the same heretics, as we do you, to prove their affirmatives: which thing to do it was never possible. The ancient father Irenæus thus stayed himself, as we do, by the *negative*: *Hoc neque prophetæ prædicaverunt, neque Dominus docuit, neque apostoli tradiderunt*: “This thing neither did the prophets publish, nor our Lord teach, nor the apostles deliver.” By a like *negative* Chrysostom saith: *Hanc arborem non Paulus plantavit, non Apollo rigavit, non Deus auxit*: “This tree” (of error) “neither Paul planted, nor Apollos watered, nor

Iren. lib. 1. cap. 1. [p. 35.]

Chrys. de Incompr. Del Natura, hom. 3. [l. 463.]

<sup>45</sup> [See vol. v. p. 201, (with the note <sup>27</sup>,) where the same line of argument is pursued.]

<sup>46</sup> [Vol. v. p. 214.]

<sup>47</sup> [This passage (“The ancient learned fathers . . . they are not of God,”) is quoted at length by Hooker (E. P. lib. ii. c. 6. 4. Keble’s edit. p. 317.): where he

assigns the proper limits of the validity which belongs to this kind of argument “ab autoritate negative.” His opponent had quoted bishop Jewel against him, without observing the real nature of the argument. See note <sup>21</sup>, vol. i. p. 289 supra: also i. p. 51.]



God increased." In like sort Leo saith: *Quid opus est in cor admittere quod lex non docuit, quod prophetia non cecinit, quod evangelii veritas non prædicavit, quod apostolica doctrina non tradidit?* "What needeth it to believe that thing, that neither the law hath taught, nor the prophets have spoken, nor the gospel hath preached, nor the apostles have delivered?" And again: *Quomodo.....nova inducuntur, quæ nunquam nostri sensere majores?* "How are these new devices brought in, that our fathers never knew<sup>48</sup>?"

St. Augustine having reckoned up a great number of the *bishops of Rome*, by a general *negative*, saith thus: *In hoc ordine successionis nullus Donatista episcopus inventur*: "In all this order of succession of bishops, there is not one bishop found that was a Donatist." St. Gregory, being himself a *bishop of Rome*, and writing against the title of *universal bishop*, saith thus: *Nemo decessorum meorum hoc tam prophano vocabulo uti consensit:—nullus Romanorum pontificum hoc singularitatis nomen assumpsit*: "None of all my predecessors ever consented to use this ungodly title: *no bishop of Rome* ever took upon him this name of singularity." By such negatives, M. Harding, we reprove the vanity and novelty of your religion. We tell you, none of the ancient catholic learned fathers, either Greek or Latin, ever used either your *private mass*, or your *half communion*, or your barbarous *unknown prayers*. Paul never planted them: Apollos never watered them: God never increased them. They are of yourselves: they are not of God.

These and other like *negatives* the holy fathers in old times might safely use without controlment: for that there was no *doctor of Louvain* as yet up start to carp and quarrel at their *divinity*. Leave this childish and unsavoury sporting and trifling with your *negatives*, M. Harding. It were a great deal more seemly for a man of learning

<sup>48</sup> [Leo Epist. 97. c. 5. As Mr. Keble observes, this passage is quoted by St. Leo from S. Ambros. de Incarnatione Domini, cap. 6. ed. Bened. tom. ii. col. 715, "Quomodo igitur Nicæni Concilii nomen obtenditur, et "nova," &c.]

and gravity, and more to your purpose, to prove your *affirmatives*.

“They have private mass” (ye say) “in all Græcia, Asia, Syria, Assyria, Armenia, and wheresoever the religion of Christ is professed.” All this we must needs believe upon your word: for other proof ye offer to make none. Notwithstanding, if they have such *private masses* in all those countries, tell us, I beseech you, who were the authors and makers of these *masses*? Ye will say, St. James, St. Chrysostom, or St. Basil. For of these *names* and *masses* ye have told us many a tale. Yet if ye consider the matter well, ye shall find that these self-same *masses* were our communions, and nothing like to your *masses*: and that the holy *sacraments* at the same, contrary to your new devices, were delivered generally in *both kinds* to all the people.

Liturgia Jac.  
[ed. Lat. p.  
27.]

St. James in his *mass* saith thus: *Diaconi tollunt discos et calices, ad impertiendum populo*: “The deacons take up the dishes and the cups, to minister the sacrament unto the people.”

Liturgia  
Chrys. [p.  
73.]

St. Chrysostom in his *mass*, saith thus: *Post mysteria feruntur ad locum, ubi populus debet communicare*: “Afterward the holy mysteries or sacraments be brought unto the place, where the people must receive together.”

Liturg. Basil.  
[p. 44.]  
[Ib. p. 49.]

St. Basil in his *mass* saith thus: *Nos omnes de uno pane et de uno calice participantes, &c. Cantores cantant communionem: et sic communicant omnes*: “All we receiving of one bread and one cup, &c. The quire singeth the communion: and so they communicate all together.” Therefore, M. Harding, ye must needs confess, either that the Grecians this day use none of these *masses*, or that their *masses* are not your *masses*, but our *communions*: which both are contrary to yourself.

Georg. Cas-  
sander in Li-  
turg. [p. 57.]

In the Armenians' liturgy it is written thus: *Qui non sunt digni communicare hanc oblationem Dei, exeant foras ante fores ecclesiæ, et ibi orent*: “They that are not worthy to receive this oblation of God, let them go forth before the church door; and there let them pray.”

Of the Grecians' order in this behalf your great and

special doctor cardinal Bessarion, being himself a Greek born, saith thus: *Hoc ipse ordo rerum posebat: primum, consecrare: deinde, frangere: postea, distribuere: quod nos in præsentī facimus:* “This the very order of the things required: first, that we should *consecrate* or bless the bread: next, that we should *break it*: last of all, that we should *divide it*, (or deliver it to the people.) *Which thing we*” (Grecians) “*do at this present day.*” Thus you see, M. Harding, that the Grecians this day *consecrate, break, and divide* the sacrament unto the people, as we do. They receive it not privately to themselves alone, the people standing by, and gazing on them, as you do. Therefore it is untrue, that you say, “They have this day your private mass.”

Bessarion,  
De Sacram.  
Euchar. [p.  
187.]  
Circa A. D.  
1450.

Touching the Grecians that live now in Venice, what order they use there, I cannot tell. Notwithstanding, as I have heard say, *private mass* they have not. But if they have, living under the *pope's jurisdiction*, it is no marvel. Certain it is, that Venice is no part of Græcia.

Matthias Illyricus, being himself born in Dalmatia, not far from the confines or borders of Græcia, and therefore, as it may be thought, the better acquainted with their orders, saith thus: *Ecclesia Græca, eique conjunctæ, Asiatica, Macedonica, Mæsica, Valachica, Ruthenica, Moschovitica, et Africana, id est, totus mundus, vel certe ejus [suppl. longe] maxima pars, nunquam primatum papæ communi consensu concesserunt: nunquam purgatorium probaverunt: nunquam privatas missas:.....nunquam communionem sub una specie:* “The church of Græcia, and the churches of Asia, Macedonia, Mysia, Valachia, Russia, Moschovia, and Africa, joined thereunto, that is to say, in a manner the whole world, or at least the greatest part thereof, never granted the *pope his supremacy*: never allowed either *purgatory*, or *private masses*, or the *communion under one kind.*”

Matt. Illyric.  
in Testibus  
Veritatis, p.  
5. [tit. iv. ed.  
1672.]

In the proem or entry of the *council of Ferrara* it is written thus: *Proxima Dominica quindecim Græci sacerdotes, domi imperatoris, jussu ejus, missam solenniter celebrarunt. Ubi etiam marchio cum suis civibus adfuit, et*

Conc. Ferrar.  
in Proemio,  
[xxx. 473.  
474.]

*panem benedictum, per patriarchæ dextram, more Græcorum, accepit, atque libavit*: “The next Sunday, fifteen Greek priests, within the emperor’s palace, by his commandment, said a solemn mass, (or communion,) whereas the *marquis* was present with his citizens, and, as the manner of the Grecians is, received and tasted the bread consecrate, at the hand of the patriarch.” Here it is to be noted by the way, that these fifteen priests said not fifteen several masses, as the manner is in the church of Rome, but all together one only mass: and that the same one mass was no private ministration, but a communion.

*Petrus Urb. in Vita Deus-dedit Papæ.*

Whereof Petrus Urbevetanus saith thus: *Tu mad instar Græcorum non cantabatur in una ecclesia, nisi forsan una missa*: “Then there was sung in one church, no more, saving perchance one only mass, as the manner of the Grecians is.”

*Durand. in Rational. lib. 4.*

Likewise saith Durandus: *Offerabant magnum panem et omnibus sufficientem: quod adhuc Græci servare dicuntur*: “They offered up one great loaf that might suffice all the church: which order, they say, the Grecians keep until this day.”

By these few, I trust, M. Harding, it may soon appear, whether of us have belied your poor Grecians.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 2.

Now then, since it is manifest, and out of all <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 69.]</sup> peradventure, that these men are fallen from the Greeks, of whom they received the gospel, of whom they received the faith, the true religion and their church itself; what is the matter, why they will not now be called home again to the same men, as it were, to their originals and first founders? And why be they afraid to take a pattern of the apostles’ and old fathers’ times, as though they all had been void of understanding? Do these men, ween ye, see more, or set more by the church of God, than they did, who first delivered us these things?

M. HARDING.

Soft and fair, sir Defender, you have not yet proved that you say is manifest and out of all peradventure. Remember you not the old homely verse of your sophistry: *Neque negativis recte concludere si vis?*.....Speak to the purpose, or else I would you would make an end of your filly follies. For indeed you trifle, and say nothing worth to be answered. And here little cause do you minister unto me to utter substantial stuff. Which I desire the discreet reader to consider, for mine excuse, that with a trifle I do also but trifle.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, by your own confession, ye do but trifle with your *filly follies*: for that, I trow, your substantial and better stuff was not yet ready.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 15. Divis. 3.*

Indeed, we have renounced that *church*, wherein we could neither have the *word of God* sincerely taught, nor the *sacraments* rightly administered, nor the *name of God* duly called upon: which *church* also themselves confess to be faulty in many points: and wherein was nothing, able to stay any wise man, or one that hath consideration of his own safety.

M. HARDING.

.....And why have ye renounced this church, but for that ye might not be suffered to set forth to the loss of Christian souls the detestable heresies of Wickliffe, Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, and other your false masters, which ye call your sincere word of God<sup>49</sup> after your schismatical and heretical manner:.....That ye say, there was nothing in the catholic church able to stay any wise man, or any that hath consideration of his safety, it is one of your impudent lies.

There were both wise men in the church, and great multitudes of such as had good regard of their souls' health, always before the devil had such a hand upon Luther and the rest of your new apostles and apostates.

<sup>49</sup> [Harding adds, "for that ye might not at your pleasure abrogate five sacraments and administer two only."]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 15. Divis. 4.*

To conclude, we have forsaken the *church* as it <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 69.]</sup> is now, not as it was in old times past, and have so gone from it, as *Daniel* went out of the lions' den, and the *three children* out of the furnace: and to say the truth, we have been cast out by these men, (being cursed of them, as they use to say, with book, bell, and candle<sup>50</sup>;) rather than have gone away from them of ourselves.

## M. HARDING.

The church that now is, and the church that was in old time, is one church, as a man in his old age is the same man he was in his youth. <sup>a</sup>From the which church no faults or imperfections can excuse you for your departing. . . . . Neither have ye gone from it as Daniel was delivered out of the lions' den, nor as the three children out of the furnace: but ye have departed wilfully from the house of God, where, touching faith, all be of one accord, unto the synagogue of Antichrist, unto Babylon of sects, where is no order, but confusion, unto the kingdom of Satan, and there ye remain as it were in a den of lions, where that roaring lion, with his fellows, lieth in wait seeking whom he may devour. Ye have stepped from the place of spiritual refrigery into the fryingpan of schisms and heresies, and from thence, after that ye have now boiled and fried in malice and rancour against the church, except ye repent, ye are like to leap into the furnace of hell, that for ever shall torment you, and never consume you. Complain not of your casting out of the church. To be excommunicate ye have deserved. And that kind of punishment is, by a merciful discipline, extended upon you, partly for your amendment, partly to conserve the rest of the body whole from your pestiferous contagion. . . . .

a Untruth. For God himself saith: "Come forth from the midst of them, O my people," Apoc. xviii. 4.

A hot kind of divinity.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Now ye begin to keep hot schools, M. Harding. Your *fryingpans* and *furnaces*, with other your like kitchen implements of *frying* and *boiling*, are hot and dangerous to deal withal.

The causes of our departure from you are answered before.

<sup>50</sup> [Apol. Lat. ". . . diris et devotionibus ejecti sumus."]

“The church” (ye say) “that now is, and the church that was in old times, is one church.” Even so, as I shewed you before, the *moon* being full, and the same *moon* eclipsed, is *one moon*: even so, a *man* well advised, and the same *man* stark mad, is *one man*: even so, the *house of God* and a *cave of thieves* is *one house*.

Matt. xxi. 13.

Ye have *excommunicate* us and put us from you. So did certain of your predecessors and fathers *excommunicate* *Christ* and his apostles. So did Diotrephes, that first claimed your *papal primacy*, *excommunicate* the faithful of *Christ*, that were the first planters of the gospel. So it is written in the Apocalypse, that *Antichrist* shall *excommunicate* all them that will not adore the *image of the beast*.

Joh. ix. 22.  
xii. 42. xvi. 2.

Joh. 9.  
“Qui amat  
primatum  
gerere.”  
Apoc. xiii. 7.

But the pope himself saith: *Excommunicatus non potest excommunicare*: “He that is *excommunicate* himself, hath no right or power to *excommunicate* others.” And in your own law it is written thus: *Qui illicite alium excommunicat, seipsum, non illum, condemnat*: “He that unlawfully *excommunicateth* another, *condemneth* not him, but himself.”

24. qu. 1. Ait:  
[in Glossa.]

24. qu. 3.  
Comperimus: Rubr.

St. Augustine saith: *Quid obest homini, si eum de illa tabula delere velit humana ignorantia, quem de libro viventium non delet iniqua conscientia?* “What is a man the worse, if the *ignorance of a man* strike him out of the book of the *church*, if *ill conscience* strike him not out of the book of life?” In this case, St. Augustine saith, it cometh sometimes to pass, *ut plurimæ sint foris oves, et plurimi sint intus lupi*, “that there be many sheep without the *church*, and many wolves within the *church*.”

Aug. ad Clericos Hippo-  
nens. [ii. 184.]  
Citatur 11.  
qu. 3. Quid  
obest.

Aug. in Joh.  
Tract. 45. [iii.  
pt. 2. p. 600.]

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. Divis. 5.

And we are come to that *church*, wherein they themselves cannot deny (if they will say truly, and as they think in their own conscience) but all things be governed purely and reverently, and as much as we possibly could, very near to the order used in old times.

M. HARDING.

.....Ye are come unto the malignant church, to the congregation of reprobates, whither as into a sink in manner all the heresies that Satan ever raised up from the beginning be avoided.....

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 16. Divis. 1.*

Let them compare our churches and theirs together, and they shall see, that themselves have most shamefully gone from the apostles, and we most justly have gone from them. For we, following the *example of Christ, of the apostles, and the holy fathers*, give the people the *holy communion*, whole and perfect: but these men, contrary to all the fathers, to all the apostles, and contrary to Christ himself, do sever the sacraments, and pluck away the one part from the people, and that with most notorious sacrilege, as Gelasius termeth it.

We have brought again the *Lord's supper unto Christ's institution*, and have made it a *communion* in very deed, common and indifferent to a great number, according to the name. For of that it is called a *communion*. But these men have changed all things, *contrary to Christ's institution*, and have made a *private mass* of the *holy communion*. And so it cometh to pass, that we give the *Lord's supper* unto the people, and they give them a vain pageant to gaze upon.

We affirm together with the ancient fathers, that the *body of Christ* is not eaten but of the good and faithful, and of those that are endued with the Spirit of Christ. Their doctrine is, that *Christ's very body* effectually, and, as they speak, *really and substantially*, may not only be eaten of the wicked



and unfaithful men, but also (which is monstrous and horrible to be spoken) of *mice and dogs*<sup>51</sup>.

We use to pray in our *churches* after that fashion, as, according to Paul's lesson, the people may know what we pray, and may answer *Amen*, with a general consent. These men, like sounding metal, yell out in the churches unknown and strange words without understanding, without knowledge, and without devotion: yea, and do it of purpose, because the people should understand nothing at all. 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

## M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup>As comparison cannot duly be made between light and darkness, between truth and lying, between Christ and Belial: so neither between the catholic church and starting holes of heretics. You say much and prove nothing.....The most ye have to crake of, which ye have never done withal, is your ministering of both kinds unto the people, your new-found holy-day, the English communion, your service in the vulgar tongue, and your vile objection of mice and dogs. This is the store-box of M. Jewel's high divinity, which he maketh no great store of, but shaketh it abroad every where. To every point I have said so much, as is <sup>b</sup>enough to stay the hearts of those that fear God, in mine Answer to M. Jewel's Challenge. To the matter of both kinds, and the objection made out of Gelasius, in the second article: to that of private mass, in the first article: to all that is said for the church service in the vulgar tongue, in the third article: to the objection of mice, dogs, and worms, in the twenty-third article. The same here to rehearse again, I think it needless. a Untruth. For there is no better comparison than between contraries: *Contraria juxta se posita magis elucescunt.*

But where ye affirm the body of Christ not to be eaten but of the good and faithful only, if ye mean the sacramental eating, so as it is eaten under the sacrament, in the visible form of bread and wine, and not of the <sup>c</sup>spiritual eating only, that is false. In that ye say the fathers be on your side, meaning the <sup>c</sup>sacramental eating, ye belie them. And so likewise reporting our doctrine to be, that wicked and unfaithful men may eat the body of <sup>c</sup>Christ effectually, ye belie us. We teach that the evil may eat the body of Christ really, that is, indeed, but not effectually. They only eat effectually, who eating it worthily obtain the effect of Christ's body; which is the unity of the mystical body of Christ, and increase of grace. <sup>d</sup>There is verily (saith St. Gregory)<sup>52</sup> b Enough no doubt and sufficient. For in the selfsame four articles, M. Harding hath uttered fourscore and fourteen great untruths. c Unfruitful and vain distinctions. Read the answer. d This book is full of fables and vanities, and therefore not thought to be St. Gregory's.

Gregor. Dial. lib. 4.

<sup>51</sup> [Supra, Replie, Art. 23. vol. iii. p. 455.]

<sup>52</sup> [The Bened. edd. and Romish writers in general maintain the

genuineness of these Dialogues: Protestants dispute it. See the grounds for either opinion in Cave.]

in sinners, and in them which receive unworthily, the true flesh of Christ and his true blood, *sed essentia, non salubri efficientia*, but in substance, not in wholesome effect.....<sup>52</sup>

That evil men receive the true body of Christ sacramentally, no less than good, where I might allege in manner all the old fathers, <sup>e</sup>St. Augustine only may suffice, who affirmeth the same, speaking thus of Judas: *Tolerat ipse Dominus Judam, diabolum, furem, et venditorem suum sicut accipere inter innocentes discipulos, quod norunt fideles, pretium nostrum*: "Our Lord himself doth tolerate Judas, and suffereth a devil, a thief, and him that sold him, to receive amongst his innocent disciples <sup>f</sup>our price which the faithful do know<sup>53</sup>.".....But what need any man to require the testimonies of fathers, sith Paul teacheth us so to believe? "Who-<sup>1</sup>soever" (saith he) "eateth this bread and drinketh of the cup of our Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of our Lord."

<sup>e</sup> St. Augustine is directly to the contrary. See the answer.

<sup>f</sup> "Our price," he meaneth the sacrament of our price.

Aug. ep. 162. [ii. 99.]

1 Cor. xi. 27.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

There is no better comparison to be made, M. Harding, than between *light* and *darkness*, *truth* and *falsehood*, *Christ* and *Belial*: for one of these contraries doth evermore bewray the other. And therefore Christ saith: "He that doth ill hateth the *light*, and cometh not to it, lest his evil doings should be espied." And this is it, M. Harding, that you so carefully keep the people from the *light of God's word*, lest by comparison thereof, they should begin to loathe your *darkness*. Pliny saith: *Tritico reperto, continuo damnatum est hordeum, et quadrupedum refectibus traditum*: "As soon as *wheat* was once found," (by comparison thereof) "straightway *barley* was refused, and given to cattle to feed upon<sup>54</sup>."

John iii. 20.

Plin. lib. 18. [cap. 7.]

Cypr. ad Cornelium, lib. 1, ep. 3. [p. 84.]

St. Cyprian saith: *Hæc est, frater, vera dementia, non cogitare quod mendacia non diu fallant: noctem tam diu esse, donec [l. quamdiu] illucescat dies*: "This is very mere madness, my brother, not to consider that lies cannot long deceive the world:" (remember) "it is *night* no longer but until the *day* spring." And therefore Chrysostom saith, as it

<sup>52</sup> ["If your lady the interpreter hath put in a spoonful of lying of her own tempering into your hotch-pot . . . revoke the error, and beware hereafter how ye admit women, though ye love them never so much, to be meddling and tampering with your clergy

matters."]

<sup>53</sup> [Harding here refers to Stephen Gardiner.]

<sup>54</sup> [Plin. "Panem ex hordeo, antequam usitatum vita damnavit, quadrupedumque tradidit refectibus."]

is alleged before: *Hæretici claudunt januas veritatis*..... : Chrys. in Matth. c. 23. homil. 44. in Opere imperfecto. [vi. app. 186.]  
 “Heretics shut up the gates of the truth. For they know right well, if the truth may appear, their falsehood will soon be espied, and the churches shall be none of theirs.” Tertullian saith: *Ipsa doctrina hæreticorum cum apostolica comparata, ex diversitate et contrarietate sua pronuntiabit, neque apostoli alicujus authoris esse, neque apostolici viri*: Tertullian. de Præscription. [c. 32. p. 213.]  
 “The very doctrine of heretics compared together with the apostles’ doctrine, even by the diversity and contrariety that is in it, beareth witness of itself, that it never came, neither from any apostle of Christ, nor from any apostolic man.”

When the emperor Adrianus had yielded to grant the Christians one church within the city of Rome, certain of his privy council advised him in any wise not so to do: “For that,” they said, “if the Christians might have but one church within the city, the whole people would all become Christians: and by comparison thereof, their *idols’ churches* should be forsaken.” Restore you the *holy communion*, M. Harding, and ye shall see your *masses* and mockeries soon fall to ground, as did the *idol Dagon* at the presence of the *ark of God*. St. Hierom saith: *Mendacium Antichristi, Christi veritas devorabit*: “The truth of Christ shall devour and consume the *lying of Antichrist*.” Ælius Lampridius. [In Alex. Sev.]  
1 Sam. v. 3.  
Hier. ad Agasiani, qu. 11. [iv. 210.]

Touching the *shaking out of store-boxes*, ye had no great cause to complain. For there is not one of all these matters, one only of *private mass* excepted, that hitherto throughout this Apology, hath, to my remembrance, been touched or mentioned more than once. But it is a small matter, M. Harding, that may suffice you to make a quarrel.

That *mice and dogs may eat the very natural body of Christ, and that really, substantially*, and indeed: it is your doctrine, it is not ours. For we utterly abhor it, and defy it, as most detestable and loathsome villainy.

I marvel not to hear you say, *that wicked creatures and faithless infidels may eat Christ’s body*, seeing ye doubt not to avouch the same of *brute beasts and dumb cattle*.

Yet St. Augustine saith: *Hoc est manducare illam escam, et illum potum bibere, in Christo manere, et illum manentem* Aug in Joh. Tract. 26. [iii. pt. 2. p. 501.]

*in se habere*: "This is the eating of that meat, and the drinking of that drink, for a man to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling within him." Even so saith Christ himself: "*He that catcheth my flesh and drinketh my blood,*" (is neither *wicked creature*, nor *faithless infidel*, nor *dog*, nor *mouse*, but) "*dwelleth in me, and I in him.*"

Aug. ep. 162.  
[ii. 99.]

But St. Augustine saith, *Judas accepit pretium nostrum*, "Judas received our price," which, by your exposition, can be none other but the body of Christ. O, M. Harding, ye should not thus have mocked the world with this authority of St. Augustine. You yourself know, ye deal not plainly: you yourself know, that St. Augustine by these words (*our price*) meant only the *sacrament* of our

Chrys. ad  
Hebræ. hom.  
16. [xii. 159.]

*price*. So Chrysostom saith: *Baptisma Christi, sanguis Christi est*: "The *baptism* of Christ is the *blood* of Christ<sup>53</sup>." Not for that it is so indeed, but for that it is a *sacrament of the blood of Christ*. Even so it is noted

De Cons.  
dist. 2. Hoc  
est.

in your own Decrees: *Ipsa immolatio carnis Christi, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, vocatur Christi passio, mors, crucifixio: non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio*: "The oblation of the flesh of Christ, that is wrought with the priest's hands, is called the *passion*, the *death*, and the *crucifying* of Christ: not in truth of matter, but in a *mystery* signifying." This exposition ye may not well refuse: it is St. Augustine's<sup>54</sup>, it is your own. Hereof we have spoken otherwheres more at large. But to put the matter out of doubt, that it may appear in what sense Judas *received the price of Christ's death*, St. Augustine himself thereof saith thus: *Christus adhibuit Judam ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis suis commendavit et tradidit*: "Christ received Judas unto his banquet, whereat he gave to his disciples the figure of his body and blood."

Aug. in Psal.  
3. [iv. 7.]

The book that ye allege in the name of St. Gregory is vain and childish, as you know, and full of fables, and not St. Gregory's.

<sup>53</sup> [This is not accurately cited, and p. 362: where the original even according to the version of Greek is printed.]  
Mutianus. See supra, vol. iii. p. 8. <sup>54</sup> [Supra, vol. iii. 333. note 36.]

But St. Paul saith: "Whosoever eateth of this bread, 1 Cor. xi. 27. and drinketh of the cup of our Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of our Lord." And what will you conclude hereof, M. Harding? Even so St. Augustine writeth of the *water of baptism*: *Baptismus valet, aliis ad regnum: aliis ad iudicium*: "Baptism is available to some unto the kingdom of God: to some unto judgment." Again he saith: *Baptismum multi habent, non ad vitam æternam, sed ad pœnam æternam, non bene utentes tanto bono*: "Some have baptism, not to life everlasting, but to pain everlasting, not well using so good a thing."

Likewise saith Tertullian: *Si qui pondus intelligant baptismi, magis timebunt consecutionem, quam dilationem*: Tertull. de Baptismo. [c. 18. p. 232.] "They that understand the weight of *baptism*, will fear more the getting of it than the delaying."

Yet ye press the matter further: St. Paul saith, "Whoso eateth unworthily of this bread, is guilty of the body and blood of Christ:" *ergo*, (say you) "Christ's body and blood must needs be really present." Here, M. Harding, it were a worthy matter to see by what engines ye would prove these hasty conclusions, or how ye would force this *guilt* and this presence to go together. For think you, that no man can be *guilty of the body and blood of Christ*, but he that hath Christ's *body and blood really present* in his hand? Verily, St. Augustine saith: *Reus erit, non parvi pretii, sed sanguinis Christi, qui violat, et commaculat animam, Christi sanguine, et passione mundatam*: Aug. de Tempore, Serm. 20 [al. 120, tom. v. app. 271.] "He is *guilty* of no small price, but even of the *blood of Christ*, that" (by fornication or advoutery) "defileth his own soul, that was made clean by the *passion and blood of Christ*<sup>55</sup>." Yet hath he not therefore *Christ's blood really present*.

Athanasius saith: *Adorantes Dominum, neque ita, ut dignum est eo, viventes, non sentiunt se reos fieri Dominicæ mortis*: Athanas. de Passione, et Cruce Domini. [ii. 109.] "Worshipping our Lord, and not living so as is meet for our Lord, they feel not, that thereby they are

<sup>55</sup> [By the Ben. ed. this sermon is placed in the Appendix, as not genuine; he adds, that in the Bibl. Patr. it is published under the name of Eusebius.]

made *guilty of our Lord's death*<sup>56</sup>." So saith God by the prophet Ezekiel, "I will require the *blood of the people* at thy hand."

Christ saith: "God shall require of you the *blood* of the *prophets*, that hath been shed from the beginning of the world."

This *guilt*, M. Harding, may well stand without any *real presence* of the *blood*, either of *Christ*, or of the *prophets*. Ye may well be *guilty of Christ's* and the *prophets' blood*, notwithstanding ye have neither the one nor the other *really present* in your hand.

This therefore is St. Paul's meaning, that the wicked resorting unworthily to the *holy mysteries*, and having no regard what is meant thereby, despise the death and cross of Christ, and therefore are *guilty of the Lord's body and blood*, that are represented in the sacrament.

Chrysostom saith, as he is alleged in the second council of Nice: *Is qui imaginem imperatoris violat, in prototypum dignitatis injustus est*: "He that defileth the emperor's image, is injurious to the majesty of the emperor's person, that is pourtrayed in the image."

St. Cyprian saith: (*Inapiti*) *in morte Christi nullus superest quæstus: sed justissime eos beneficia neglecta [leg. contempta] condemnant*: "The wicked have no gain by the death of Christ, but the benefits that they have despised do most justly condemn them."

To come near to the purpose, St. Augustine saith: *Habent foris sacramentum corporis Christi: sed rem ipsam non tenent intus, cujus est illud sacramentum. Et ideo sibi judicium manducant et bibunt*: "Outwardly they have the sacrament of Christ's body: but the thing itself" (which is Christ's body represented by the sacrament) "inwardly in their hearts they have not." And therefore they eat and drink their own judgment. Here St. Augustine saith, they are *guilty*, not because they receive, but *because they receive not the body of Christ*. Mark well these words, M. Harding: they are effectual. The wicked by St. Au-

<sup>56</sup> [This work is placed by the Bened. edd. in their second volume "inter Dubia."]

Ezek. xxxiii. 8.

Luke xi. 50.

Conc. Nicen. 2. Act. 6. [xii. 1066: in marg.]

Cypr. [I. Arnold.] de Ab- lutione pe- dum. [app. cxix.]

Aug. ad Bo- nif. epist. 50. [ii. 663.]

gustine's judgment are *guilty, not because they receive, but because they receive not the body of Christ.*

Again he saith: *Qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio non manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem: licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi: sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit:* "Whoso abideth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, out of doubt he eateth not spiritually his flesh, nor drinketh his blood: notwithstanding carnally" (that is to say with his bodily mouth) "and visibly he do press with his teeth the *sacrament of the body and blood of Christ:* "and rather eateth and drinketh" (not Christ's very *body and blood*, but) "the sacrament of so great a thing unto his judgment." These words, M. Harding, be so plain, that I cannot imagine what ye should more desire. They are *guilty of the blood of Christ*, for that they despise the price wherewith they were saved, not for that they receive it really into their mouths.

So St. Augustine saith again: *Reus erit æternæ mortis, quia vilem in se habuit sanguinem redemptoris:* "The advouterer is guilty of everlasting death, because he despised in himself the blood of our Saviour <sup>57</sup>."

The distinction that you imagine between *real receiving* in the wicked, and *effectual receiving* in the godly, as it is only of yourself, without the authority of any doctor, Greek or Latin, so is it nothing else but a very *effectual* and *real folly*. For the very body of Christ, if it be not *effectually received*, is not received. Christ himself saith: "*He that eateth me shall live by me.*" St. Ambrose saith: *Hic panis est remissio peccatorum. Qui accipit, non moritur morte peccatoris:* "This bread is the remission of sins. He that receiveth it, shall not die the death of a sinner <sup>58</sup>."

St. Augustine saith: *Qui non sumit hanc escam, non* Aug. in Joh. tract. 20. [iii. pt. 2. p. 500.]

<sup>57</sup> [Respecting this sermon, see p. 199, note <sup>55</sup>.]

<sup>58</sup> [S. Ambros. "... qui autem accipit, non morietur peccatoris morte, quia panis hic remissio peccatorum est."]

Aug. in Joh. tract. 20. [iii. pt. 2. p. 501.]

Aug. de Tempore, serm. 120. [v. app. 271.]

Ambros. de Benedict. Patriarch. cap. 6. [ol. cap. 9. tom. i. 525.]

*habet vitam: et qui eam sumit, habet vitam, et hanc utique æternam:* “He that receiveth not this meat, hath no life: and he that receiveth the same, hath life, and that everlasting.”

Aug. eodem loco. [ibid.]

Likewise again he saith: *Hujus rei sacramentum..... in mensa Dominica præparatur, et de mensa Dominica sumitur: quibusdam ad vitam, quibusdam ad exitium: res vero ipsa, cujus est sacramentum, omni homini ad vitam, nulli ad exitium, quicumque ejus particeps fuerit:* “The sacrament hereof is prepared upon the *Lord’s table*, and from the *Lord’s table* is received: to some unto life, to some unto destruction. But the thing itself,” (that is, the body of Christ,) “whereof it is a *sacrament*, is received of all men to life, and of no man to destruction, whosoever shall be partaker of it.” You may not negligently pass over these words, M. Harding. St. Augustine saith plainly: “The thing itself that is represented by the sacrament,” (that is to say, the very body of Christ) “is received of all men to life, and of no man to destruction, whosoever shall be partaker of it.” Hereof you must needs conclude against yourself, that the *wicked receive not the body of Christ.*”

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 16. Divis. 2.*

But, not to tarry about rehearsing all points, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 70.]</sup> wherein we and they differ, for they have well nigh no end, we turn the *scriptures into all tongues:* they scant suffer them to be had abroad in any tongue<sup>59</sup>.

M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup> This is nothing but open mockery.

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, too fond for a child. For there was never such order taken by the governors of the church.

.....We <sup>a</sup>gladly suffer them to be had in every place of Christendom in the learned tongues, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, (TO BE READ OF THE VULGAR UNLEARNED PEOPLE.) Neither were they altogether forbidden to be had in some vulgar tongues before the saucy malapertness of heretics forced the governors of the church, for safeguard of the people, <sup>b</sup>to take other order.

<sup>59</sup> [See this subject discussed supra vol. iii 262. (Replie, Art. 15.)]



## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye can vouchsafe to allow us the *scriptures* in the three *learned tongues*, *Greek*, *Hebrew*, and *Latin*: that is to say, in such sort as the simple people may in no wise touch them. But where did God ever sanctify these three tongues, and call them *learned*? or where were they ever so specially canonized and allowed, above all other tongues, to the custody of the *scriptures*?

St. Augustine saith: *Scriptura canonica tot linguarum literis, et ordine, et successione celebrationis ecclesiasticæ custoditur*: “The canonical scripture is kept in the *letters of so many tongues*, and by the order and succession of ecclesiastical publishing.” Again he saith: *Scriptura divina ab una lingua profecta, per varias interpretum linguas, longe lateque diffusa, innotuit gentibus ad salutem*: “The holy *scriptures*, passing from one tongue, and being published abroad, far and wide,” (not only by *three learned tongues*, but also) “*by sundry tongues of interpreters*, have come to the knowledge of nations and people, to their salvation.” Again he saith: . . . . . *Habemus Dei beneficium, qui scripturas suas in multis linguis esse voluit*: “We have the benefit of God, that would have his *scriptures* to be” (not only in *three*, but) “*in many tongues*.” St. Chrysostom saith: *Syri, Ægyptii, Indi, Persæ, Æthiopes, et innumeræ aliæ gentes, dogmata ab hoc introducta, in suam transferentes linguam homines barbari, philosophari didicerunt*: “The *Syrians*, the *Egyptians*, the *Indians*, the *Persians*, the *Ethiopians*, and other *nations innumerable*, translating into their own tongues the doctrine that they had received of St. John, being barbarous people, endeavoured themselves to learn wisdom.” St. Hierom saith: *Scriptura sancta populis omnibus legitur, ut omnes intelligant*: “The holy scripture is read to all nations, that all may understand it.” It were hard to say, that all the nations of the world read or heard the scriptures in *Greek*, *Hebrew*, or *Latin*, to the intent they might the better understand it. If these authorities seem not plain

Aug. Epist.  
48. [ii. 246.]

Aug. de Doct.  
Christ. lib. 2.  
cap. 5. [iii.  
21.]

Aug. in Psal.  
cv. [iv. 1200.]

Chrys. in Joh.  
hom. 1. [viii.  
10.]

Hieron. in Ps.  
lxxxvi. [ii. pt.  
2. 350.]

Theod. de  
Corrigend.  
Græc. affect.  
lib. 5. [ed.  
Gaisf. p. 219.]

and sufficient, Theodoretus saith further: *Hebraici libri, non modo in Græcum idioma conversi sunt, sed in Romanam quoque linguam, Ægyptiam, Persicam, Indicam, Armenicam, et Scythicam, atque adeo Sauromaticam: semelque ut dicam, in linguas omnes, quibus ad hanc diem nationes utuntur*: “The Hebrew books of the scriptures are translated, not only into the *Greek* or *Latin* tongue, but also into the tongues of *Egypt*, *Persia*, *India*, *Armenia*, *Scythia*, and *Sarmatia*: and, to be short, into all the tongues that until this day are used in the world.” This, I trow, is somewhat more than *Greek*, *Hebrew*, and *Latin*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. Divis. 3.

We allure the people to read and to hear God's <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 70.]</sup> word; they drive the people from it.

M. HARDING.

Ye allure the people busily to hear and read the scriptures for evil purpose. And thereby ye have filled their hearts, whom ye have deceived with pride, so as they think themselves able to judge of the highest questions that be in divinity. We keep the people, so far as we can for you, from heresies, and require them rather to be hearers than judges, and to learn necessary knowledge of God's word <sup>a</sup> at wholesome and godly sermons.

a A mockery.  
For many  
hear not one  
sermon in  
twenty years.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We teach not the people to presume of knowledge, as you teach them to presume of ignorance: but only we exhort them, for the better satisfaction of their consciences, to read the scriptures, and therein to learn the good will of God. And notwithstanding ye may not allow them to be *judges*, that is to say, to discern between the light of God and your darkness, yet ye might suffer them to pick out some small crumbs, that fall from the Lord's table.

Apol. Socrat.

Howbeit, Socrates saith: “The simple unlearned people, in cases of truth, judgeth oftentimes more uprightly than the deepest philosophers.” Likewise Christ saith: “I thank thee, O Father, for that thou hast hid these things

Matt xi. 25.

from the wise and politic, and hast opened the same to little babes."

But ye will say, "The scriptures are hard, and above the reach of the people." Even so said the Pelagian heretic Julianus. And therefore St. Augustine thus reproveth him for the same: *Exaggeras quam sit difficilis, paucisque conveniens eruditis, sanctarum cognitio literarum*: "Ye enlarge and lay out with many words, how hard a matter the knowledge of the scripture is, and meet only for a few learned men." St. Chrysostom saith: *Scripturæ et servo, et rustico, et viduæ, et puero, et illi qui valde imprudens esse videatur, faciles sunt ad intelligendum*: "The scriptures are easy to the slave, to the husbandman, to the widow, to the child, and to him that may seem to be very simple of understanding<sup>60</sup>." St. Augustine saith: *Modus ipse dicendi quo sacra scriptura contexitur, &c. quasi amicus familiaris, sine fuco ad cor loquitur indoctorum, atque doctorum*: "The phrase or manner of speech wherein the scriptures are written, &c. speaketh without colour, as a familiar friend, unto the heart, as well of the unlearned, as of the learned." St. Cyrill saith: *Scripturæ, ut omnibus essent notæ, parvis et magnis utiliter familiari sermone commendatæ sunt, ita ut nullius captum transcendant*: "The scriptures, that they might be easy to all men, as well small as great, are profitably set abroad in familiar speech, so that they overreach no man's capacity<sup>61</sup>." St. Augustine saith: *Sunt quidam homines, qui cum audierint, quod debent esse humiles,..... nihil volunt discere: putantes, quod si aliquid didicerint, superbi erunt, &c. Hos reprehendit scriptura.....*

Aug. contr. Jul. lib. 5. cap. 1. [x. 627.]

Chrys. in Matth. hom. 1. [vi. 11. c.]

Aug. Epist. 3. [ii. 409.]

Cyrl. contra Julian. lib. 7. [vi. 232.]

Aug. in Psal. 131. [l. 130. tom. iv. 1468.]

<sup>60</sup> [S. Chrysost. ἄπερ καὶ γηπόνω, καὶ οἰκέτῃ καὶ γυναικὶ χήρᾳ, καὶ παιδὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ τῷ σφόδρα ἀνοήτῳ δοκοῦντι εἶναι, πάντα εὐσύνοπτα καὶ ῥάδια καταμαθεῖν· τοιαῦτα γὰρ τὰ τῆς ἀληθείας. There is a passage very nearly resembling this in serm. 3. de Lazaro (tom. i. 739), in which St. Chrysostom argues at great length for the inestimable value of reading the scriptures privately as well as publicly: . . .

ἵνα πᾶσιν εὐσύνοπτα ἢ τὰ λεγόμενα, ἵνα καὶ ὁ χειροτέχνης, καὶ οἰκέτης, καὶ ἡ χήρα γυνή, καὶ ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀμαθέστατος κερδάνῃ τε καὶ ὠφελῆθῃ παρὰ τῆς ἀκροάσεως.]

<sup>61</sup> [St. Cyrill said this of the writings of Moses . . . καὶ αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ Μωσέως, ἵνα καὶ ὑπάρχη γνώριμα μικροῖς καὶ μεγάλοις, μετεποιήθη χρησίμως εἰς τὸ τῆς γλώττης εὐτριβές καὶ δυσέφικτον ἐχούσης παντελῶς οὐδέν.]

“Some men, when they hear say they must be lowly, will learn nothing; thinking that if they learn any thing they shall be proud. But these are reproved by the scriptures.”

Aug. in Sentent. excerptis ex August. p. 1067. [Sent. 309. x. app. 244. ex epist. 194. tom. ii. 723.]

Likewise again St. Augustine saith: *Ipsa ignorantia in illis qui intelligere noluerunt, sine dubitatione peccatum est: in eis autem qui non potuerunt, est poena peccati. Ergo in utrisque non est excusatio: sed justa damnatio:* “Ignorance in them that would not understand, without doubt is sin: but in them that could not understand, it is the punishment of sin. Therefore neither of them both hath good excuse: but either of them hath just damnation.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. *Divis.* 4.

We desire to have our cause known to all the world: they flee to come to any trial. [Vol. iv. p. 70.]

M. HARDING.

a A worthy council of forty bishops, such as they were in the time of Paulus the Third.

Then why came ye not to the chief and most lawful consistory of the world, the late general council at Trent? . . . What trial should we come unto? Our doctrine hath had too high a teacher, to be tried by men now. It hath been approved too long, to be put in daying<sup>62</sup> in these days, at the latter end of the world.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Aug. epist. 169. [ii. 67.]

That we made not our appearance at your late *chapter at Trident*, ye have already made our excuse. The journey was too long to be taken in vain. Ye say, “your doctrine, be it right, be it wrong, may not now be tried, nor put in daying.” So said sometimes the *old Donatian heretics* unto St. Augustine: *Disputare nolumus; et baptizare [i. rebaptizare] volumus:* “Dispute we will not: but” (continue in our error, and) “baptize we will.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. *Divis.* 5.

We lean unto *knowledge*: they unto *ignorance*. [Vol. iv. p. 70.]  
We trust unto *light*: they unto *darkness*.

<sup>62</sup> [Daying = arbitration.]

M. HARDING.

Ye lean to the favour of secular princes, whom by flattery and heresy ye may deceive. . . . Crake not of your great knowledge, nor of your light. "Woe [L. O] be to them," crieth our Lord in Esay, "that say good is evil, and evil is good; that put light for darkness, and darkness for light." . . . Your demeanour is so evil, your doctrine so false, your tongue so railing, that we take your word for no slander.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We flatter our princes, M. Harding, as Nathan flattered king David; as John Baptist flattered Herod; as St. Ambrose flattered Theodosius; and as salt flattereth the green sore. Indeed, we despise not the *minister of God*, as sundry of your fellows have used to do: of whom one doubteth not to say, "*The pope is the head, and kings and emperors are the feet*"<sup>63</sup>. Another saith, "*The priest is so far above the king, as a man is above a beast.*" Such words of contempt and villainy we have not used. They agree well with you, and with your religion. We yield to the *king* that is due to the *king*: we yield to *God* that is due to *God*. We say to the prince, as St. Ambrose sometime said to the emperor Valentinian: *Noli te gravare, imperator, ut putes te in ea quæ divina sunt imperiale aliquod jus habere*: "Trouble not yourself, my lord, to think, that you have any princely power over those things that pertain to God." Dorman. fol. 15.  
Stanislaus Orichovius in Chimæra. [fol. 97.]

But if they be flatterers, that humbly advertise and direct their liege princes by the word of God, what are they then, that say as you say: *Totus mundus non potest accusare papam: nemo potest dicere papæ, Domine, cur ita facis: sacrilegii instar esset, disputare de facto papæ: Dominus Deus noster papa: papa potest quasi omnia facere quæ potest Deus?* "The whole world may not accuse the *pope*: no man may say to the *pope*, Sir, why do ye thus? it were a sin as bad as sacrilege, to dispute of any the *pope's* doings: *our Lord God the pope*: the *pope* may do Petr. de Palude de potestat. Pap. [ad art. 4.]  
Dist. 40. Non nos. In Gloss. Extrav. Joh. 22. Cum Inter. In Gloss. [col. 140. F.]  
Hostien. de translation. Prelati. Quanto. [fol. 84. col. 1. No. 12.]

<sup>63</sup> [Dorman's expression is "some others in place of feet to go."]

in a manner whatsoever *God* may do." These, these, M. Harding, and a thousand other your like speeches, may seem somewhat to smell of flattery.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 16. Divis. 6. and 7.*

We reverence, as it becometh us, the writings of the apostles and prophets: and they burnt them<sup>[Vo l. iv. p. 70.]</sup> 64.

Finally, we in God's cause desire to stand to God's only judgment: they will stand only to their own.

M. HARDING.

Whatsoever ye pretend, the cause ye have taken in hand to defend, is not God's cause, neither is this stir which ye make in the world, for Christ's sake. Luther himself, when at a disputation with doctor Eckius, inflamed with anger, and passing the bounds of modesty, was admonished of certain, forasmuch as it was God's cause that was treated, to handle the matter more soberly, and with the spirit of softness, he brake out into these words: *Non propter Deum hæc res cæpta est, nec propter Deum finietur*: "This matter is not begun for God's sake, neither for God's sake shall it be ended." Therefore speak no more to us of God's cause. There be other causes that move you to do as ye do. . . .

Untruth, standing in open and wilful corruption.

Hosius contra Bren- tium, lib. 1.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Luther" (ye say) "in disputation was inflamed with anger, and passed the bounds of modesty." No doubt, M. Harding, if he had had some part of your sobriety and modesty, he might have done a great deal better. Touching the matter, being zealously moved with the iniquity and wicked wilfulness of his adversaries, he uttered these words, not of himself, but of Eckius, that disputed against him: "*Eckius and his fellows never began this matter for God's sake, nor for God's sake will they end it.*" For he saw they had begun, and were bent to end it against God, as being inflamed with ambition and malice, and procured and hired by the pope. These words Luther spake of

Jacob. Andree contra Hosium, p. 352.

64 [Apol. Lat. "comburunt." Harding says they only burnt the translations.]

Eckius, his adversary, and not of himself. Even so, M. Harding, may we also truly say, you and your fellows have not begun these your contentious vanities for God's sake: nor for God's sake will you end them.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 16. Divis. 8.*

[Vol. iv. p.  
70.]

Wherefore, if they will weigh all these things with a quiet mind, and fully bent to hear and to learn, they will not only allow this determination of ours, who have forsaken errors, and followed Christ and his apostles, but themselves also will forsake their own selves, and join of their own accord to our side, to go with us<sup>66</sup>.

<sup>66</sup> [Harding concludes the fifth part with abusive scolding, which bp. Jewel omits.]

*Here endeth the Fifth Part.*

## THE SIXTH PART.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 1. Divis. 1.*

**B**UT peradventure they will say it was treason to attempt these matters without a sacred *general council*: for that therein consisteth the whole force of the *church*: there *Christ* hath promised he will ever be a present assistant. Yet they themselves, without tarrying for any *general council*, have broken the commandments of *God*, and the *decrees* of the *apostles*: and, as we said a little above, they have spoiled and disannulled almost all, not only the ordinances, but even the doctrine of the *primitive church*. And where they say, “It is not lawful to make a change without a *council*,” what was he that gave us these laws, or from whence had they this *injunction*?

M. HARDING.

If general councils continue in that estimation and authority they have ever had, their private conspiracies and false conveyances in corners be like to be dashed . . . Now pricketh forth their secretary, who thinketh himself a fresh soldier in rhetoric, and giveth the onset upon us with a blind “peradventure.” But, sir, whatsoever you imagine us to say, touching a general council, we are not so simple, as to grant (which your “peradventure” seemeth to surmise of us) that your heretical and most ungodly matters, which you speak of, might without blame be attempted by licence of any council . . . Such wicked changes in religion as ye have made, neither is it lawful to make with a council, nor without a council.



THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. Divis. 2

[Vol. iv. p. 70.]

Indeed king Agesilaus did but fondly in this behalf, who when he had a determinate answer made him of the opinion and will of mighty Jupiter, would afterward bring the whole matter before Apollo, to know whether he would allow thereof, as his father Jupiter had done, or no. But yet should we do much more fondly, when we hear God himself plainly speak to us in his *most holy scriptures*, and may understand by them his will and meaning, if we would afterward (as though this were of none effect) bring our whole cause to be tried by a *council*; which were nothing else, but to ask whether men would allow as God did, and whether men would confirm God's commandment by their authority.

M. HARDING.

... Forasmuch as the scriptures, wherein God speaketh unto us, be in sundry places not most open and plain to <sup>a</sup> human senses, and many by mistaking them be deceived, were it not well done of you, for the more surety and better understanding of that ye go about, I mean in matters concerning religion, to follow the judgment of the catholic church represented in general councils? Yea, we say boldly, that surer it is in points of faith to lean to the <sup>b</sup> exposition of the fathers agreeing together, and to follow the tradition of the church, than to trust to yourselves, or to the letter of the scriptures, scanned only by your own wits. For the church is promised to be led into all truth by the Holy Ghost. Ye cannot say any such promise hath been made to your particular company. Therefore it were not fondly done, as ye say, but wisely, say we, if ye tried and examined your doctrine, which ye pretend to be according unto the scriptures, by the <sup>c</sup> rule of ecclesiastical tradition, which is the chief rule to try every doctrine by...

<sup>a</sup> A Vain folly. For what have human or natural senses to do with the sense of God?

<sup>b</sup> The expositions of the fathers very seldom agree together: yet are they for the most part contrary to the church of Rome.

<sup>c</sup> The traditions now used in the Roman church are commonly contrary to the traditions of the ancient learned fathers. Therefore this rule is deceitful.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We never despised the judgment of the learned and holy fathers, but rather take them, and embrace them, as the witnesses of *God's truth*. And therein we find you

the more blameworthy, M. Harding, for that, having without cause renounced the judgment and orders of the *primitive church*, and *ancient fathers*, as to the wise and learned it may soon appear, yet nevertheless ye evermore make vaunt of your *antiquity*, and fray the world with a vizard of the *church*, and a show of old *fathers*: as if a poor *summoner*, that had lost his commission, would serve citations by the virtue of his empty box. And thus have ye set all your vain phantasies in place of *God's church*, and your *church* in place of *God*; as by the words and witness of your own fellows I have before shewed more at large. For example, cardinal Cusanus saith: *Nulla sunt Christi præcepta, nisi quæ per ecclesiam pro talibus accepta sunt*: "The commandments of Christ are no commandments, unless they be so allowed by the church."

Part. 5. cap. 10. divis. 2. [Supra vol. vi. p. 144.] Nicol. Cusan. ad Bohæmos. epist. 2. [p. 834.]

Thus ye leave *Jupiter*, and run to *Apollo*; or rather, ye forsake *God*, and seek to *man*: and as it is written in the prophet Jeremy, "Ye leave the fountain of the water of life, and rip up broken and filthy cisterns, that can hold no water." Tertullian thus upbraideth the heathens: *Apud vos de humano arbitrato Divinitas pensatur*: "Among you the right of God is weighed by the judgment of men."

Jerem. ii. 13.

Tertul. in Apologetico. [c. 5. p. 6.]

Clemens Alexandr. in Oration. ad Gentes. [i. 86.]

But Clemens Alexandrinus saith: *Quoniam ipsum Verbum ad nos venit de caelo, non est nobis amplius eundem ad humanam doctrinam*: "Forsomuch as *the Word itself*" (that is, *Christ*) "is come to us from heaven, we may not now any more seek unto the doctrine of man." Likewise St. Chrysostom saith: *Fuisset extremæ absurditatis, eum, qui edoctus fuerat a Deo, postea cum hominibus communicare*: "It had been great folly for St. Paul, having received his doctrine from God himself, afterward to confer thereof with men," that is to say, with Peter, or James, or with any others.

Chrys. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 1. [x. 675.]

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 1. Divis. 3.

Why, I beseech you? except a *council* will and command, shall not *truth* be *truth*, or *God* be *God*? [Vol. iv, p. 71.]

If Christ had meant to do so from the beginning, as that he would preach or teach nothing without the bishops' consent, but refer all his doctrine over to Annas and Caiaphas, where should now have been the *Christian faith*? Or, who at any time should have heard the *gospel* taught? Peter, verily, whom the *pope* hath oftener in his mouth, and more reverently useth to speak of, than he doth of Jesus Christ, did boldly stand against the *holy council*, saying, "It is better to obey God, than men." And after that Paul had once entirely embraced the *gospel*, and had received it, *not from men, nor by man, but by the only will of* [Gal. i. 12.] *God, he did not take advice therein of flesh and blood,* nor brought his case before his kinsmen and brethren, but went forthwith into Arabia, to preach God's divine mysteries by God's only authority.

## M. HARDING

If you occupy a flute no better, by my rede you shall give over your piping and flouting. Truth is truth, and God is God, whether any council will or nill. Marry, as for the truth, and for God, every council lawfully assembled hath will, so against the truth, and against God, it hath no nill . . . When ye prove unto us, that ye are specially called, as Paul was, and have a special commission <sup>a</sup>to preach against the doctrine of the church, as he a We preach against your follies and phantasies, and not against the doctrine of the church. had against the wicked Jews, then a-God's name take no advice of any man, but forthwith preach, and cry out so loud as ye list, so that ye go into Arabia, as Paul did, or where else soever ye will. For every good man would be loth England should be troubled with you.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 2. *Divis. 1.*

Yet truly we do not despise *councils, assemblies,* and conferences of *bishops,* and learned men: neither have we done that we have done altogether without *bishops,* or without a *council.* The matter hath been treated in open *parliament,* with long consultation, and before a notable *synod* and *convocation.*

M. HARDING.

Either your tongue agreeth not with your heart, or else I will prove the contrary by your own arguments, which in the next paragraph before this ye have huddled up For whereas your matters are (as ye ordinarily say) evident by plain scripture, and the word of God is readen of every man, (without distinction and limitation,) therefore ye do first of all play as fond a part, as king Agesilaus did, who receiving an answer of mighty Jupiter, would afterward bring the matter before Apollo: yea, furthermore, ye do much more fondly than he, if when ye may hear God himself speak plainly to you in the most holy scriptures, ye would bring the whole cause to be tried by a council.

How say ye then now, are not these your own proper reasons, &c. your foresaid worshipful reasons, &c.? If ye mean (as by reason ye must) the parliaments of these later days, the first of all did make most for you: and yet how open was it for you? Had ye any place at all in it? were ye admitted within the doors? or had ye any thing to do in that assembly? Consider then, with what consultation your purposes were concluded. Did they tarry many months about it? had they bishops? <sup>a</sup>had they divines, and the most learned, to reason to and fro with all liberty? was the authority of the universal church of Christ, and the doctrine of the ancient fathers considered? Ye say in Latin, *Plenis comitiis*, that is, "in the full and whole assembly," as though none at all had there resisted, but every man had yielded to your matters. What say ye then of the spiritual lords, a great part of the parliament, and without all doubt the part which must be chiefly and only regarded, when the question is of religion? how many of them gave you their voice to your gospel? yea, which of them all did not resist it? One alone<sup>67</sup>, I must confess, was afterward made to break unity, of whom a right good and catholic bishop said to a nobleman, "We had but one fool among us, and him ye have gotten unto you." But as of the spiritual lords ye had none at all, (except that one, little worthy of the name of a bishop and lord, whose learning was small, and honour thereby much stained,) so of the temporal ye had not all: and so had ye also in the lower house very many, and well learned, that spake against you.....

But let us consider the notable convocation in which your matter hath been treated. If ye mean the clergy coming together at that first parliament time, of which we speak, it was of catholics, not of sacramentaries<sup>68</sup>; and it put up a bill against

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, enclosed. For they had divines, and a solemn disputation was appointed at Westminster, in the presence of the states of the realm. But your fellows fled from it.

<sup>67</sup> [This alludes to Anthony Kitchen, bishop of Llandaff, one of those named in the commission for archbishop Parker's consecration. See Abr. Bramhall *Ῥομφαία*

*διστομὸς*, pp. 56, 57, (ed. Hag. 1659,) where this passage is quoted. See also Burnet's Reform. ii. 792.]

<sup>68</sup> [See Burnet's Reform. iii. pt. 1. 526.]

your proceedings; so far it was off from confirming them. If ye mean any since that time, in which your superintendentships met together, for what cause was it a notable synod, and a notable convocation?

Ye be desperate in your lying, and crake of a full parliament, and a notable synod, not regarding by what means ye promote your cause to the multitude, and save yourselves from reproach of extreme folly. For otherwise ye which can so amplify the small and obscure meetings of a few Calvinists of one little island, what would ye not say of the last general council, to which more nations were assembled together than are shires in England; more years were bestowed in consultation, than weeks in your full parliament; <sup>b</sup> more bishops defined and subscribed, than were ministers of all sorts in your notable synod, by many parts?.....

Lastly, if they will needs have their matters seem to depend of their parliament, let us not be blamed, if we call it *parliament religion, parliament gospel, parliament faith.*

<sup>b</sup> A notable great company. There were only forty poor bishops, and yet some of the same were no bishops at all.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We will not discuss the right and interest of the *parliaments of England*. As much as concerneth *God's everlasting truth*, we hold not by *parliament*, but by *God*. *Parliaments* are uncertain, and often contrary, as we have seen: but *God's truth* is one, and certain, and never changeth. The things, that were so suddenly and so violently shaken down in the late time of *queen Mary*, are now of *God's great mercy*, by *our most noble and gracious lady queen Elizabeth*, advisedly and soberly reared up again, that they may the more firmly continue, and stand the better. Whatsoever want ye imagine was in that *parliament*, forasmuch as we were no part thereof, I trust we may the more easily be excused. Howbeit, so scornfully disdainng the whole state of so *noble a realm*, ye shall hardly win the opinion either of sobriety or of great wisdom. The *parliament* was summoned by *royal authority*, and was continued and concluded in order, as heretofore it hath been used.

But your bishops (ye say) withstood us: and your brethren in the convocation promoted a bill against our doctrine. I know, M. Harding, they subscribed then against us with the very same hands with which, not long

before, they had openly protested and solemnly sworn against the *pope*: and with which they have sithence received and embraced our whole *religion*, to the utter condemnation of all your follies. These were they, that promoted bills against us, and withstood our doctrine.

Only one fool (ye say) ye had amongst all your bishops, and he was soon gotten to come to us. Happy were they, M. Harding, that had but *one fool* in so great a company. If some of your *Louvanian clergy* had then been bishops, I think they might have been somewhat better stored. Notwithstanding, it was not well done of your part, so uncivilly to call your *brother, fool*. All the rest of your brethren, very few excepted, have done the like. Yet *fools*, I trow, ye will not call them, lest happily your own wits be called in question.

Where ye would seem to say, that the *parliament* holden in the first year of the *queen's majesty's* reign was no *parliament*, for that your bishops refused wilfully to agree unto the godly laws there concluded, ye seem therein to bewray in yourself some want of skill. The wise and learned could soon have told you, that in the parliaments of England matters have evermore used to pass, not of necessity by the special consent of the *archbishops* and *bishops*, as if without them no statute might lawfully be enacted; but only by the more part of the voices, yea, although all the *archbishops* and *bishops* were never so earnestly bent against it. And *statutes* so passing in *parliament*, only by the voices of the *lords temporal*, without the consent and agreement of the *lords spiritual*, have nevertheless always been confirmed and ratified by the *real* [fors. *Royal*) *assent of the prince*, and have been enacted and published under the names of the *lords spiritual* and *temporal*.

Read the statutes of king Edward the First. There shall ye find, that in a *parliament* solemnly holden by him at St. Edmund's Bury, the *archbishops* and *bishops* were quite shut forth. And yet the *parliament* held on, and good and wholesome laws were there enacted, the departing, or absence, or malice of the *lords spiritual* notwith-

standing. In the records thereof it is written thus: *Habito* A. D. 1296. *rex cum suis baronibus parlamento, et clero excluso, statutum est, &c.*: "The king keeping the parliament with his barons, the clergy" (that is to say, the *archbishops* and *bishops*) "being shut forth, it was enacted <sup>68</sup>," &c.

Likewise: *In Provisione de Martona*, in the time of <sup>Anno 1273.</sup> king Henry the Third, whereas matter was moved of <sup>[4, 1235.]</sup> *bastardy*, touching the *legitimation of bastards* born before <sup>In Provisione Marton. cap. 9.</sup> marriage, the statute passed wholly with the *lords temporal*, whether the *lords spiritual* would or no: yea, and that contrary to the express *decrees* and *canons of the church of Rome*: the like hereof, as I am informed, may be found <sup>Extr. Qui filii sunt legitimi.</sup> Rich. II. ann. 11. cap. 3. Howbeit, in these cases, I must confess, I walk somewhat without my compass. Touching the judgment hereof, I refer myself wholly unto the learned.

Further, whereas ye call the doctrine of Christ, that now by God's great mercy, and to your great grief, is universally and freely preached, a *parliament religion*, and a *parliament gospel*, (for such sobriety becometh you well, and may stand you instead when learning faileth,) ye might have remembered, that *Christ* himself at the beginning was universally received and honoured through this realm by assent of *parliament*: and further, that without *parliament* your *pope* himself was never received, no, not in the late time of queen Mary. Yea, and even then his holiness was clogged with *parliament conditions*, that *whatsoever had been determined in parliament, and was not repealed, were it never so contrary to his will and canons, should remain still inviolable, and stand in force*. Otherwise his holiness had gone home again. Such, M. Harding, is the authority of a *parliament*. Verily, if *parliaments* of realms be no *parliaments*, then will your *pope*

<sup>68</sup> [In sir F. Palgrave's "Parliamentary writs" (Chronol. abstract, p. 26.), in the Parliamentary History, vol. i., as well as in other histories, there is a short account of a dispute be-

tween the king and the clergy at St. Edmund's Bury in 1296; but this statute does not occur in the Statutes at large, or in the Collection of Statutes printed by order of parliament in 1810.]

be no *pope*. Therefore, as you now call the truth of God that we profess, a *parliament religion*, and a *parliament gospel*, even so with like sobriety and gravity of speech ye might have said, Our fathers in old times had a *parliament Christ*: and your late fathers and brethren had of late, in the time of queen Mary, a *parliament faith*, a *parliament mass*, and a *parliament pope*.

Neither is it so strange a matter to see *ecclesiastical causes* debated in *parliament*. Read the *laws* of king Inas, king Alfred, king Edward, king Ethelstan, king Edmund, king Edgar, king Canute<sup>69</sup>; and ye shall find that our godly forefathers, the *princes* and *peers* of this realm, never vouchsafed to intreat of matters of peace or war, or otherwise touching the common state, before all controversies of religion, and *causes ecclesiastical*, had been concluded. King Canute, in his *parliament* holden at Winchester upon Christmas day, after sundry laws and orders made, touching the *faith*, the keeping of *holy days*, *public prayers*, learning of the *Lord's prayer*, receiving of the *communion* thrice in the year, the manner and form of *baptism*, *fasting*, and other like matters of *religion*, in the end thereof saith thus: *Jam sequitur institutio legum sæcularium*: “*Now followeth an order for temporal laws.*”

Leges Canuti. [Wilkins, p. 133.]

Thus we see, that the godly catholic princes in old times thought it their duty, before all other affairs of the common weal, first to determine matters of *religion*, and that even by the *parliaments* of this *realm*.

In a *parliament* holden by king William the Conqueror, it is wrtten thus: *Rex, quia vicarius summi regis est, ad hoc constituitur, ut regnum et populum Domini, et supra omnia sanctam ecclesiam regat et defendat, &c.*: “The king, forasmuch as he is the *vicar of the highest King*, is therefore appointed to this purpose, that he should *rule* and defend the kingdom and people of the Lord, and above all things the *holy church*,” &c. Hereby it appeareth,

<sup>69</sup> [See *Leges Anglo-Saxon. Eccl. et Civil.*, auctore David Wilkins, Lond. 1721.]



that *kings* and *princes* are specially and of purpose appointed by God, not only to defend, but also to *govern* and *rule* the *holy church*.

Howbeit, if any imperfection shall appear in the former *parliaments*, we give God thanks for the same that is: and trust, that for his own name's sake he will confirm that he hath begun. The *hearts of princes* and *determinations of parliaments* are in his hand. If any thing want, the arm of the Lord is not shortened: he is able to supply the same.

Ye magnify much your late *chapter of Trident*, which you would so fain have to be called a *general council*, with *so many nations, so many bishops, and so many years of consultation*. Yet, notwithstanding, of all these *so many, and so many nations, and countries*, if it may please you to sit down, and to take the account, ye shall find there were only poor *forty bishops*<sup>70</sup>, and certain of the same (as Richard Pates, the bishop of Worcester<sup>71</sup>, and *blind* sir Robert<sup>72</sup>, the archbishop of Armagh) that only had the bare titles of *bishoprics*, and indeed were no *bishops* at all. Two others of your said *so many and so notable learned and holy bishops*, being at your said worthy *council*, were even there killed in advoutery: the one stricken down with a club; the other taken in the manner by the hus-

Concll. Tri-  
den. sub Ca-  
rolo Quinto.

Robert, Cæ-  
cus. Vide  
Conc. Tri-  
dent. sub  
Paul. III.

<sup>70</sup> [At the first opening of the council there were only twenty-two bishops present. In the 5th sess. there were forty-nine.]

<sup>71</sup> [Richard Pates, after filling high offices in the king's service abroad, was made bishop of Worcester by the pope at Rome, and was thereupon attainted, 1542: his attainer being reversed in the first year of queen Mary, he occupied his see; he was deprived under Elizabeth, and went abroad. He sat in the council of Trent (uninvited, as Humphrey in his life of Jewel says), both before and after Mary's reign. Jewel is probably speaking of the part which he took in the earlier sessions, when he was only a titular bishop. See Wood's *Athenæ Oxon.* ii. 794.]

<sup>72</sup> [The name of this person (a native of Scotland) was Robert Waucop, according to his subscription in the council of Trent (where he sat from 1545 to 1547); but he is known also under the name of Venantius. He had been nominated by pope Paul III. for the archbishopric of Armagh; but the appointment never took effect, Dowdall having been consecrated archbishop in Dec. 1543. Waucop introduced the order of Jesuits into Ireland. See bishop Mant's *History of the Irish Church*, vol. i. p. 181. See also Burnet's *Reform.* vol. iii. pt. 2, 533. ed. 1829, where it is stated that Waucop was not blind, but only shortsighted.]

band, and hanged by the neck, out of a great Lucane<sup>73</sup> window into the street. For these and other causes, Henry the French king, openly by his ambassador, protested against the same council in the presence of all your *so many, and so many bishops there*, and said: "*It was not a council general, but a private convent or assembly of a few certain people summoned together for gain's sake.*"

Matth. Flac. Illyric. in Protest. Con. cil. Trident. p. 79.

Joh. Sleidan. lib. 23. [f. 11b. 22.] An. 1551. Conventus quorundam privatus utilitatis gratia institutus.

Aug. de Civitate, lib. 19. cap. 19. [viii. 563.]

August. in Psalm. 126. [iv. 1429.] Chrysost. 1. ad Tim. hom. 10. [ed. Lat. iv. 1354.] Hier. ad Evagrium. [iv. pt. 2. p. 802.]

Ans. ad Philipp. cap. 1. [ii. 295. b.] Beda 1. Pet. 2. [sub fin.] Petr. de Palude de potest. Colla. Apostol. Art. 1. [concl. 7.] Thom. 2. 2. qu. 184. Art. 6.

Now whereas it hath pleased you, as well here, as elsewhere, to sport yourself with *superintendents* and *superintendentships*, and to refresh your wits with so vain a fancy of your own, if ye had been so deeply travelled in the *doctors, new or old*, as ye bear us in hand, ye might easily have known, that a *superintendent* is an ancient name, and signifieth none other but a *bishop*. St. Augustine saith: *Vocabulum episcopatus inde ductum est, quod ille, qui præficitur, eis, quibus præficitur, superintendit..... Ergo, ἐπισκοπεῖν, Latine dicere possumus superintendere.* Again he saith: *Quod Græce dicitur episcopus, hoc Latine, superintendor, interpretatur.* Chrysostom saith: *Episcopus [al. episcopatus] ex eo dicitur, quod omnes inspiciat.* St. Hierom saith: *ἐπισκοποῦντες, id est, superintendentes.* Anselmus saith: *Episcopus (Latine) superintendens dicitur.* Beda likewise saith: *Episcopus Latine superintendens dicitur.* Petrus de Palude saith: *Episcopus dicitur superintendens: et Petrus fuit superintendens toti mundo: "Peter was the superintendent of the whole world."* Your own Thomas of Aquine saith: *Episcopi dicuntur ex eo, quod superintendunt.* Therefore M. Harding, if modesty move you not, yet at least, for your gravity's sake, leave playing with these vain and childish follies. The *bishops of England* have this day, not only the same name, but also the same room, and authority, and jurisdiction, that other *bishops* have ever had before.

<sup>73</sup>["Lucane window;" this is probably a corruption from the French word *Lucarne*, "a window in the roof." Illyric simply speaks of *fenestra*, but the circumstances of this disgraceful story imply, that the window was accessible from the roof. The story seems to re-

quire confirmation; although the many respectable names subscribed to the Protestatio adv. conventum Trident. shew that it was generally believed at the time. The Editor is not aware, whether the papists ever contradicted it.]

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 1.

But touching this *council*, which is now summoned<sup>74</sup> by pope Pius, wherein men so lightly are condemned, being neither called, nor heard, nor seen, it is easy to guess what we may look for, or hope of it.

M. HARDING.

The general council of Trent is now at length by God's special favour concluded and ended<sup>75</sup>. What have ye to say to it? Forbear your accustomed lying, what have ye to say to it? For <sup>a</sup>matters of faith, what is not sound and true? For <sup>a</sup>manners, what sore lacketh due salve? For <sup>a</sup>discipline, what disorder hath not wholesome restraints and punishments? What defects be not providently considered, how to be supplied? What abuses be not required to be taken away, as far as man's wit could devise, and the weakness of the present age can bear?

<sup>a</sup> Untruths, open, and without shame. For example, your stewes, your court-gians, and fornications, and concubines were never touched.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All this matter is fully answered by *what*, and by *what*. *What* matter of faith? *What* manners? *What* disorder? *What* defects? *What* abuses? But all these *whats* notwithstanding, *what* if your *pope*, your *cardinals*, and your *clergy*, with the whole *disorder of your Roman church*, with so many priests *keeping concubines*, with so many *nonresidents*, with so many *dumb bishops*, and with so many thousands of *common harlots*, be in case now, even as they were before? Will ye tell us nevertheless, *that all your sores be sufficiently salved?* or must we believe that your *keeping of concubines*, your *open stewes*, and *fornications*, &c. *be no sores?* Verily, St. Bernard saith, as it is alleged before: *Intestina et insanabilis est plaga ecclesie*: "The wound of the church bleedeth inwardly, and is past cure." And again: *A planta pedis, usque ad verticem capitis non est in ea sanitas*: "There is no whole part in the church from the sole of the foot to the top of the head." Baptistia Mantuanus saith:

.....ÆGROTATQUE FIDES JAM PROXIMA MORTI:

"The *faith* (of the Roman church) is sick, and almost dead."

<sup>74</sup> [Apol. Lat. "simulatur."]

<sup>75</sup> [The Bull of renewal is dated, 1563. Harduin, tom. x. pp. 110, 1560. The last session (opened 167.]

Bern. in Cantica, Serm. 33. [sub fin.] Holcot, in lib. Sapient. Lectio. 23. [l. 24. p. 87.] Bern. in Convers. Pauli. Serm. 1. [l. 962.] Baptist. Mant. Pastor, lib. 4. ad Leceum 10. [lin. 174.]

In your *old Latin translation of the Bible*, there be sundry errors, so open and so gross, that a very babe may soon espy them: as it may more plainly appear by Budæus, Erasmus, Valla, Faber, Lindanus, and others. Yet that notwithstanding, your *council* saith precisely thus: *Ne quis veterem vulgatam editionem rejicere quovis prætextu audeat, vel præsumat*: “Let no man dare or presume by any manner of colour to refuse the *old common translation of the Bible*:” as if your *councils* were purposely summoned to maintain errors. If ye will so wilfully deceive us in sensible matters, how may we then trust you in matters of *faith*?

Conc. Trident.  
[Harduin.  
x. 23.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 2.*

In times past, when Nazianzene saw in his days <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 71.]</sup> how men in such *assemblies* were so blind and wilful, that they were carried with affections, and laboured more to get the victory, than the truth, he pronounced openly, that he never had seen any good end of any *council*. What would he say now, if he were alive at this day, and understood the heaving and shoving<sup>76</sup> of these men? For at that time, though the matter were laboured on all sides, yet the controversies were well heard, and open errors were put clean away by the general voice of all parts. But these men will neither have the case to be freely disputed, nor yet, how many errors soever there be, suffer they any to be changed. For it is a common custom of theirs, often and shamelessly to boast, that *their church cannot err, that in it there is no fault, and that they must give place to us in nothing*. Or if there be any fault, yet must it be tried by their<sup>77</sup> *bishops* and *abbots* only, because they

Nazianzen.  
ad Procopium. [ii.  
110.]

<sup>76</sup> [Apol. Lat. “conatus.”] Latin to correspond to the word  
<sup>77</sup> [There is nothing in the “their.”]

be the directors and rulers of matters: for that they be the *church of God*. Aristotle saith, that a "city cannot consist of bastards:" now whether the *church of God* may consist of these men, let themselves consider. For, doubtless, neither be their *abbots*, *abbots* indeed, nor their *bishops*, *such natural right bishops* as they ought to be<sup>78</sup>.

## M. HARDING.

Gregory Nazianzene, in his Epistle to Procopius, saith thus: "I refuse to come to whatsoever council of bishops, because I could never yet to this day see the end of any council ended with any profit, and after which, things amiss were not rather made more grievous than healed." Nazianzene in that Epistle spake of <sup>a</sup>provincial councils, specially those that were holden in his troublesome times, where most commonly heretics, through favour of their deceived princes, bare the sway. Which, in matters of faith, could hardly then obtain any credit among the catholics, unless they had been confirmed by the authority of the bishop of Rome, of which sort at that age were few. Those other, Nazianzene had experience of, of these he had not. Albeit indeed, the utility of the Nicene council in his time, that is to say, within so few years after the same was holden, was not yet thoroughly espied and fully known abroad. Neither would he, if he were alive at this day, reprove the holy general council of Trent, as ye do. For why should he? . . . <sup>b</sup>And how shameless be ye, to require us to yield and give place unto you? Who made you judges over us? Who gave you commission? Where is your warrant? . . .

<sup>a</sup> Untruth.  
For he speaketh of all manner of councils, as well general as provincial.  
His words be: *Prorsus decrevi fugere OMNEM CONVENTUM EPISCOPORUM.*

<sup>b</sup> This is a lusty kind of divinity.

What need ye to shew your malice so much at bishops and abbots? Which of them hurteth you? Have ye not in prison or in custody <sup>c</sup>at your appointment, all the bishops of England, one *apostata*, yet living, excepted, which after sundry flights and changing of coats, is fled from the tents of the church to your scattered troops? The abbots, have ye not driven them away? Be ye yet afraid of their shadows? As by Aristotle a city cannot consist of bastards, no more can the church of England consist of such bastard bishops as ye be: what number of abbots ye have left in cloisters, such number of true bishops have ye left in churches. One must I still except, who is a true bishop by consecration (as I understand), though a false man by apostasy, and going from his faith, and from his religion.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth.  
For they are committed only by the appointment of the prince.

<sup>78</sup> [Apol. Lat. "Certe nec legitimi sunt abbates, nec genuini episcopi."]

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Touching the unlucky success of *councils*, the ancient father Nazianzene saith thus: *Equidem, ut vere, quod res est, scribam, prorsus decrevi fugere omnem conventum episcoporum. Nullius enim concilii bonum exitum unquam vidi. Concilia enim non minuunt mala, sed augent potius*: “To say the truth, I am utterly determined never to come to any *council of bishops*. For I never yet saw good end of any *council*. For *councils* abate not ill things, but rather increase them.” These words, thus uttered, whether they be universally true or otherwise, I will not reason. It may seem hereby, this learned father, for his time, by experience found them true. And for ought that may appear to the contrary, notwithstanding any thing contained in your *Gloss*, he seemeth to utter the same, as well of *general councils* as of *provincial*.

Greg. Nazian. ad Procopium. [ii. 110.]  
ὅτι μηδέ-  
μίας συν-  
όδου τέλος  
εἶδον χρη-  
στὸν, μηδέ  
λίσιν κα-  
κῶν μᾶλ-  
λον ἐσχη-  
κυίαν, ἢ  
προσθήκην.

Sozomenus.

Certainly after the great *general council of Nice*, the *Arian heretics* waxed mo and more mighty than ever they had been before. The emperors Constantius and Valens, with their wives and courts, became *Arians*. Constantinus the Great himself was also doubted to be an *Arian*. Liberius, the bishop of Rome, and Hosius,<sup>a</sup> that famous learned bishop of Spain, gave their hands unto the *Arians*. Ten several sundry *provincial councils* gave their voices with the *Arians*. St. Hierom saith: *Ingemuit totus orbis, et Arianum se esse miratus est*: “The whole world began to groan, and marvelled that it had taken part with the *Arians*.” Therefore Nazianzene saith, *he never saw council, nor provincial, nor general, that ended well*. For that, as one saith: “The greater side oftentimes overweigheth the better.” Even so said the *French king’s ambassador*, in the behalf of his prince, in your late *chapter at Trident*: *Nostra, patrumque nostrorum et avorum memoria, synodos indictas fuisse, episcopos convenisse, maximos in Germania atque Italia conventus peractos esse scimus. Vix tamen ullus, aut perexiguus inde fructus Christianitati constitit*: “We know, that both in our grandfathers’ and fathers’ days, and in our own time, *councils* have been summoned,

a [Sozom. lib. 4. tom. ii. 136.]

Hier. adversus Luciferianos. [iv. pt. 2. 300.]

Titus Livius: Major pars vincit meliorem.

Oratio Synod. Legati Regis Francie. Anno 1562. [p. 4.]

*bishops* have met together, great and solemn assemblies have been kept, as well in Germany as in Italy, *yet scarcely any good at all, or very little good came thereof to the state of Christendom*<sup>79</sup>.”

Concerning *abbots* and *monasteries*, we have said before. We have as many *abbots* in England this day, as either *Christ* ever had, or his *apostles*. Notwithstanding one of your learned fellows of Louvain, for the good will he beareth to that religion, telleth us, that the *apostles were monks*, and *Christ* himself was the *abbot*. The *abbots* and *monks* that were in old times, were men given to study and learning. And out of *monasteries* learned men were then taken, as out of *schools* and *universities*, to the rule and government of the church<sup>80</sup>. But your *abbots* now are as much like those *abbots*, as your *church* is like the *primitive church of Christ*.

Erasmus saith: *Haud scio, an nunc magis expedit ecclesie Christianae, si pauciora essent monasteria*<sup>81</sup>,..... *essetque omnium idem cultus, eademque preces, eademque vite ratio*: “I know not whether it were better for the church of Christ, that there were fewer monasteries, and that all men had *one service of God, one kind of prayer, and one order of life*.”

### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. *Divis. 3.*

But grant, they be the *church*: let them be heard speak in *councils*: let them alone have authority

<sup>79</sup> [“ In Oratione habita a Guido Fabro oratore Caroli Galliarum regis” Brixiae 1562: in a collection of the speeches at Trent in the Bodl. Theol. 4to. A. 28.]

<sup>80</sup> [S. Augustin. ep. 76. The epistle speaks of *deserters* from the monasteries being admitted into holy orders, to the manifest injury and deterioration of the clergy, whereas the custom was to use great caution in the choice of the persons who were ordained out of the monasteries, “cum ex his qui in monasteriis permanent, non ta-

men nisi probatiores et meliores in clerum assumere soleamus.” And again, “cum aliquando etiam bonus monachus vix bonum clericum faciat, si adsit ei sufficiens continentia, et tamen desit instructio necessaria, aut personae regularis integritas.” So that the evils of monastic life had even then begun to work.]

<sup>81</sup> [Erasmus Schol. in Hieron. After “monasteria” occur the following words, “quorum magnam partem ad mores parum religiosos prolapsam videmus.”]

[Cypr. ad  
Presb. et  
Diac. p. 11.]

to give consent: yet in old time, when the *church of God* (if ye will compare it with their *church*) was very well governed, both *elders* and *deacons*, as saith Cyprian, and certain also of the *common people*, were called thereunto, and made acquainted with *ecclesiastical matters*<sup>81</sup>.

## M. HARDING.

Ah, sirs, would ye have the common people come to the general council? Whom mean you, I pray you? Tinkers and tapsters, fiddlers and pipers, such as your ministers be? Alas, poor souls, what should they do there? For there is no tinkering nor tipling, no fiddling nor piping. There may they shut up both budgets and mouths. For neither can they speak in such an audience to be understood, nor can they understand what is spoken. Look in your books better, and you shall find Cyprian to make little for your purpose.

Had your matter been good, it might have been defended without lies. Being as it is, altogether beside truth and reason, for some colour of maintenance of the same, ye pass all measure in lying. Where saith St. Cyprian that certain of the common people were called to ecclesiastical councils? Yea, specially, where saith he <sup>a</sup>that the common people were made judges of ecclesiastical matters? for so hath your Latin, which not without guile your lady interpreter commonly turneth, "were made acquainted with ecclesiastical matters?" If you had meant true dealing, defender, you would have quoted the place: but you knew thereby your falsehood should have been espied. <sup>b</sup>The place which you mean, doubtless, is in the second tome of St. Cyprian's works, where we find the sentences of the bishops of Afric, *De hæreticis baptizandis*: which proveth your strange saying, by you fathered upon that holy martyr, nothing at all. The words be these: *Cum in unum Carthagine convenissent*, &c.: [Cypr. p. 329.] "When many bishops in the first day of September were assembled together at Carthage, out of the province of Afric, Numidia, Mauritania, with their priests and deacons, the most part of the people also being present," &c.

Now what can you gather out of them for your purpose more, but that a great number of the people were present only in the church or other place, where the bishops were assembled? That certain of the common people were called to this council, there is no such word mentioned, not by Cyprian, nor by any else. <sup>c</sup>Neither were the priests themselves (which this youthful gentleman interpreteth elders) and deacons <sup>c</sup>called thither, but they attended upon the bishops, as in such case it hath been accustomed: for sentence none might give in a council, but <sup>c</sup>only

<sup>81</sup> [Apol. Lat. "ad ecclesiasticarum causarum cognitionem."]

<sup>a</sup> St. Cyprian's words be plain: *Nihil sine consensu plebis*, &c. lib. 3. epist. 10.

<sup>b</sup> Your guess deceiveth you. It is not there.

<sup>c</sup> Untruths, boldly avouched. Read the answer.



bishops. Then how much less were the common people called to that council, specially to sit as judges in ecclesiastical matters? . . . . Marry, that you would so have it, I think well. For such confusion might best serve you to procure the overthrow of good order, in which the church is governed, which if it be maintained duly, your disordered and rebellious state will soon be confounded. . . . .

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Your *tinkers* and *tapsters*, M. Harding, are ashamed in your behalf to see your folly. A poor silly jester, to win his dinner, would be loth to scoff so coldly. Certain of our clergy want the knowledge of *rhetoric, logic, philosophy*, the *Hebrew*, the *Greek*, and the *Latin tongues*. Therefore ye call them *tinkers* and *tapsters*. Such is the sobriety and modesty of your talk. Of what school or tongue then are your priests, M. Harding, that for the more part can neither *speak Latin*, nor *read English*, nor *understand the articles of their faith*, nor *any portion of the scriptures*: *clouds* without rain: *lanterns* without light: *salt* without savour: *blind guides*: *dumb dogs*: that, as one saith, seem to have their souls given them instead of salt, to keep them from stinking? Of what *art* or *occupation* was he, that baptized a child in Latin, in this sort: *In nomine Patria, et* De Cons. dist. 4. Re-tulerunt. *Filia, et Spiritu Sancta*? What a skilful clerk was your pope Julius II., that assigning a warrant, instead of *fiat*, wrote *fiatur*? Your own doctor Alphonsus de Castro saith: Julius pap. 2. *Constat plures papas adeo illiteratos esse, ut grammaticam* Alphons. lib. 1. cap. 4. *penitus ignorent*: “It is most certain, that many popes be so unlearned, that they be utterly ignorant of their grammar<sup>82</sup>.” And being utterly ignorant of their *grammar rules*, I beseech you, for what other profound *science* of *logic* or *philosophy* can ye praise them? Another of your doctors saith: *Papa propter defectum literaturæ non potest* Felinus de Rescriptis. Si quando. [fol. 80. col. 4.] *deponi*: “The pope may not be deposed for lack of learning.” That is to say, the *pope*, though he be never so

<sup>82</sup> [Alphonsus. These words will be found in the edition of 1534 (in All Souls' library), and in the ed. of 1539. Brit. Mus.; the passage, which has been muti-

lated in the editions subsequent to these, will be found entire, supra, vol. iv. 472, where, see the note<sup>34</sup>, and note<sup>35</sup>, p. 473. See also vol. ii. p. 211, note<sup>42</sup>.]

ignorant, or void of knowledge, yet is as good a *pope* as the best.

Aureum Speculum. In Antilogia. [et ap. Walch. monim. med. æv. tom. i. p. 100. pt. 1. c. 5.] Another of your *doctors* saith: *Venalitate curiæ Romanæ....., inaniter præficiuntur lenones, coqui, stabularii equorum, et pueri*: "Through the bribery of the court of Rome, bawds, cooks, hostlers, and children, be placed in offices to govern the church." Shall we therefore say, as you say, that all your *priests* be *fiddlers* and *pipers*, *tinkers* and *tapsters*?

2 Cor. xi. 6. Some certain of our *clergy* be ignorant in the tongues, as yours be: but not ignorant in knowledge, as yours be. The worst of them seeth and lamenteth your wilful ignorance.

Aug. contra Academ. lib. 3. c. 7. [l. 281.] St. Augustine saith: *Multo minus malum est, indoctum esse, quam indocilem*: "Less hurt is it to be unlearned, than to be wilful, and unapt to learn."

Iren. lib. 2. c. 45. [p. 154.] Irenæus saith: *Melius est et utilius, idiotas et parum scientes existere, et per charitatem proximos [al. proximum] Deo fieri<sup>83</sup>, quam putare se multum scire, et multa expertos in suum Deum blasphemos inveniri*: "Better is it a great deal, for men to be ignorant and to know but little, and by love to draw near to God, than to think themselves to know much, and have great experience, and yet to be found blasphemers against God."

Ambros. de Fide lib. 1. c. 3. [ii. 451.] St. Ambrose saith: *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo, saluum facere populum suum. Regnum enim Dei in simplicitate fidei est, non in contentione sermonis*: "It pleased not God by *logic* to save his people. For the kingdom of God standeth not in contention of talk, but in simplicity of faith." Likewise he saith: *Verba philosophorum excludit simplex veritas piscatorum*: "The simple plain faith of fishers confoundeth the words of the learned philosophers."

Orig. in Cant. hom. 4. [iii. 93.] The ancient father Origen saith:.....*Sapientes hujus sæculi, videntes absque arte grammatica, et peritia philosophica consurgere muros evangelii, velut cum irrisione quadam dicunt, perfacile hoc posse destrui calliditate sermonum, per astutas fallacias, et argumenta dialectica*: "The wise men of this world, seeing the walls of the gospel to rise up

<sup>83</sup> [Irenæus . . . πλεσιόν γενέσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ . . .]

without *grammar*, and profound knowledge in *philosophy*, say scornfully amongst themselves, that all this by subtilty of speech, and crafty shifts, and *logical arguments*, may full easily be shaken down."

It appeareth by the *councils of Carthage and Hippo* Conc. Carthag. 3. can. 10. [iii. 883.] Et Concil. Hippon. [iii. 895. c. 20.] *Regius*, that in old times children under fourteen years of age<sup>84</sup> were admitted to be readers in the *church*, and notwithstanding either their age or want of learning, the people was well contented with silence and reverence to give ear unto them. St. Chrysostom saith: *In humanis negotiis, quando rex diademate coronatus, &c.*: "Even in worldly affairs, when the king sendeth forth his proclamations, the courier [ed. 1574 curreur], or pursuivant, is oftentimes a man of small account, and sometime so base, that he never knew his own father or grandfather. But they that receive the proclamation have no regard unto him that brought it: notwithstanding, in respect of the king's letters that he brought, they yield him honour, and with silence and reverence give attendance to the proclamation."

These simple unlearned ones, whom you so disdainfully despise, shall rise up in the day of our Lord, and condemn you with all your knowledge. God is able to make the poor *ass* to speak, to control blind *Balaam's* wilful purposes. St. Hierom saith: *Paulus,.....qui solœcismos facit in loquendo, Christi crucem portat, et quasi triumphans, omnes capit: totum orbem subegit, ab oceano usque ad mare rubrum*: "Paul, that is not able to utter his mind in congrue speech, beareth the *cross of Christ*, and taketh all men prisoners, as if it were in triumph: from the ocean unto the Red sea, he subdued the whole world<sup>85</sup>." Likewise St. Ambrose saith: *Non quæro, quid loquantur philosophi: requiro quid faciant. Soli in suis gymnasiis remanserunt. Vide, quam fides argumentis præponderet. Illi quotidie a suis consortibus deseruntur, qui copiose disputant: isti quotidie crescunt, qui simpliciter credunt. Non creditur philosophis: creditur piscatoribus.....*: "I demand

<sup>84</sup> [Concil. Carth. 3. "Lectores "perfectæ nimirum, ad ann. 21." cum ad annos pubertatis venerint &c." Harduin adds this note, <sup>85</sup> [The Breviarium in Psalmos is not genuine.]

Num. xxii. 28. Hieron. in Psal. 81. [ii. 335.]

Ambros. ad Gratianum de Fide, lib. i. c. 5. [al. cap. 13. tom. ii. 460.]

not, what these great learned philosophers say, but what they do. They are forsaken and left alone in their schools. Behold how much more weight there is in faith, than in arguments. They, with their profound *reasons*, are daily forsaken of their fellows: these, with their *simple faith*, go forward, and increase daily. Men believe not the learned philosophers: they believe unlearned fishers."

"Priests," ye say, "this youthful gentlewoman interpreteth elders." O, M. Harding, little needeth that godly, learned, and virtuous lady to fear your so unmanly and childish toys. If ye had been either so sagely studied as ye pretend, and your friends have thought, ye might soon have learned that *presbyter*, a *priest*, is nothing else but *senior*, that is, an *elder*, and that a *priest* and an *elder* are both one thing. And therefore whereas St. Paul saith: *Adversus presbyterum accusationem ne admiseris*: St. Cyprian, translating the same, saith thus: *Adversus majorem natu accusationem ne receperis*. Your own doctor Thomas Aquina saith: *Presbyteri in Græco dicuntur, quasi seniores*. Your own Gratian saith: *Presbyter Græce, Latine senior interpretatur*. St. Hierom saith: *Idem est presbyter qui episcopus*. These two words, *πρεσβύτερος*, *πρεσβύτατος*, are expounded in Latin, *Natu major*, *natu maximus*. So Plutarchus<sup>86</sup> saith: *Πρεσβύτερα δένδρα*, "Old trees." So Nazianzene saith: *Πρεσβυτικῶς βακτηρεύοντες*: "Going by a staff as old men use to do." Therefore, M. Harding, it had been more for your gravity to have spared these your youthful follies.

Ye say, "The priests and deacons waited only upon the bishops, but sentence in council they might give none." This tale were true, M. Harding, if every your word were a gospel. But St. Luke would have told you far otherwise. For speaking of the first *Christian council*, holden in the *apostles'* time, he saith thus: *Convenerunt apostoli et seniores, ut dispicerent de hoc negotio*: "The *apostles* and *elders* met together, to take order touching this

1 Tim. v. 1.  
κατὰ πρε-  
σβυτέρου.

Cyprian, ad  
Quirinam  
[Testim.] lib.  
3, cap. 76, p.  
325.]

Thom. Se-  
cund. secun-  
dæ, quest.  
184, artic. 6.  
Dist. 21. Cle-  
ros.

Hieron, ad  
Titum cap. 1.  
[iv. 413.]

Plutarch. in  
Publicola.  
[Nazianz. de  
Baptism.]

Act. xv. 6.

<sup>86</sup> [There is some mistake here: Plutarch's life of Publicola. It occurs however in Theophrast. Historia Plant. lib. 1. cap. 15.]

matter." And again in the conclusion: *Placuit apostolis et senioribus, cum tota ecclesia*: "It seemed good to the apostles and elders, together with the whole church." Here you see the apostles and elders give their voices together. Nicephorus saith: *Athanasius inter diaconos Alexandria primarius,.....non minima pars Nicenae synodi*: "Athanasius being" (not a bishop, but) "one of the chief deacons of Alexandria, was not the least part of the council of Nice<sup>87</sup>." Tertullian saith: *Præsident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti*: "The judges in such ecclesiastical assemblies be the best allowed elders, having obtained that honour not for money, but by the witness of their brethren." And in the second council of Nice, *Petrus Protopresbyter* and *Petrus Presbyter*, not being bishops, but only priests sent thither by Adrianus the bishop of Rome, gave their assents, and subscribed their names before all the bishops<sup>88</sup>.

Touching St. Cyprian, ye say, as your gravity and modesty best leadeth you, "We lie without colour, and pass measure in lying." And here, as men do that go by guess, and answer long before they know, ye find out a place in St. Cyprian that we thought not of: and upon affiance thereof, ye blow up your trump, and call us liars. Howbeit, wise men think him a hasty judge, that pronounceth before he know the cause. St. Cyprian saith: *.....A primordio episcopatus mei statui, nihil sine consilio vestro, et sine consensu plebis, mea privatim sententia, gerere*: "From my first entering into the bishopric, I have determined to do nothing by mine own authority, without your advice," (being the priests and deacons,) "and without the consent of the people." For doing the contrary hereof, the ancient father Origen rebuketh bishops of pride and stateliness. Thus he saith: *Quis hodie eorum, qui*

Niceph. lib.  
8. cap. 15.  
[i. 562.]

Tertull. in  
Apol. [c. 39.  
p. 31.]

Conc. Nicen.  
2. act. 24. et  
6. [xliii. 133.]

Cyprian, lib.  
3. epist. 10.  
[ad presb. et  
diac. p. 11.]

Orig. in Exod.  
hom. 11. [il.  
171.]

<sup>87</sup> [Nicephorus: Πρὸς οὓς γεν-  
ναίως ἀντεφέρετο Ἀθανασίος τοῦ  
χοροῦ μὲν τῶν διακόνων ἐν Ἀλεξαν-  
δρείᾳ ἡγούμενος . . . . μέρος οὐκ  
ἐλάχιστον τῆς ἐν τῇ συνόδῳ βουλῆς  
ἦν.]

<sup>88</sup> [This of course they did as  
delegates from the pope, whose  
precedency was then established.  
Still it shews, that Harding is mis-  
taken in his assertion that priests  
do not give sentence in council.]

*populis præsunt, ..... consilium dignatur inferioris saltem sacerdotis accipere? Ne dixerim laici vel gentilis: "What one nowadays of all the bishops, that have the oversight of the people, vouchsafeth to take the counsel of any inferior priest? I will not say, of a layman, or of an heathen."* Such, M. Harding, are your *cardinals* and *bishops of Rome*. They disdain the company and counsel of their inferiors. St. Ambrose, touching a case of faith against the Arians, saith thus: *Veniant si qui sunt, ad ecclesiam. Audiant cum populo: non ut quisquam iudex resideat: sed ut unusquisque de suo affectu habeat examen .....: "If there be any of them, let them come to the church: let them give ear and hearken with the people: not that any man there shall sit as judge: but that every man may have the examination of his own mind."* St. Ambrose alloweth no one man to sit as *pope*, and to overrule all the rest, whatsoever he say.

Ambro. lib.  
5. epist. 32.  
[Valentin. ii.  
801.]

Epist. Nicol.  
pap. ad Imp.  
Michaelem.  
[Crabb. ii. p.  
755. col. 1.]

To conclude: your own *pope Nicolas*, writing unto *Michael, the Greek emperor*, saith thus: *Ubinam legistis, imperatores, antecessores vestros, synodalibus conventionibus interfuisse? Nisi forte in quibusdam, ubi [al. in quibus] de fide tractatum est: quæ universalis est, quæ omnium communis est: quæ non solum ad clericos, verumetiam ad laicos, et ad omnes omnino pertinet Christianos: "Where did your majesty ever read, that your predecessors, being emperors, were ever present at the assemblies of councils? Unless it were, when question was moved concerning the faith. For faith is universal and common to all men, and belongeth not only to the priests, but also to the laymen, and generally to all Christians."* But hereof we shall have occasion to speak more hereafter.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 3. Divis. 4.

But, I put case, these *abbots* and *bishops* have no knowledge: what if they understand nothing, what religion is, nor how we ought to think of God? I put case, the pronouncing and ministering of the law be decayed in *priests*, and good counsel fail in

[Vol. iv. p.  
72.]

the *elders*, and, as the prophet Micah saith, “The Micah. iii. 6. night be unto them instead of a vision, and darkness instead of prophesying: or, as Esaias saith, “What if Isa. lvi. 10. all the watchmen of the city be become blind?” “What Matt. v. 13. [Luke xiv. 34.] if the salt have lost his proper strength and savouriness;” and, as Christ saith, “be good for no use, scant worth the casting on the dunghill<sup>89</sup>?”

## M. HARDING.

.....The world knoweth so well (yea, heaven also) the great worthiness of those fathers in every respect, that I should do them wrong here to praise them, for that by your fond surmises you seek their dispraise.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Heaven and earth knoweth, M. Harding, that two of your *reverend worthy fathers*, notwithstanding their virtues, and all their great worthiness, were taken and slain in advoutery, even there present at your council<sup>90</sup>. There-Matt. Flac. Illyricus, in protestatione contra Con-cil. Trident. p. 79.fore ye do yourself some wrong, in respect of your credit, so wastefully to bestow your praises.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis. 1.*

Well, yet then, they will bring all matters before the *pope*, who cannot err. To this I say, first, it is a madness to think that the *Holy Ghost* taketh his flight from a *general council*, to run to Rome, to the end if he doubt, or stick in any matter, and cannot expound it of himself, he may take counsel of some other spirit, I wot not what, that is better learned than himself<sup>91</sup>. For if this be true, what needed

<sup>89</sup> [The passages in St. Matthew and St. Luke are taken together.]

<sup>90</sup> [Supra vol. vi. p. 220, note.]

<sup>91</sup> [It is a subject for deep regret, that from a just indignation at the

subject dependence of a pretended free council upon Rome, so good a man as bp. Jewel should have been led to use expressions so offensive and unjustifiable. He meant doubtless, that the pretended in-

so many *bishops*, with so great charges, and so far journeys, to have assembled their *convocation* at this present at Trident? It had been more wisdom and better, at least it had been a much nearer and handsomer way, to have brought all things rather before the *pope*, and to have come straight forth, and have asked counsel at his *divine breast*. Secondly, it is also an unlawful dealing, to toss our matter from so many *bishops* and *abbots*, and to bring it at last to the trial of one only man, specially of him, who himself is appeached by us of heinous and foul enormities, and hath not yet put in his answer: who hath also aforehand condemned us without judgment by order pronounced, and ere ever we were called to be judged.

## M. HARDING.

We may less wonder at your jesting in other things, sith now we see you scoff and jest in things touching God himself. Sir, set you so light by the Holy Ghost, <sup>a</sup>as thus unreverently to talk of his flight and running to Rome, of his doubting and sticking, of his unableness to declare doubtful cases, of asking counsel of another spirit? Who ever uttered such vile talk of the Holy Ghost, but some vile caitiff, quite void of his grace? Cannot you conceive, that reasonably the determinations of councils be referred to the pope, Christ's vicar in earth, unless ye utter such irreverent and profane scoffs? It had become a wicked Celsus, a Porphyrius, a Julian, thus to talk, rather than any Christian hickscorner. You should at least have looked on your square cap, and your white rochet, if you have any: if

a We honour  
and adore the  
Holy Ghost  
as very God:  
but you  
shamefully  
abuse the  
name of God.

fallibility of such a council at Trent clashed with the pretended infallibility of the pope at Rome; and that therefore their pretensions to the presence and assistance of the Holy Ghost were neutralized by their referring all doubts to the decision of the pope. Still this is no excuse for such a dangerous mode of expression. Unscrupulous and shocking pleasantry of this kind seems to have

been the fashion of the day. Thus Sleidan, in the latter part of the 22d book of his History, tells us, "Ridiculo proverbio dici solet, Spiritum Sanctum Roma subinde Tridentum venire includum mantica, propterea nimirum, quod crebro pontifex et celeribus equis, quid fieri velit, per literas atque mandata suis ibi legatis nunciat."]



nothing else, they would have told you, that such profane lightness became not your person.....

Concerning the point itself you touch, <sup>b</sup> although the pope have that privilege which Christ <sup>b</sup> prayed to his Father for to be given unto Peter, as being Peter's successor, that his <sup>b</sup> faith fail not, and that he confirm his brethren, and therefore be an <sup>b</sup> assured judge in matters of faith, yet this notwithstanding, councils be not assembled together in vain. For the fathers of the council do <sup>c</sup> help the faith and doctrine of the highest pastor. Wherefore, in the first council at Jerusalem, when as a great question rose, and Peter had said his judgment, not propped with any testimony of the holy scriptures; James approved it, adding thereto the testimony of the prophets. For God's providence so tendereth the church, that the chief <sup>b</sup> members, though they depend of the <sup>b</sup> head, yet defend and help the head.....

<sup>b</sup> Untruths, huddled together without shame.

<sup>c</sup> A sage kind of mockery. For then doth not the pope confirm his brethren, but rather is confirmed by his brethren.

Wherefore Beda admonisheth discreetly, that Paul conferred the gospel, which he had preached amongst the Gentiles, with the other apostles, seeking warily to be resolved, whether he preached rightly of the ceasing of the observances of the law. Not that he doubted ought thereof himself, (saith he,) but that the minds of them that were in doubt might be confirmed by the authority of that apostolic council.

To that you allege, secondly, as a great inconvenience, we tell you, that forasmuch as the pope is at every general council, lawfully assembled, either in person, as sundry popes have been, or by his legates; <sup>d</sup> neither is it an unlawful dealing, nor such tossing as you term it, matters maturely debated in the council, to be referred to the pope, head of the council, not so much for a new trial, as for final confirmation. The fathers of the Nicene council besought St. Sylvester, that what they had ordained, he would confirm and ratify. And Leo, what things the council of Chalcedon had decreed touching matters of faith, saith that he approveth them. And the council itself, speaking to Leo, saith thus: *Decretis tuis nostrum honora judicium*: "With thy decrees honour our judgment." Likewise the fathers of other councils required their constitutions to be strengthened by confirmation of the pope's authority.....

<sup>d</sup> Wisely. The Holy Ghost that is present at the council, for better advice, taketh counsel of the pope.

And, sir, find you fault with the pope, because he hath not yet put in his answer? I pray you, <sup>e</sup> who accused him? Where, when, and whereof? In what lawful court? Before what lawful judge? O you say, he hath not yet put in his answer. Be it that Hick, Hob, and Hans, of your sects have impudently accused him. How would ye have him bring in his answer? To what seat of judgment, to what consistory can ye cite him, that is by Christ appointed <sup>f</sup> to be the supreme judge of all his church, the shepherd of all his flock? It is not for him, you know, to bring in his answer in Westminster-hall, nor in Star-chamber. Will ye have him appear before your high commissioners in the long chapel at Paul's, or in M. Grindal's chamber thereby, where ye

<sup>e</sup> The whole world accuseth him.

<sup>f</sup> A foul untruth. For Christ never gave the pope any such commission.

Luke xxii.

Acts xv.

Lib. Retra. in Act. Apostol.

have said and done your pleasure, and deprived many honest men of their benefices? Or will ye rather have him come to Geneva, to Zurich, to Frankfort, to Strasburg, to Wittenburg, or to some other corner, where ye have your congregations, there to be judged by Jack and Gill? I pity you, poor souls, that ye talk thus so far out of square, and would the pope to bring in his answer, ye know not where, having neither just court, or consistory to call him unto, nor lawful judge, nor law to pass upon him. For through your schisms and heresies, as ye have made yourselves churchless, Christless, and Godless; so also courtless, judgeless, and lawless. I cannot compare you better than to the rebels of Norfolk under captain Kete<sup>91</sup>, amongst whom mount Surry was their London, and an oak, or an elm, commonly called the tree of reformation, was their Westminster-hall. Such prince, such dominion, such judge, such consistory.

Ye complain, the pope hath condemned you without judgment by order pronounced, and before ye were ever called to be judged. This is as true as that the murderer, or thief, answereth the judge at the bar, saying, "Not guilty, my lord." Ye have been sundry times called to lawful consistories, to synods, to councils. Always either ye made not your appearance, or by right of safe conduct conveyed yourselves away, without any show of obedience: or, upon promise of amendment, you were dismissed. How many legates and *nuncios* have sundry popes sent into Germany, and other provinces, to convent you, to hear you, to move you to a better mind, and call you home, and with all merciful means to gather you again into the lap of the church? He may say, to your condemnation, that was said of the Jews: "What is that I ought to have done to g my vineyard, which I have not done? But all was in vain, such hath been your stubbornness."

g Open blasphemy: the church is the pope's vineyard.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We jest not at *God's holy Spirit*, M. Harding. We know it is the same *Spirit of wisdom*, that hath renewed the face of the world, and discovered the multitude of your follies. But well may we jest at your unhandsome and open legerdemain, that so vainly seek to blind us with a painted shadow of the *Spirit of God*. Ye pretend long prayers, much fasting, great conference of doctors and scriptures, and the undoubted presence and assistance of *God's holy Spirit* in all your doings, and yet openly strive against the manifest *word and Spirit of God*, and follow only your own *spirit*, which we may truly call the *spirit of*

<sup>91</sup> [In Strype Eccl. Mem. II. i. Mount Surrey seems to be a corruption for Moushold hill, above 271, as well as by Burnet, Reform. vol. ii. 243, he is called Ket. Norwich.]

*vanity.* The *spirit* that you mean, is nothing else but the *spirit of Rome*, which you say is the *spirit of truth*, and cannot err. In one of your late *councils*, holden in *Rome*, as ye were singing and roaring out, *Veni Creator Spiritus*, a poor old owl, amazed with the noise, leapt out of the hole where she sate, and pitched down in the midst, and sate amongst you. Thus it pleased God to discover your hypocrisy, and your folly, that the world might know in what *spirit* ye were assembled <sup>92</sup>.

Nicolaus de  
Clavengis.  
[*l. Clemangis: in disput. super mater. Concil. General. fol. ccl. b.*]

Elias, the prophet of God, jested thus at the *priests of Baal*: “Cry out aloud: it is your God. Either he is occupied in some talk, or he is in his inn, or he is travelling upon the way, or else perhaps he is asleep<sup>93</sup>.” Yet neither was Elias an hickscorner, nor jested he at *God’s holy Spirit*, nor did he any thing that was unseemly for his person. Kings xviii. 27.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ If this jesting so much offend your tender ears, M. Harding, beware ye offend not your dearest friends, that have more liberally used the like jesting. For Nicolaus Cusanus, being himself a *cardinal* of the church of Rome, thus jesteth at pope Eugenius, his lord and master:..... *Quomodo potest papa Eugenius dicere, hoc verum esse, si ipse velit, et non aliter? Acsi inspiratio ipsius Sancti Spiritus foret in potestate Romani pontificis, ut tunc inspiret, quando ipse velit*: “How can pope Eugenius say, this is true, if it please him to have it so, and none otherwise? As though the inspiration of the Holy Ghost were wholly at the pope’s commandment, to breathe only when he will have him.” Terasius, the patriarch of

Nic. Cusan.  
de Concord.  
lib. 2. cap.  
20. p. 749.

<sup>92</sup> [The pope, of whom this story is related as having occurred four years before Clemangis wrote, was Balthasar Cossa, John XXIV. [*al. XXIII.*], who is described by Clemangis as “*perfidissimus ille, nuper e Petri sede (quam turpissime fœdabat) ejectus.*” It should be added, however, that he was one of the three popes, who were chosen by different parties on the death of Alexander V., and that he was deposed at Constance in the 12th Session, 1415, after having broken

faith with the council. It seems hardly fair to identify Harding with a man, whose claims to the popedom, he would probably have been willing to acknowledge to be at least doubtful.]

<sup>93</sup> [This is not a parallel case. The irony of the prophet is manifestly directed against a false God. Jewel’s irony is directed against those who falsely laid claim to the divine presence, but it leads him to forget the reverence which is due to the Third Person of the blessed Trinity.]

I. quæ. I.  
Eos qui.

Constantinople, writeth thus to Adrianus, the bishop of Rome: *Tolerabilior est hæresis Macedonii, qui asserit Spiritum Sanctum esse servum Patris et Filii. Nam isti faciunt Spiritum Sanctum servum suum*<sup>94</sup>: “The heresy of *Macedonius*, that held that the Holy Ghost is a slave to the Father and to the Son, is more tolerable than the heresy of *simonists*. For they make the Holy Ghost their own slave.” I will say nothing of Laurentius Valla, canon of the church of Rome, for that he, so many years ago, so sharply found fault with sundry errors in the church, and therefore was thought over partial in his speeches. Notwithstanding his words be these: *Papa etiam rem ecclesiasticam, et Spiritum Sanctum quæstui habet, quod Simon ille magus detestatur*: “The pope maketh merchandise of church goods, and raiseth gain of the Holy Ghost, and setteth him to sale.” This jesting is broad and bitter, M. Harding, and yet nothing prejudicial to the Spirit of God. ➔

Laur. Valla,  
de Donation.  
Constantini.  
[p. 96.]

As for your *councils*, whether they be all and evermore summoned by the *Spirit of God* or no, it may well be doubted. The *University of Paris* thus protested, by way of appeal, against *pope Leo X.* and his *council of Rome*: *Dominus Leo papa Decimus, in quodam cœtu in civitate Romana, nescimus qualiter, non tamen in Spiritu Domini, congregato*: “Our lord *pope Leo X.*, in a certain *council* gathered in the *city of Rome*, by what mean we know not, but surely not by the *Spirit of God*.” And touching your *late chapter*, or *conventicle*, which ye call the *council of Trent*, the *French king’s* ambassador, being there in presence, said thus: *Minus legitima, minusve libera fuisse dicuntur illa concilia. Qui aderant, ad voluntatem alterius semper loquebantur*: “The saying is, that these were neither *lawful*, nor *free councils*. The *bishops*, that were there, spake” (not always of the *Spirit of God*, but) “ever-

Appellatio  
Univ. Paris.  
Anno 1517. [fol.  
xxxv. b.]

Orat. Syno-  
dica [Guid.  
Fabr.]  
Anno 1562.  
[p. 4.]

<sup>94</sup> [Thrasius Hadriano: “Tolerabilior est Macedonii et eorum qui circa ipsum sunt Spiritus Sancti impugnatorum, impropria hæresis. Illi enim creaturam et servum Dei Patris et Filii Spiritum Sanctum delirando fatentur; isti vero (scilicet Simoniaci) Spiritum Sanctum efficiunt suum servum.”]

more to please some other:" by which *other* he meant the *pope*.

Christ saith unto Peter, "I have prayed for thee:" Luc. xxii. 32.  
 "And Paul went up to Jerusalem to visit Peter:" *ergo*, Gal. ii. 1.  
 (ye say,) "The pope hath authority to confirm councils."  
 O, M. Harding, your logic of Louvain is marvellous hasty.  
 Ye force your *conclusions* to run in post. For what maketh  
 either *Christ's prayer for Peter*, or Paul's journey from  
 Arabia to Jerusalem, for the *confirmation of your councils*?  
 Verily here is no manner mention neither of *confirmation*,  
 nor of *council*, nor of *pope*. You might as handsomely  
 have concluded thus: "Peter took his boat, and went a  
 fishing: *ergo*, The pope hath full authority to confirm  
 councils." And whether ye will make this same to serve  
 you for an argument, or no, it were hard to tell.

Whereas Christ prayed namely for Peter, St. Augustine  
 saith, as he hath been alleged before: *Nunquid pro Petro* Aug. de Quæst. Novi Testam. Quæst. 75. [iii. app. 73.]  
*rogabat, pro Jacobo et Johanne non rogabat?* "Did Christ  
 pray only for Peter, and did he not pray for James and  
 John<sup>95</sup>."

Again he saith: *Hac nocte postulavit Satanus vexare* Aug. de verbis Dom. in Evangel. secundum Luc. Serm. 36. [v. 575. et ed. Froben. tom. x. col. 127.]  
*vos, sicut triticum: sed ego rogavi Patrem pro vobis* [*Bened. leg. te*], *ne deficiat fides vestra* [*Bened. leg. tua*]: "This  
 night hath Satan desired to thresh you, as if ye were  
 wheat. But I have prayed to my Father" (not only for  
 Peter, but) "for you, that your faith may not fail<sup>96</sup>."

Touching that Paul went up to Jerusalem of courtesy to Galat. ii. 1.  
 see Peter, he sought not thereby the certainty of his own  
 doctrine, as a man that otherwise stood in doubt whether  
 he had so long, for the space of fourteen years, preached  
 truth, or falsehood; but rather found fault with Peter's  
 dissimulation in *doctrine*, and reproved him openly, even  
 unto the face. St. Hierom saith: *Perrexit Hierusalem,* Hier. in Epist. ad Galat. cap. 1. [tom. iv. 235.]  
*.....non tam ut disceret [al. disciturus] aliquid ab apostolis,*  
*quam cum eis evangelium, quod docuerat, collaturus:* "Paul

<sup>95</sup> [These Quæstiones are not Bp. Jewel here exactly follows the  
 St. Augustine's.] Frob. Erasm. edition. Supra vol. v.

<sup>96</sup> [S. August. de verb. Domini. 452, note 41: also p. 462.]

went up to Jerusalem, not so much to learn any thing of the apostles, as to confer with them touching the *gospel* that he had preached.”

Chrysostom.  
ad Galat.  
cap. 1. [x.  
677.]

St. Chrysostom saith further: *Paulus nihil opus habebat Petro, nec illius egebat voce, sed honore par erat illi: nihil enim hic dicam amplius*: “Paul had no need of Peter, nor had any cause to crave his voice, but in honour and worthiness was his equal: as for more, I will not say.”

In the former  
Reply, Artic.  
4. Divis. 26.  
[Supra vol.  
ii. 263.]

Concerning the *confirmation of councils*, we have spoken other where more at large. *Councils* were *confirmed*, not only by the *bishop of Rome*, but also by other *bishops* and *patriarchs*: and not only by other *bishops*, but also by

Concil. Chalcedon. Actio.  
3. [vil. 480  
A.]

*kings* and *emperors*. The emperor Martianus saith: *Sacro nostræ serenitatis edicto venerandam synodum confirmamus*:

“By the holy edict of our *majesty* we confirm this reverend *council*.” Likewise the *bishops* in the *council of Constantinople* besought the emperor Theodosius: *Rogamus clementiam tuam, ut per literas tuæ pietatis ratum esse jubeas, confirmesque concilii decretum*: “We beseech your favour, that by your *majesty’s* letters ye will ratify and confirm the decree of the *council*.”

Concil. Constantinopol.  
1. [iii. 557.]

Touching the *council* of the *apostles* at Jerusalem, your own doctor saith: *Postquam Petrus dixisset, Jacobus, auctoritate pontificali, protulit definitivam sententiam*: “When Peter had said his mind, James, by his *episcopal authority*, pronounced the definitive sentence<sup>97</sup>:” that is to say, gave his confirmation to the whole. By which saying it may appear, that James was in authority above Peter. For he that pronounceth *definitive sentence*, in all assemblies is ever the greatest.

Joan. de Parisiis, cap. 14.

To conclude, *councils* have been allowed, and holden for good, whether the *bishop of Rome* would or no. Liberatus saith, when Anatolius, by consent of the *council of Chalcedon*, had obtained the *primacy*<sup>98</sup>, and the *bishop of Rome’s* *legates* stood against it, their gainsaying of the *judges* and *bishops* there was not received. And notwithstanding the

Liberat. cap.  
13. [P. 93.]

<sup>97</sup> [There is some mistake in the marginal reference.]

<sup>98</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 260, and the note <sup>15</sup>.]

apostolic see of Rome even hitherto stand against it, yet the decree of the council, by the authority and maintenance of the emperor, after a sort, standeth still in force.

Quodammodo. [at quoque modo.]

Much pleasant sport ye make us, M. Harding, with putting in the pope's answer. "Be it" (say you) "that Hick, Hob, and Hans have accused the pope. Would ye have him appear in this court, or in that, to be judged by Jack and Gill?" The whole world, M. Harding, hath of long time charged the pope with *ambition, bribery, simony, superstition, idolatry*, and open *corruption* of the ordinances and will of God. If he disdain the judgment of so many, and call the whole world *Hick* and *Hob*, let him not marvel, if the whole world disdain him. If he may be both judge and party, and may make answer only before himself, I doubt not, but he shall have a good favourable hearing.

I beseech thee, good Christian reader, for shortness sake, consider that I have written before, touching the accusing and judging of the pope. There shalt thou see, as Ennodius saith, "That the *pope*, together with the power of teaching, hath received free liberty to do ill, without controlment." Therefore he saith: *Neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo, iudex iudicabitur*: "The *pope*, that is the *judge*, shall be judged neither by the *emperor*, nor by the *whole clergy*, nor by *kings*, nor by the *people*." Such a *prerogative*, saith Athanasius, was sometime claimed by the Arian heretics: *Cum ipsi sint rei, ac iudicio obnoxii, veluti Caiaphas, iudicandi munus invadunt*: "Whereas they themselves be guilty, and in danger of judgment, they play the part of Caiaphas, and take upon them to be judges themselves." In like manner Chrysostom saith: *Figura ibi duntaxat iudicii erat, re autem ipsa erat latronum impetus*: "There was only a face of judgment: but in deed it was a brunt or violence of thieves."

Part. 5. c. 6. divis. 7. [supr. vol. vi. p. 98.] Ennodius, [p. 1622.]

9. quest. 3. Nemo.

Athanas. contra Arian. Orat. 1. [at Epist. ad Episcop. Egypti et Lib. tom. i. p. 276.]

Chrys. in Matth. hom. 85. [vii. 800.]

Ye say further, the pope may say, to our condemnation, that God saith unto the Jews: "What is it, that I ought to have done to my vineyard, but I have done it?" And thus ye give the *pope* power to challenge the *church of God* to be his own. Even so Nero, that wicked *tyrant*, when

Isa. v. 4.

Sueton. in Nerone. [c. 55.]

he had wasted and consumed the *city of Rome*, and burnt it with fire, he called the same, nevertheless, by his own name, *Neronopolis*, “Nero’s town.” One of your doctors saith: *Hujus communitatis* [suppl. *ut talis*] *non est dominus, nisi Christus, vel papa*: “There is no lord of this common state” (that is to say, of the church) “but either *Christ*, or the *pope* :” as if Christ and the pope were joint purchasers.

Hervæ. de  
Potestate  
Pape, in  
Prologo.

1 Pet. v. 4.

But indeed Christ only is the *prince of pastors* : and the *church* is his only *spouse*, and not the *pope’s*. St. Augustine saith unto Christ: *Tu Petro non dixisti, Pasce oves tuas, sed, Pasce oves meas*: “Thou saidst not unto Peter, Feed thy sheep, but, Feed mine.” Peter belongeth unto the *church* : but the *church* belongeth not unto Peter.

Aug. de Ver-  
bis Domini,  
in Evangelio  
secundum  
Johannem,  
serm. 50.  
[v. 675.]

Isa. v. 7.

The *church* is not the *pope’s vine* : it is the *vine of the Lord of Sabaoth*. Therefore, M. Harding, advise yourself better. Your words are guilty of great blasphemy. It shall be sufficient for the *pope*, if he may be only a branch in this *vine* : if he be not withered : if he be not cut off, and thrown into the fire.

Aug. in Jo-  
han. Tractat.  
123. [ill. pt. 2.  
p. 817.]

St. Augustine saith: *Qui hoc animo pascunt oves Christi, ut suas velint esse, non Christi, se convincuntur amare, non Christum: vel gloriandi, vel dominandi, vel acquirendi cupiditate*: “They that feed the sheep of Christ, to that end that they would have them to be their sheep, and not Christ’s, are found to love themselves, and not Christ, for desire either of glory, or of government, or of gain.”

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 4. *Divis.* 2.

How say ye, do we devise these tales? Is not this the very course of the *councils* in these days? Are not all things removed from the whole holy *council*, and brought before the *pope* alone: that, as though nothing had been done to purpose by the judgments and consents of such a number, he alone may add, alter, diminish, disannul, allow, remit, and qualify whatsoever he list? Whose words be these then? And why have the *bishops and abbots*, in the late

[Vol. iv. p.  
73.]



council at Trident, concluded thus in the end: "saving always the authority of the see apostolic in all things?"

Or why doth pope Paschal write so proudly of himself? "As though," saith he, "there were any general council able to prescribe a law to the church of Rome: whereas all councils both have been made, and have received their force and strength, by the authority of the church of Rome: and in ordinances made by councils, is ever plainly excepted the authority of the Roman bishop." If they will have these things allowed for good, why be *councils* called? But if they command them to be void, why are they left in their books, as things allowable?

Extra, De Election. et Electi potestat. Significasti. [col. 106.]

## M. HARDING.

Sir, what need you bestow so much talk in vain? Is it not reason the <sup>a</sup>members acknowledge the head? Would you the members to work their actions without the head? Is pope Paschalis to be called proud for preferring the church of Rome before a council? Have not councils ever been thought to lack their full authority, <sup>b</sup>which were not called and confirmed by the bishop of Rome? . . .

a Who made all the faithful of Christ the pope's members?

b Untruth, plain and manifest. For the pope had no authority to call councils: as it shall appear.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The modesty and sobriety of pope Paschal's claim shall better appear in the next *division*. Verily the *church of Rome* these many years may seem to have been nothing else but a mother of falsehood, and a school of pride. Pope Nicolas saith: *De sedis apostolicæ judicio nemini licet judicare*: "It is lawful for no man to judge of the pope's judgment." And of late years pope Leo said, *Papa habet auctoritatem super omnia concilia*, "The pope hath authority over all *councils*." That all lawful *councils* have evermore been summoned and confirmed by the *pope*, it is a manifest and gross untruth, as hereafter it shall be opened more at large.

Nicol. Pap. 1. ad Imp. Michaellem. [Crabb. tom. ii. 753.]  
Concil. Lat. sub Leone 10. sess. 10. [f. sess. 11. Harduin 1x. 1828.]

Where ye say, "It is reason the members should acknowledge their head;" that is the *pope*: for shame, M. Harding, and for your credit's sake, once leave these vani-

ties. If the pope be any part of God's church, he is a member, and not the head: and the faithful of the church of God are *Christ's* members, and not the *pope's*. Indeed pope Athanasius<sup>97</sup> saith thus of himself: *Mihi cura erit, evangelii fidem circa meos populos custodire, partesque corporis mei per spatia diversa terrarum, quantum possum, literis convenire*: "I will be careful to keep the faith of the gospel amongst my people, and by letters to deal with *the parts of my body* lying over the sundry coasts of the world." Thus he imagineth in his dream, that all the princes and states of the world be nothing else but the parts and members of his body.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. *Divis.* 1.

But be it so: let the *bishop of Rome* alone be above all *councils*, that is to say, let some one part be greater than the whole: let him be of greater power, let him be of more wisdom than all his; and, in spite of Hierom's head, *let the authority of one city be greater than the authority of the whole world.* [Vol. iv. p. 73.]

Hieronymus ad Evagrium. [iv. pt. 2. p. 803.]

M. HARDING.

It is a common manner of this defender, what he must needs grant, to make a shew in words, as though it were free gift. So, many times beggars will seem gentlemen, and payers of debt will seem givers. "Let the bishop of Rome" (saith he) "alone be above all councils." <sup>a</sup>Sir, he is so, no thank to you. Yet speak you like a liberal gentleman, "That is to say, let some one part be greater than the whole" No, sir, maugre your scoffing head, part shall not be greater than the whole, but part shall be greater than part: <sup>b</sup>in a right sense, is not the head greater than the body, the bishop than his clergy, the <sup>b</sup>master of a house more than his family? Neither is the council the whole party, except your merry wit can devise us a whole body without a head. "Let him be of greater power," say you. And so he is. "Let him be of more wisdom than all his." We say not so. It may be, that his council hath more learning, <sup>c</sup>more knowledge, and more wisdom than his only person. Albeit, when we speak of that wisdom of the see apostolic, which is sure, infallible, and cannot err, we mean not only the pope's singular person, but the head pastor and bishop, as he doth those things which pertain to

<sup>a</sup> Untruth. Otherwise shew us by what authority he is so.

<sup>b</sup> Full wisely. As if the pope were the HEAD, and the whole church were his BODY: or as if the pope were the MASTER, and the church his FAMILY.

<sup>c</sup> The council hath more wisdom and learning than the pope, yet the pope is in wisdom and learning above the council.

<sup>97</sup> [This is an error of the press, the Editor is unable to correct; (overlooked by bp. Jewel,) which there never was a pope Athanasius.]

that chair, that is to say, inasmuch as he proceedeth not upon his own private judgment,<sup>d</sup> but by the instinct of the Holy Ghost, promised by Christ to his vicar. Where you say, "And in spite of Hierom's head, let the authority of one city be greater than the authority of the whole world;" we tell you, that this you speak more spitefully than learnedly. For St. Hierom in his epistle to Evagrius speaketh<sup>e</sup> only of a particular matter, blaming the custom of Rome, where contrary to the custom of the whole world, deacons in certain cases were preferred before priests, whereof we have spoken before.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Sir defender" (ye say) "speaketh like a liberal gentleman." Again ye say, "No sir, maugre your scoffing head." These and other like words, M. Harding, are fitting and seemly for your person, and may well become your merry wit.

Where we say, *Let the bishop of Rome be of greater power than any general council*; ye answer us readily, "And so he is." Where we say, *Let him be of more wisdom than all other bishops*; ye answer again, "We say not so." As if ye would allow the pope authority and power without wisdom. Yet wise men have said, that *power without wisdom is the kingdom of folly*.

"The pope" (you say), "maugre your scoffing head, shall be greater than the church; and yet shall not the part be greater than the whole." Awake a little, M. Harding, and expound us your dream. The whole we speak of, is the whole church of Christ. And, I trow, by your learning, the pope is a part or member of the same. Otherwise ye must tell us, that the pope is no part of the church of Christ: which thing, all circumstances considered, were not hard to be granted.

"But the pope" (say you) "being but a part, is greater than the whole church." *Ergo*, say I, it must needs follow, that the part is greater than the whole. Neither was it my *scoffing head*, as it pleaseth you to say, that framed this reason. Your own doctor Gerson, the director of the *council of Constance*, saw it, and uttered it above a hundred and fifty years ago. Yet was he not therefore thought to be a *scoffer*. These be his words: *Quærerere utrum*

<sup>d</sup> O fond folly! For so any simple creature, so long as he is led by the Holy Ghost, can never err.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth, vain and childish. For St. Hierom speaketh plainly of authority: *Si auctoritas queritur, major est orbis urbe.*

Jo. Gerson.  
De potestat.  
Ecclesiast.  
consid. 7.  
[1. 121. a.]

*papalis autoritas sit major quam ecclesia, redit in idem, acsi quæreretur, utrum totum sit majus sua parte:* “To demand, whether the authority of the pope be greater than the authority of the church, is as much as if a man would demand, whether the whole be greater than the part.” You see, M. Harding, these be Gerson’s words, and not mine. Therefore ye might with more sobriety have spared your scoffing at scoffing heads.

q. quest. 3.  
Nemo. In  
Glossa.

Some of your friends have said, *Si totus mundus sententiaret in aliquo negotio contra papam, videtur quod standum esset sententiæ papæ:* “If the whole world should give sentence in any matter against the pope, it seemeth we ought rather to stand to the pope’s judgment, than to the judgment of all the world.” Albertus Pighius saith: *Certius est iudicium papæ, quam iudicium generalis concilii, aut totius orbis terrarum:* “The judgment of the pope is more certain, than is the judgment of a general council, or else of all the whole world<sup>98</sup>.” Another saith:.....*Papa virtualiter est tota ecclesia.....:* “The pope by power is the whole universal church.” Another saith: *Potestas solius papæ excedit potestatem residuæ ecclesiæ:* “The pope’s only power exceedeth the power of all the church beside.”

Albert. Pigh.  
Eccles. Hier.  
lib. 6. c. 13.

Hervæus, De  
Potestat.  
Pap. His  
premissis,  
Petr. de Pa-  
lud. De Po-  
testate Papæ,  
art. 4.

Extra. de Ju-  
diciis. Cum  
renissent.  
Joan. Andr.

Another saith: *Papa non potest subjicere se concilio generali:* “The pope cannot submit himself to a general council<sup>99</sup>.” Upon these worthy foundations ye have built up the pope’s infinite and universal power: and therefore ye say, “Sir defender would seem to grant you of free gift, that he must needs grant perforce, whether he will or no.”

All this notwithstanding, M. Harding, others of your more indifferent doctors would have told you another tale.

Bernard. Ci-  
tatur a Pico  
Mirand. In  
quest. “An  
Papa sit su-  
pra Concil.”

St. Bernard saith: *Quæ major superbia esse potest, quam ut unus homo toti congregationi iudicium suum præferat, tanquam solus habeat Spiritum sanctum?* “What greater pride can there be, than that one man should esteem his own judgment more than the judgment of all the church, as if he only had the spirit of God?” Whereunto Picus

<sup>98</sup> [The exact words have not been found in Pighius, but the conclusion in view.]  
<sup>99</sup> [Joan. Andr. There is some whole of his argument has this mistake in this reference.]

Mirandula addeth these words: *Imo simplici potius rustico, et infanti, et aniculæ, magis quam pontifici maximo, et mille episcopis, credendum est, si isti contra evangelium, illi pro evangelio faciant*: “Nay, we ought to believe a simple plain husbandman, or a child, or an old woman, rather than the *pope* and a thousand *bishops*, if the *pope* and the *bishops* speak against the *gospel*, and the others speak with the *gospel* <sup>1</sup>.”

The *bishops* in the *council of Ferraria* say thus: *Qua- concil. Ferrar. sess. 10. [l. sess. 9. xxxi. 625.]*  
*cunq̄ue facultate Romana ecclesia prædita sit, universali tamen ecclesiæ, quam generalis synodus præ se fert, inferior est*: “With whatsoever power the *church of Rome* be endued, yet is it inferior to the *universal church*, that is represented by the *general council*.” But perhaps ye will say, this was a council of rebels and schismatics, for that the *bishops* assembled there were not so applicable unto the *pope*.

The *bishops* in the *council of Basil* say thus: *Etsi papa concil. Basil. Inter Epist. Synodales. In appendice concil. Basil. Sacrosanct. Generali. [xxix. 249. d.]*  
*sit caput ministeriale ecclesiæ, non tamen est major tota ecclesia. Alioqui, errante pontifice, quod sæpe contingit, et contingere potest, tota erraret ecclesia*: “Although the *pope* be the ministerial head of the *church*, yet is he not greater than all the *church*. Otherwise whensoever the *pope* erreth, which thing happeneth oftentimes, and may well happen, the whole *church* should likewise err.” Again they say: *Nonnulli os suum ponentes in cælum, potestatem Romani pontificis supra potestatem sacrorum generalium conciliorum, contra juris divini et humani veritatem, a sanctis patribus alias declaratam, exaltare nituntur*: “Many men, setting their face against the heaven, go about to exalt the power of the bishop of Rome above the power of *holy general councils*, contrary to the truth of the law, both of God and man, declared unto us by the holy fathers.”

Again they say: *Ecclesia Romana non est universa, sed est de universitate corporis mystici, id est, ecclesiæ: et sic est membrum dicti corporis mystici, ut patet per beatum Gregorium. Igitur ex quo est membrum dicti corporis, non* <sup>In eadem appendice: eodem cap. [ib. 525.]</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [The Editor has been unable to find the work here referred to.]

*est, nec esse potest caput illius. Cum differentia sit inter caput et membra:* “The church of Rome is not universal, but a part of the universal mystical body of Christ, which is the church: and so is it a member of Christ’s said body mystical, as it appeareth by St. Gregory. Therefore, forasmuch as it is a member of the said body, it is not, neither can it be the head of the same body. For there is a difference between the head and the body.”

[Ib. pp. 513-525.]

Likewise again they say: *Allegant, papam impune posse tollere constitutionem concilii generalis, contra prohibitionem ipsius concilii generalis: supponentes papam esse pastorem universalis ecclesiæ. Sed ipsorum suppositum est falsum: et consequenter ipsorum assertio super eo fundata est falsa:*

The pope is not pastor of the universal church.

“They say, the *pope* may safely abolish the decree of a general council, notwithstanding the same general council have decreed the contrary: supposing that the *pope* is the bishop of the universal church. But their supposal is false: and so, consequently, false is their doctrine, that they have built thereupon.”

But, lest you should say that all these bishops and fathers in the councils of Ferraria and Basil were inflamed with schismatical spirits, or possessed with devils, Nicolaus Cusanus, being himself a *cardinal*, and a child of the church of Rome, hath by express words avouched the same. Thus he saith: *Quia sedentes in ipsa sede ab hominibus assumuntur, deviabiles, et peccabiles, et nunc maxime, mundo ad finem tendente, et malitia excrescente, sua potestate ad ædificationem data, ad destructionem abutuntur; quis dubitare potest, sanæ mentis,.....universale concilium tam in abusum, quam (in) abutentem, potestatem habere, &c. Universaliter dici potest, universale concilium.....esse omni respectu tam supra papam, quam (supra) sedem apostolicam:* “Forasmuch as the *popes* sitting in the *apostolic see* of Rome be chosen of men, and be such as may err, and sin, and now specially, the world drawing towards an end, and wickedness increasing, *abuse their power to the destruction of the church*, that was given them for the rearing up, and furnishing of the church; what man, having his right wits, can doubt but a general council hath authority, as well

Nicol. Cusanus, de Concord. lib. 2. c. 17. [p. 736.]

over the abuse, as also over the *pope* that hath made the abuse? Universally it may be said, that the *universal council is in every respect as well above the pope, as also above his apostolic see.*" Here is specially to be noted, that cardinal Cusanus saith, "The *pope*, sitting in his *apostolic see*, abuseth his *universal power*, and that to the destruction of the church."

Therefore, M. Harding, this part of your book, among the rest, would more advisedly have been considered. D. Cole himself, notwithstanding otherwise well inclined unto your faction, yet in this point is well content to give you over. Thus he saith of himself: "I hold herein rather with Gerson, *that the council is above the pope.*" "The pope" (ye say) "in one respect, as he is a man, in his own singular person may happen to err: but in another respect, as he is head pastor, and chief bishop, and is placed in Peter's chair, he cannot err."

And thus, as the heathens in old times imagined their *Centaurus* to be half a man, and half a horse; or their *Janus* to have two faces, the one behind, and the other before; even so have you imagined two *popes* in one body, the one going backward, the other forward: the one bearing light, the other darkness: the one deceived, the other not deceived: the one speaking truth, the other falsehood: and yet both these *popes* incorporate together in one person. Give us leave therefore, M. Harding, to say now, as the whole university of Paris said, not long sithence, unto pope Leo: *A domino nostro papa, jam non bene consulto, appellamus*: "We appeal from our lord the *pope*, being as now not well advised." We appeal from the *pope* that hath erred so shamefully, unto that *pope* that cannot err.

Certainly St. Hierom saith: *Non est facile stare in loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri, jam cum Christo regnantium: ne forte veniat angelus, qui scindat velum templi tui, qui candelabrum tuum de loco moveat*: "It is no easy matter to stand in Peter or Paul's place now reigning with Christ: lest the *angel* come, and rent asunder the veil of thy temple, and remove thy candlestick from his place."

The place of St. Hierom to Evagrius is answered before.

D. Cole.  
[supra vol. 1.  
p. 109.]

Appellatio  
Univers. Pa-  
ris, a Leone  
10. an. 1517.  
[fol. xxxvi.]

Hier. ad He-  
liodorum, de  
laude vitæ  
solitariae. [lv.  
pt. 2. p. 11.]

Part. 2. cap. 3.  
divis. 5. [vol.  
iv. p. 379.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 5. *Divis.* 2.

How then, if the pope have seen none of these <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 73.]</sup> things, and have never read either the *scriptures*, or the old *fathers*, or yet his own *councils*? How if he favour the Arians, as once pope Liberius did? or have a wicked and a detestable opinion of the life to come, and of the immortality of the soul, as pope John had but few years sithence? or, to increase his own dignity, do now corrupt other *councils*, as pope Zosimus corrupted the *council* holden at *Nice* in times past; and do say, that those things were devised and appointed by the holy fathers, which never once came into their thought; and, to have the full sway of authority, do wrest the *scriptures*, which thing, as Camotensis saith, is an usual custom with the *popes*? How if he have renounced the *faith of Christ*, and become an *apostata*, as Lyranus saith, many *popes* have been? Yet for all this, shall the *Holy Ghost*, with turning of a hand, knock at his breast, and even whether he will or no, yea, and wholly against his will, kindle him a light, so as he may not err? Shall he straightway be the headspring of all right, and shall all the treasures of wisdom and understanding be found in him, as it were laid up in store<sup>1</sup>? Or, if these things be not in him, can he give a right and apt judgment of so weighty matters? Or, if he be not able to judge, would he have, that those matters should be brought before him alone?

M. HARDING.

To your *how ifs* and *what ifs*, I could soon make an answer by the contrary. <sup>a</sup> And, sir, how if the pope have seen all these

<sup>a</sup>What then?  
Should he  
therefore be  
above gene-  
ral councils?  
*Sadly and  
sagely, and  
much to the  
purpose.*

<sup>1</sup> [Apol. Lat. "tanquam in scrinio."]



things, the scriptures, fathers, and councils? What have you then to say? Is not your tale then at an end? Were your matter good, and yourself wise, you would not so commonly use that weak kind of reasoning. But to a number of your *how ifs* and *what ifs*, for the reader's sake, to put away all scruple, I give you this answer.

Wisd. ix. 1.

God's wisdom (as the scripture saith) disposeth all things sweetly, and in one instant foreseeeth the end, and means that be necessary to the end. If he promise any man life everlasting,

Rom. viii. 30.

withal he giveth him grace also to do good deeds, whereby to obtain the same. "Whom he hath glorified," (saith St. Paul,) "them he hath justified and called."

Matt. xvi. 18.

So whereas he hath by force of his prayer made to the Father promised to Peter, and for the safety of the church <sup>b</sup> to every Peter's successor, that his

Luke xxii. 32.

faith shall not fail, and therefore hath willed him to confirm his brethren, that is, to remove all doubts and errors from them: we are assured he will give him such wit, diligence, learning, and understanding, as this firmness and infallibility of faith, and confirming of brethren requireth. Shall we stand in doubt, whether that happeneth in things supernatural, which we see to be in things natural, that who giveth the end, he giveth also things that pertain to the attaining of the end? If God would promise us abundance of corn for the next year to come, what were more foolish than to doubt, and say like to this defender, "how if," and "what if" men will not till the ground, nor sow any seed? Doubtless if they sow, they shall reap: if they sow not, neither shall they reap. But what? We may gather of the promise of God, that we shall have not only fair and seasonable weather, whereby the fruits of the earth may prove plentiful, but also that the husbandmen shall employ their endeavour, pains, and labour. For the abundance of corn so promised shall not be given but to such as till, sow, and travail. Even so whereas Christ hath promised to the <sup>c</sup> successors of Peter firmness of faith, to the apostles and their successors the Spirit of truth, and likewise to councils gathered in his name, we must persuade ourselves, that nothing shall want, necessary for the controversies touching faith, to be decided.

That you say of Liberius the pope, is stark false. <sup>d</sup> He never favoured the Arians. The most ye can find against him is, that he was compelled by the great persecution of Constantius the emperor, to subscribe to the Arians. Neither is that by the ancient writers of the ecclesiastical stories constantly affirmed, but of the chief of them not spoken of, where most occasion was to signify it, if it had so been: of some denied, of some mentioned not as true, but as a false rumour bruited abroad of him. By which rumour it seemeth <sup>e</sup> St. Hierom was deceived, remaining in the east, far from the places where the truth might more certainly be known. But were it true, that he subscribed, as

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, fond and childish. For Christ prayed no more for Peter than for others: nor ever made mention of Peter's successors. O worthy and grave reasons!

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For Christ never entered into such covenant with Peter's successors.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth, plainly reprov'd by St. Hierom.

<sup>e</sup> St. Hierom's authority refused as a man writing rashly he knew not what.

Sozom. lib. 4. cap. 15. [ii. 150.]  
Lib. de Viris illustribus in Chroniols.

f The pope denieth Christ, for lack of charity, but not for lack of faith.

Peter denied Christ, yet being done <sup>f</sup> for lack of charity, and not by error in faith, well might that fact be slanderous to the church, but it was not a decree made in favour of the Arians, neither to confirm that heresy.

g Untruth, manifest. See the answer.

That you report of Pope John the Twenty-second is likewise most false. The worst that Marsilius of Padua and William Ockam, heretics, wrote of him, to flatter the emperor Ludovicus of Bavaria, is, that he had taught openly, <sup>g</sup> (which also is referred to the time before he was pope,) that the souls of the just see not God until the day of judgment. That he had a wicked and a detestable opinion of the immortality of the soul, there was no such his opinion, but it is your false slander, by which your wicked and detestable malice imagined to deface the church, and specially the authority of the holy see apostolic. No story of any estimation mentioneth, that he was of that first opinion after he came to be pope, much less that he gave any definitive sentence of such matter. But contrariwise, <sup>h</sup> when as he prepared himself to go to the definition of that question concerning the seeing of God, which just souls have before the day of judgment, as Benedictus the Eleventh *in sua extravagante* saith, he was prevented by death, so as he might not do it.

h Untruth, contrary to that M. Harding said immediately before. For he held this error in the time of his popedom.

i Untruth, manifestly reproved by the council of Africa.

k These be very vain and childish forgeries.

You belie Zosimus: <sup>i</sup> he corrupted not the council of Nice: but signified to the bishops of Africa, assembled in council at Carthage, the truth concerning the canons of the Nicene council. The same may be proved by Julius the First, by the Epistle of <sup>k</sup> Athanasius and other bishops of Egypt, Thebais, and Libya, written to Marcus the pope, of the original of the 72 canons of the Nicene council that remained in safe custody in the church of Rome, subscribed with the hands of the fathers, that at the same council were present. And what credit was to be given to the contrary information of only twenty canons that was returned from the bishops of Constantinople and Alexandria, <sup>l</sup> when heretics before had burned the books, where the whole number was contained, and left but those twenty, that all books now commonly have?

l Untruth, without any savour of wit or learning. Why should M. Harding allege so foolish fables?

If we should allege Camotensis and Lyra, you would call them the black guard, and set little by them. First shew us, where they have that you allege out of them. M. Jewel allegeth that of Camotensis in another place. But where it is, he keepeth it to himself, and of himself it is likely it proceeded. For his dealing is such, as any false practice in respect of him may seem credible. Albeit, what worshipful doctor ye mean by Carnotensis, <sup>m</sup> I know not. Peradventure ye mean Carnotensis, otherwise called Ivo. I have cause to guess, that so it should be. And yet four books of sundry prints both English and Latin so have. If there be any such, as I suppose there is not, he is very obscure, nor worth the naming.

m If ye know him not, then may you best blame your ignorance.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here ye say, "And, sir, how if the pope have seen all these things, the scriptures, the fathers, the councils? What have you then to say? Is not your tale then at an end?" No, verily, M. Harding. I would further desire God to give him grace to use them well, and to his glory. Notwithstanding, your own doctors will soon put all these your *whats* and *what ifs* out of question. For concerning the pope's great and high learning, Alphonsus de Castro saith, as he hath been alleged before: *Constat, plures papas adeo illiteratos fuisse, ut grammaticam penitus ignorant*: "It is certainly known, that sundry *popes* have been so unskilful in learning, that they never understood their *grammar*<sup>2</sup>. And this he speaketh, not of one *pope* only, but of sundry. "But" (you say) "Christ hath prayed for Peter, and made sure promise that his faith should never fail." Therefore the *pope* is wise: the *pope* is learned: the *pope* is catholic: the *pope* cannot err. All this, and a great deal more, the *pope* may claim only by *virtue of Christ's prayer*. Now therefore if the *pope* should err or be in *heresy*, he might sue Christ in an action of covenant, and require him to perform his promise. So saith the prophet Michas: *Sacerdotes in mercede docebant, et prophetae in pecunia divinabant: et super Dominum requiescebant, dicentes, Nonne est Dominus in medio nostrum?* "The *priests* taught the people for hire, and the *prophets* prophesied for money: and yet they rested themselves upon God's promise, saying, *And is not the Lord in the midst amongst us?*" So the *Valentinian heretics* said sometime of themselves: .....*Nos salutem de privilegio status possidemus...* "We have our safety by the privilege of our state." We cannot miscarry: we cannot err: but the prophet saith: "Every man is a liar:" "Accursed be he that trusteth in man." Your own doctor Alphonsus saith: *Omnis homo errare potest in fide, etiamsi papa sit*: "Every man may err in *faith*: yea, although he be the *pope*."

Alphons.  
contra Hæ-  
res. lib. 1. cap.  
4. [ed. 1534.]

Mic. iii. 11.  
[Vulg.]

Tertull. ad-  
vers. Valen-  
tinian. [cap.  
30. p. 261.]

Psal. cxvi. 11.  
Jer. xvii. 5.  
[Alphonsus,  
p. 20.]

<sup>2</sup> [Concerning the editions of Alphonsus, see supra vol. iv. p. 472, and note 34.]

Howbeit, that your unlearned reader may the better consider how safely he may give credit to your bare word, whether the *pope may be deceived in faith or no*, it may easily appear by these few examples. Whoso listeth to

Concil. tom.  
1. [Crabb.  
184.]

Tertull. con-  
tra Prax-  
eam. [cap. 1.  
p. 501.]

Beat. Rhe-  
nan. [ed.  
1520. 378.]

Hier. in Præ-  
fat. de Viris  
Illustr. [iv.  
pt. 2. p. 124.]

Conc. Nicen.  
2. act. 7.  
[xiii. 377. b.]

Conc. Con-  
stant. 6. act.  
13. [xi. 556.]

Alphons. lib.  
1. cap. 4. [p.  
20.]

In Legenda  
Hilarii. [in  
Legend. Aur.  
Hist. 16.]

Synod. Ro-  
man. in Fas-  
ticulo rerum  
sciendarum.  
Impresso Co-  
lon. 1553.  
[fol. xliii. b.]

seek may find mo. Pope Marcellinus offered up incense, and made sacrifice unto devils. Tertullian saith: *Episcopum Romanum agnoscentem jam prophetias Montani, Priscæ, Maximillæ, &c.*: “The bishop of Rome, well liking now the *prophecies*” (or *heresies*) “of Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla,” &c. Upon which words Beatus

Rhenanus noteth thus: (*Episcopus Romanus*) *Montanizat*: “The bishop of Rome favoureth the heresy of Montanus<sup>3</sup>.”

*Pope Liberius was an Arian heretic*<sup>4</sup>, as hereafter it shall better appear. *Pope Honorius* was condemned for an heretic

in two *general councils*. In the *council of Constantinople*, the

words of his condemnation be alleged thus: *Anathematizari curavimus Honorium, qui fuerat papæ antiquæ Romæ: quia in omnibus mentem Sergii sequutus est, et impia dogmata confirmavit*: “We have caused *Honorius*, the

late *pope of old Rome*, to be accursed: for that in all things he followed the mind of *Sergius the heretic*, and confirmed his wicked doctrines.” Alphonsus de Castro saith:

*Anastasiū papam favisse Nestorianis, qui historias legit, non dubitat*: “Whosoever hath read the stories or

course of time, cannot doubt but pope Anastasius favoured the *Nestorian heretics*.” In the very *legend* of Hilarius

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

it is mentioned, that *pope Leo* was an *Arian heretic*. In a *synod holden at Rome* against *pope Hildebrand*, it is written thus: *Incendio tradidimus decreta eorum hæretica*:

<sup>3</sup> [In the editio princeps of Tertullian's works, Basil. 1520, the word “Montanizat” alone is printed in the margin, as the commentary of Beatus Rhenanus; but it seems clear, that he meant it to apply not to the pope of Rome, but to Tertullian himself, who blames Praxeas for preventing the pope from acting upon his favourable view of the prophecies of Montanus, &c., and who himself

became a Montanist. The passage from Tertullian himself proves, however, that the pope had been favourably disposed towards the Montanists.]

<sup>4</sup> [S. Hieron. in libr. de Eccl. Scriptor. in vita Fortunatiani... “... in hoc habetur detestabilis, “quod Liberium pro fide ad exitium pergentem primus sollicitavit, ac fregit, et ad subscriptionem hæreseos compulit.]

“ We have burnt their *heretical decrees.*” - *Pope Sylvester II.* was made *pope* by *necromancy*, and in recompence thereof, promised himself both body and soul unto the *devil.*

*Hulderichus*, the *bishop of Augusta in Germany*, expresseth the *restraint of priests' marriage* by these words: *Periculosum hujus hæresis decretum*: “ The dangerous decree of this heresy.”

Notwithstanding, I have seen the same epistle unto *P. Nicolas*, together with another epistle to like purpose, written in old vellum, of very ancient record, under the name of *Volusianus*, the *bishop of Carthage*<sup>5</sup>. But, what need we to touch all the particulars? The doctors of the *great school of Sorbona in Paris*, have determined in their articles, that *St. Peter himself erred in the faith.* The *council of Basil* condemneth *pope Eugenius* by these words:

*Eugenium contemptorem sacrorum canonum: pacis, et veritatis ecclesie Dei perturbatorem notorium: universalis ecclesie scandalizatorem: simoniacum: perjurum: incorrigibilem: schismaticum: a fide devium: pertinacem hæreticum, &c.*: “ We condemn and depose *pope Eugenius*, a despiser of the holy canons, a disturber of the peace and unity of the church of God: a notorious offender of the whole universal church: a simonist: a forsworn man: a man uncorrigible: a schismatic: a man *fallen from the faith*, and a wilful *heretic.*” Of *pope John's heresy*<sup>6</sup>, touching the immortality of the soul, we shall speak more hereafter. *St. Hierom* saith: *Qui scripturam intelligit aliter, quam sensus Spiritus Sancti flagitat, quo scripta est, licet ab ecclesia non recesserit, tamen hæreticus appellari potest*: “ Whosoever otherwise understandeth the *scriptures*, than the sense of the Holy Ghost requireth, by whom they were written,” (as it is most certain the *pope* in infinite places both hath done and doth,) “ although he

<sup>5</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 616, note 89.]

<sup>6</sup> [This was John XXIII. (Balthasar de Cossa.) It will be seen

below, that bishop Jewel confounded him with John XXII. (Ossa), who was also accused of heresy a century before.]

Joannes Stella Venetus, [fol. xliiv. b.]

Epist. Hulderici ad Nicolaum Papam. [ap. Paral. Ursperg. p. 436.]

Erasm. in Annot. in Epist. ad Gal. cap. 2. In faciem illi restitit. [p. 600.]

Conc. Basil. sess. 34. [xxix. p. 180.]

In Conc. Constan. in Appendice, [sess. 11.] c. In primis. [xxvii. p. 609.]

Quinimo idem Johan. pap. XXII. [l. XXIII.] dixit, et pertinaciter credit animam hominis cum corpore humano mori, et extingui, ad instar animalium brutorum.

24. Quest. 3. Heresis. be not departed from the *church*, yet he may well be called an heretic."

Now, if *idolaters, Montanists, Arians, Monothelites, Nestorians, deniers of the immortality, simonists, sorcerers, maintainers of filthiness*, and other obstinate and wilful *heretics*, may err, then, whatsoever M. Harding and his fellows shall say to the contrary, it is easily seen, that the *pope may err*.

Conc. Basil. inter epist. Synodales. [xxix. 246. c. 249. e.]

Verily, the council of *Basil* saith thus: *Multi ex summis pontificibus in hæreses et errores lapsi esse dicuntur, et leguntur: certum est, papam errare posse: concilium sæpe condemnavit atque deposuit papam, tam ratione fidei, quam morum*: "It is reported and read, that many *popes* have fallen into *errors and heresies*: it is certain, that the *pope may err*: the council hath oftentimes condemned and removed the *pope*, in respect as well of his heresy in *faith*, as of his lewdness in life." Visellus<sup>7</sup> saith: *Summorum pontificum quidam pestilenter erraverunt*: "Certain of the *bishops of Rome* have been in *pestilent heresies*."

Visellus.

24. Q. 1. A recta. In Glossa.

Your own Gloss saith: *Certum est, quod papa errare potest*: "It is certain that the *pope may err*." Another of your doctors saith: *Interdum possit aliquis esse, qui esset a sede removendus: ut si esset fœmina, vel hæreticus: sicut fuerunt aliqui: et ob [al. ab] hoc non numerantur in catalogo paparum*: "The *pope* may sometimes be such a one, as may seem worthy to be removed: as, if he were a *woman*, or an *heretic*. And certain such there have been: and therefore they be not reckoned in the calendar of the *popes*."

Joh. de Parisiis, de potestat. Reg. et Pap. cap. 18. [cap. 23. p. 142.] Gerson. an liceat appellare a Pap. [l. 436. b.] Hostien. de concessione præbendæ. Proposuit.

Another saith: *Aliqui papæ inventi sunt flagitiosi et hæretici*: "Some *popes* have been found wicked men, and heretics." Another saith: *Et papa, et episcopi sunt deviabiles a fide*: "Both *popes* and *bishops* may wander from the *faith*." Another saith: *Papa mandans aliquid fieri, quod sonet in hæresim, turbat statum ecclesiæ, et non est ei parendum*: "The *pope* commanding any thing to be done, that soundeth of heresy, troubleth the state of the *church*,

<sup>7</sup> [Visellus. This may possibly name Visellus is not found in any be a false print for *Veselus*: the of the usual authorities.]

and we may not obey him." Another saith: *Papa potest esse hæreticus, et de hæresi judicari*: "The pope may be an heretic, and of heresy may be judged."

Extra. de Electione. Significasti. Abb. [Pannorm. tom. 1. pt. 1. fol. 122. col. 1.]

All these were the popes' undoubted friends. But now let us hear the pope himself. Pope Pius II., otherwise called Æneas Sylvius, saith thus: *Quid si criminosus papa contraria fidei prædicet, hæreticisque dogmatibus imbuat subditos?* "What if a notorious wicked pope teach things contrary to the faith, and with heretical doctrine pervert his subjects?" He could never have moved this question, if he had thought it a matter impossible, that ever the pope should be an heretic.

Æneas Sylv. de Conc. Basil. lib. 1. [p. 19. c.]

I would not stand so long in so clear a case, were it not, that M. Harding, all this notwithstanding, telleth us so sadly, and biddeth us believe it upon his warrant, that the pope undoubtedly can never err. Stanislaus Hosius, the greatest stickler of that side, blusheth not to say thus: *Numerentur omnes, &c.*: "Reckon all the popes that ever were from Peter, until this Julius, that now is; there never sate in this chair any Arian, any Donatist, any Pelagian, .....or any other, that professed any manner heresy." Yet, nevertheless, your own doctor, Alphonsus, saith: *Non credo aliquem esse adeo impudentem papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare, nec in interpretatione sacrarum literarum hallucinari possit*: "I believe, there is no so shameless a flatterer of the pope, that will grant him this prerogative, that he can never err, nor be deceived in the expounding of the scriptures<sup>8</sup>. Here, M. Harding, your own principal doctor, Alphonsus, calleth all them that maintain your doctrine, and say as you say, the shameless flatterers of the pope. Certainly, I think, it may safely be said: If a man will take the view of all Christendom, he shall not find so many heretics in any one see whatsoever, as may be found in the see of Rome. And for that cause, perhaps, Franciscus Petrarcha calleth Rome, *Asylum hære-*

Hosius in confessione Petricovien. cap. 29. [fol. 21. H.]

Alphons. contra hæres. lib. 1. cap. 4. [ed. 1534.]

Franc. Petr. epist. 20.

<sup>8</sup> [The editions of Alphonsus de Castro subsequent to that of 1539, omit this passage. See supra vol. iv. p. 472. note <sup>34</sup>, and p. 473. note <sup>35</sup>.]

*sium, et errorum*<sup>9</sup>: “The sanctuary of errors and heresies:” and in his *Italian sonnets*, he calleth it, *the school of error, and the temple of heresy.*

Schola d' errore, e Tempio d' Heresia. [3 Parte, fol. 137. a.]

Nicol. Lyra, in Matth. cap. 16. [v. 280.]

Baldus de offic. præsid. 1. Sæpe.

[Supra vol. v. 452.]

Orig. in Matt. Tract. 1. [iii. 524.]

As for Nicolaus Lyra, ye doubt of our dealing, for that the printer hath not quoted the place. It may please you therefore to peruse his notes upon the sixteenth chapter of St. Matthew. There, among others, ye shall find these words: *Ex hoc patet, quod ecclesia non consistit in hominibus, ratione potestatis, vel dignitatis ecclesiasticæ, vel sæcularis: quia multi principes, et summi pontifices inventi sunt apostatasse a fide*: “Hereby it appeareth, that the church standeth not upon men, in consideration, either of their power, or of their dignity, either ecclesiastical or temporal. For many princes and *popes have been found to have strayed from the faith.*” Therefore Baldus saith: *Cautela est, quod quis dicat, Credo quod credit sancta mater ecclesia: non quod credit papa*: “It is to be marked, that a man may say, I believe, that the church believeth: but he may not say, *I believe, that the pope believeth.*” His meaning is, that the *pope* may be deceived, and believe amiss. Ye say, “Christ prayed for Peter; *ergo*, the pope cannot err.” But where was *Christ’s* prayer then, when so many *heretics* were *popes in Rome*? Will ye say that *Christ* prayed for *Arians*, for *Nestorians*, for *Montanists*, for *Monothelites*, for *simonists*, for *idolaters*, for *necromancers*, for *poisoners*, for *murderers*, and for *dame Joan* too? Or that, by the virtue of *Christ’s* prayer, none of these could ever err? Or that the *pope’s* errors must go for *truth*, or his *heresies* be holden as *right religion*, only because you tell us, that whatsoever he say, *he cannot err*? O, M. Harding, I shewed you before, that *Christ* prayed not only for *Peter*, but also for all the rest of his disciples. Origen saith, as he is before alleged: *Num aulebimus dicere, quod adversus unum Petrum non prævalituræ sint portæ inferorum: adversus cæteros apostolos prævalituræ sint?* “Shall we dare

<sup>9</sup> [The passage intended is probably in the 18th epistle of the “Liber Epist. sine Titulo” (Opp. p. 807.); where, however, the expression is “asylum pessimiarum rerum Babylon.”]



to say, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against *only Peter*? and that the same gates shall prevail against all other the apostles?" St. Cyprian saith: *Rogabat pro delictis nostris, sicut ipse declarat, cum dicit ad Petrum: ego rogavi pro te, ne deficiat fides tua*: "Christ prayed" (not for *Peter* only, but) "for our sins, as he himself declareth, saying unto *Peter*, I have prayed for thee, that thy faith should not fail." St. Augustine, expounding the same words, saith thus: *Ego rogavi patrem pro vobis* [Bened. leg. *te*], *ne deficiat fides vestra* [Bened. leg. *tua*]: "I have prayed" (not only for *Peter*, but also) "for you, that your faith should not fail"<sup>10</sup>. Chrysostom saith: *Omnis Christianus, qui suscipit verbum Petri, thronus fit Petri: et Petrus sedet in eo*: "Every Christian man, that receiveth the word of *Peter*, is made *Peter's chair*, and *Peter* himself sitteth in him."

Cypr. in Oratationem Dominicam. [p. 213.]

Aug. de verbis Domini. secund. Ine. Serm. 36. [v. 575.]

Chrys. in Mat. hom. 23. in opere imperf. [vi. app. 143. A.]

Otherwise, M. Harding, they are not all *Peters*, that sit in place of *Peter*. St. Ambrose saith: *Non habent hæreditatem Petri, qui fidem* [Bened. leg.<sup>11</sup> *sedem*] *Petri non habent*: "They have not *Peter's inheritance*, that have not the *faith* of *Peter*."

Ambr. de Penit. lib. 1. cap. 6. [ii. 399.]

St. Hierom saith: *Auferet Dominus nomina vanæ gloriæ, et admirationis falsæ, quæ versantur in ecclesia*: "God will take away these names of vainglory and false ostentation, that are used in the *church*." Where we say, *pope Liberius favoured the Arians*, "that" (ye say) "is stark false." And yet, ye know, St. Hierom is the reporter of that falsehood. "But St. Hierom" (ye say) "was deceived." In such reverence and regard ye have the doctors and learned fathers of the church. Ye believe them no further than ye list. I doubt not, but St. Hierom might better say, M. Harding is deceived. If St. Hierom's authority suffice you not, you may take also the authority of St. Augustine. For St. Augustine saith, as he is alleged

Hier. in Sophoniam, cap. 1. [iii. 1647.]

Pope Liberius.

Hieron. de Ecc. Scrip. In Fortunatiano. [iv. pt. 2. p. 124.]

<sup>10</sup> [Concerning the readings "vobis" and "vestra," see vol. v. supra p. 452, note 41.]

<sup>11</sup> [S. Ambros. The Bened. edd. (on the authority, as they say, of the best and most numerous MSS.) read "sedem Petri." All former editions, and some MSS., read "fidem."]

Nicol. Cusan. De Concor-  
dan. lib. 2.  
cap. 5. [p.  
716.]  
Alphons. contra hæ-  
res. lib. 1.  
cap. 4. [p.  
20.]  
Platin. in Li-  
berio.

by cardinal Cusanus, that pope Liberius gave his hand and consent unto the Arians. Certainly, Alphonsus, your own doctor, saith: *De Liberio papa, constat* [l. Platina refert] *fuisse Arianum*: "Touching pope Liberius, it is well known he was an Arian." Platina saith: *Liberius, ut quidam volunt, in rebus omnibus sensit cum hæreticis*: "Pope Liberius, as some say, was in all points of one judgment with the (Arian) heretics."

Antonin. part. 2. tit. 10.  
[l. tit. 9.]  
cap. 4. §. 5.  
[tom. ii. p.  
24. B.]

Antoninus, the archbishop of Florence, saith: *Liberius papa consensit præceptis Augusti (Ariani), ut una cum hæreticis communicaret*: "Pope Liberius so consented to the commandments of the Arian emperor, that he communicated with the heretics." So saith Joverius in the *Abridgement of Councils*. So saith Hermannus Gigas. So saith your very legend, commonly called *Historia Longobardica*<sup>12</sup>. Among others, Erasmus saith: *Ariana hæresis, et Romanum pontificem involvit, et ipsos imperatores*: "The Arians' heresy entangled and wrapt both pope and emperor." By the pope, namely, he meaneth pope Liberius.

Joverius,  
Her. Gigas.

Hist. Longobard. [Hist. 98. de Felice ii.]  
Erasm. in annot. in Hler. contra Luciferian. [Hieron. Opp. ii. 135.]  
Nicol. Cusan. de Concor-  
dan. lib. 1.  
cap. 14. [p.  
707.]

Cardinal Cusanus saith: *Liberius, et Honorius, et alii in cathedra Petri aliquandiu sedentes in errorem schismaticum seducti ceciderunt*: "Pope Liberius, and Honorius, and others sitting in Peter's chair, have fallen into schismatical error, and have been deceived."

Yet you doubt not to say, "St. Hierom was shamefully deceived, and wrote of ignorance, he knew not what, and all is false."

Pope John.

Likewise ye say, that we report of pope John is most false and impudent. Our report is, that pope John denied the immortality of the soul: not thoroughly and altogether, but only in that he said, "Until the time of the last judgment, the soul lieth still, as in a trance, as doth the body, without sense of joy or pain." Wherein he not only withstood the *express word of God*, but also unwares quite overthrew his own whole *kingdom of purgatory*, which is the greatest and fairest of all his three

<sup>12</sup> [*Historia Longobardica*, generally called *Legenda Aurea*, sometimes *Speculum Sanctum*, was written by Jacobus de Voragine (fl. 1290.)]

crowns. For what avail his *pardons* and *trentals*, if the soul lie still asleep until the day of judgment, and feel no pain? Verily, after the last judgment, by common consent, there shall be nor *purgatory*, nor *trental*, nor *mass*, nor *pope*, nor *pardon*. Now if there be no place of *purgatory*, neither before nor after the last judgment, then may we well conclude, that absolutely, and without doubt, there is no *purgatory*. The first authors of this error, as St. Augustine saith, were the heretics called *Arabici*.

Touching pope John's error, Gerson saith thus<sup>13</sup>: *Johannes papa XXII. decrevit, &c.*: "Pope John XXII. decreed, that the souls of the wicked should not be punished before the day of the last judgment: which error the *University of Paris* condemned for heresy, and caused the pope to recant." One of your own companions of Louvain saith: "Pope John kept this error secretly to himself, and never had the open consent of the *church of Rome*." And for better excuse hereof he saith: *Petrus non fidem Christi, sed Christum, salva fide, negavit*: "Peter denied not the faith of *Christ*, but, his faith saved, he denied no more but only *Christ*." And so by this pretty shift of your *Louvainian divinity*, ye have both *Christ* without *faith*, and also *faith* without *Christ*. Thus, M. Harding, it is plain, by your own doctors and fellows, that our report of pope John is neither a *false slander*, as you say, nor *proceedeth of detestable and wicked malice*.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. "What shall I say, but all is false? It is a foul thing, M. Jewel, and a wicked impudency, thus to belie the doctors. Certain it is, Gerson never said it, nor in *Sermone Paschali*, as you report, nor any where else, that this pope John made any such decree. Neither was his error, as you untruly burthen him, &c. That ye write touching this pope either proceedeth of malice, or of ignorance, &c. The error of pope John XXII.

Aug. ad  
Quodvult-  
deum, hæres.  
83. [viii. 24.]  
Gerson.  
Serm. 1. In  
Fest. Pas-  
chal. [iv.  
491. d.]

Copus Dial.  
1. pp. 50, 51.

Addition.

M. Harding,  
fol. 64. a.

<sup>13</sup> [Gerson in Festo Paschali: "Propter quod insuper apparet falsitas doctrinæ papæ Joannis vicesimi [ed. 1606.], quæ damnata fuit cum sono buccinarum "vel tubarum coram rege Philippo avunculo tuo, per theologos Parisienses de virgine beata, et credidit potius theologis Parisiensibus quam curiæ."]

was not, that the souls of the wicked be not punished before the day of the last judgment, but that the souls of the good see not the face of God before the last day. His position was conceived with these terms, as we find it in Adrianus, that learned pope, and in the Extravagant of pope Benedictus Undecimus, who succeeded him next: *Animæ purgatæ ante finale iudicium non habent stolam, quæ est clara, et facialis visio Dei.*

M. Harding,  
fol. 65. a.

2.

M. Harding,  
fol. 65. b.

“Of this question some doctors then held the affirmative, some the negative. Amongst them that held the negative, this pope John XXII. was one before he was pope, and perhaps also afterward. But he held it only as his private opinion.

3.

4.

Fol. 66. b.

“Now this was an error in pope John: I deny not: yet for the same is not he to be counted an heretic: as neither St. Irenæus, Theophylactus, and St. Bernard are, who seem to have been of the same opinion. Gerson saith: *Propter quod apparet falsitas doctrinæ papæ Johannis XXII. quæ damnata fuit cum sono buccinarum, vel tubarum coram rege Philippo avunculo tuo per theologos Parisienses.* Remember, good reader, this error of pope John XXII. was not condemned by the divines of Paris when he was pope, but before, when he was a private doctor, and lived in the realm of France, &c. And so by this purgatory is not taken away at all, as your scoffing tale, that liketh you so well, pretendeth it to be: neither were the heretics, that of St. Augustine are called *Arabici*, the first authors of this error, as you say, but the Armenians and Grecians, if we may believe Guido. Now touching that you have alleged out of the council of Constance, I marvel with what face you bring it in. And what a great falsehood is it to put in your book the name of pope John XXII. for pope John XXIII. The name of this John XXIII. was, before he took upon him to be pope, Balthazar de Cossa, as there ye have it declared, &c. Neither was he a true pope, lawfully elect, but an usurper, as two others were with him at the same time. So by this place ye have proved no heresy against pope John XXII., nor against any true

5.

Fol. 66. a.

6.

7.

8.

9.

67. a.

pope at all, but only have shewed yourself a shameless shifter, and one that hath a more malicious mind to hurt the authority of the pope, than matter of just accusation against him." *The answer.* All this is true, no doubts: for M. Harding's saws must go for gospel. First, good reader, I will tell thee, what man this pope John was, and then make answer to every piece hereof in order. The next pope before him was Clemens the Fifth, that caused Franciscus Dandalus, the ambassador of Venice, to come before him tied in an iron chain, and to wallow under his table, as a dog, while his holiness sat at supper<sup>14</sup>. Otherwise the indignation he had conceived against the Venetians, could never be swaged. The fourth pope after him was Urbanus the Fourth, that took five of his cardinals upon displeasure, and tied them up in sacks, and threw them out into the sea. As for this pope John himself, he turned bishoprics into abbeys, and abbeys into bishoprics; bishoprics into archbishoprics, and archbishoprics into bishoprics; one bishopric into two, and two into one; cities into towns, and towns into cities: and thus was evermore altering, and never contented<sup>15</sup>. Pope Clemens, his predecessor, being dead, the cardinals, after they had long contended among themselves about the election of a pope, and could not agree, they committed the whole matter in trust unto this John; being then also himself a cardinal, that he should choose whom he best liked, and end the strife, nothing doubting, but he would have chosen one of the same cardinals that they had named. But he having the whole power in his own hand, like a man of trust, forgot all others, and chose himself, and so was pope by his own election. Being pope, he excommunicated Ludovicus the emperor, for that he had attempted to execute some part of his imperial office without his licence. By mean whereof, he inflamed all Christendom with such discord and hatred, and deadly wars, as could not after-

Sabell. Ennead. 9. lib. 7.

Sabell. Ennead. 9. lib. 9.  
Naucl. Genera. 44.  
[p. 993.]

Naucl. Genera. 44.  
[ibid.]

Nauclerus.  
[Gener. 45.  
pp. 996, 997.]

Carion [p. 426.]  
pro sua voluntate.

<sup>14</sup> [See Defence of the Apology, supra vol. v. p. 421.]

<sup>15</sup> [Nauclerus, "Adeo præterea rebus novis studuit, ut et sim-

"plices episcopatus bifariam divi-  
"deret, ac divisos in unum rede-  
"gerit &c."]

Paralipomen. ward be quenched in thirty years<sup>16</sup>. He said, he had  
 Urspergen- power to raise up emperors and to depose them at his  
 sis. [p. 353.] pleasure: and that, whensoever the empire is void, the  
 pope is *emperor*: and that there is no power above the  
*pope*.

And whereas certain preachers, loathing the intolerable  
 ambition and lordliness of the clergy that then was, had  
 told the people openly in their sermons, that *Christ* and  
 his *apostles* were simple and poor, and possessors of no-  
 thing, he caused them to be taken and condemned, and  
 burnt as heretics. Which thing, saith one, he did, the  
 better to justify his own greediness. For at the time of  
 his death he left in his treasury five and twenty thousand  
 thousand crowns in ready gold<sup>17</sup>: which thing was the  
 more to be wondered at, for that, not long before, the same  
 pope John had joined in war with Robert, the king of  
 Apulia, in defence of the state of Genoa: in which war,  
 as Antoninus Florentinus saith, such abundance of gold  
 and treasure was spent on both sides, as might have bought  
 a good kingdom. Such a one, M. Harding, was pope  
 John: whose doctrine you may not in any wise suffer to  
 be stained. And therefore, touching the matter itself, you  
 have minced it prettily. It was no *heresy*, you say, but  
 only an *error*. And why so? I trow, because this *John*  
 was no inferior *bishop*, nor private man, but a *bishop of*  
*bishops*, and a *pope*. For in any other poor man it had  
 been an *heresy*. The Arabians and Armenians<sup>18</sup> many  
 hundred years before were condemned and holden as  
*heretics* for the same. So blessed a thing is it to be a  
*pope*.

But if this *error* were no *heresy* in pope John, then a  
 great many, that so charged him, did him great wrong, and  
 were much to blame. Antoninus saith: *Johannes XXII.*

<sup>16</sup> [Nauclerus says "30 years:"  
 Paraleip. Ursperg. "about 24."]

<sup>17</sup> [The reading in "Catalog.  
 annorum" by Anselm. Ryd. is  
 "quinquies vices millium aureo-  
 rum." The reading in the mar-

gin is given both by Nauclerus  
 and by Antoninus.]

<sup>18</sup> [St. Augustine only names  
 the Arabians. Harding attributes  
 this heresy to the Armenians, "if,"  
 he says, "we may believe Guido."]

Anselmus  
 Rid. [fol. 81.]  
 millies vigin-  
 ti quinque  
 millia.

Anton. pt. 3.  
 tit. 21. cap. 4.  
 [Chron. iii.  
 332, 333.]

M. Harding,  
 fol. 65. b.

Aug. ad  
 Quodvult-  
 deum. [viii.  
 24.]

Pope John  
 an heretic.

Anton. pt. 3.  
 tit. 21. cap. 6.  
 §. 15. [ill.  
 p. 333.]

*sermonem faciens in publico consistorio, dixit quædam hæresim sapientia*: “Pope John, speaking openly in the consistory, uttered certain words savouring of heresy:” and therefore he saith, that of many he was judged an *heretic*. Asserebant ex eo, ipsum esse Hæreticum.  
 Christianus Massæus saith: *Johannes papa XXII. misit Parisios duos, qui hanc hæresim prædicarent*: “Pope John sent two preachers to Paris, to set forth this heresy.” Massæ. lib. 18. anno 1332. [p.247.]  
 Nauclerus saith: *Imo Johannem papam XXII. magni et multi theologi, scientia et vita probati, dogmatizabant esse hæreticum*: “Nay, many great and famous doctors of divinity, notable as well for their learning, as for their life, published pope John to be an heretic.” So many historians, and so many, and so notable doctors of divinity, may be witnesses sufficient to prove one heretic, if he were not a *pope*. Naucl. Genera. 45. [p. 997.]

Gerson saith not, *Johannes papa decrevit*, “Pope John decreed.” “This” (you say) “is a foul thing, and a wicked impudency.” *The answer*. It is no manly part, M. Harding, to strive and wrangle about words, when the matter is plain. If Gerson said not, “Pope John decreed these things,” yet he said “Pope John published and taught these things.” And a man would think, that *teaching* and *publishing* were not much less than *decreeing*. Gerson’s words be plain, even as you yourself have alleged them: *Propterea apparet falsitas doctrine papæ Johannis XXII.*: “Hereby appeareth the falsehood of the doctrine of pope John.” Christianus Massæus saith: *Papa Johannes prædicavit errorem*: “Pope John preached or set forth this error.” And it is said, *the pope’s will must needs stand for law*. M. Harding, fol. 64. b.  
Decreed.  
Massæ. lib. 18. [p. 247.]  
Extra, de Trans. Epl-scopi. Quanto. [In Glossa.]

You say, “Remember, good reader, this error of pope John XXII. was not condemned by the divines of Paris when he was pope, but before, when he was a private doctor, and lived in the realm of France.” *The answer*. Thou must believe M. Harding, good reader, be his tale never so unlikely, yea, though he speak impossibilities. “This error of pope John” (saith he) “was condemned in the presence of Philip, the French king, not when John Before he was pope.

was pope, but before, when he was a private man." Now I beseech thee, good reader, for thy better satisfaction, consider well the years and ages, as well of this king Philip the Sixth, as also of this pope John the two and twentieth. It appeareth by all writers whatsoever, that this John was consecrate pope at Avignon, *anno* 1316, and that Philippus Valesius was crowned king in France, *anno* 1328. By which computation it is plain, that this *John* was *pope* thirteen years before this *Philip* was *king*. This story is evident, and agreeably confessed by all that have written: yet it pleaseth M. Harding to take it by the top, and to turn it backward; and to tell us of himself only, without further authority, that Philip Valesius was king, and sat in place of judgment, to hear causes of religion, thirteen years at the least before this John was pope. Thus, by M. Harding's handling, pope John when he was pope, yet was no pope; and Philip was a king thirteen years at the least before he was king. Such pretty verities M. Harding can shape us for his advantage.

Yet, M. Harding, you tell us, *That this John was condemned by the divines of Paris, not when he was pope, (God forbid: for then must we confess that the pope was an heretic,) but before, when he was a private doctor, and lived in the realm of France.* Here is a marvellous case, M. Harding. An *heretic* by your confession may be a *pope*; but a *pope* in no wise may be an *heretic*. "This John" (you say) "was hereof condemned, when he was a private man, and lived in France." I pray you, M. Harding, and where lived he afterward, being *pope*? Look up your chronicles. Where was pope John's abode? Where was his consistory? Where was his court, during all that whole time while he was *pope*? Perhaps you think, it was at Rome. For there sat St. Peter: there is the continuance of his succession: and thereof the popes are called the *bishops of Rome*. If you so think, M. Harding, your thought deceiveth you. For indeed it is well known, that pope Clemens the Fifth, that was the next predecessor before pope John XXII.. removed himself, and all his

When he lived in France.

Sabell. Ennead. 9. lib. 7.



train, from Rome to Avignon in France, in the year of our Platina. Lord 1303<sup>19</sup>. From which time, during the space of three-score and fourteen years following, the popes continued still at Avignon, and never returned back to Rome. It was in vain therefore for you to say, "Pope John, at the time of his condemnation, was no pope, but only a private man, and lived in France." For during the whole time of his popedom, he continued still in France at Avignon. And being fourscore and ten years of age, he died at Avignon, and at Avignon was buried, in the cathedral church, where his body resteth until this day, and not in Rome.

Say no more, therefore, M. Harding, that pope John's error was condemned in Paris, and blown out with trumpets in the presence of the king, not when he was pope, but only when he lived in private estate. For all the historiographers that have written hereof will soon controul you. Antoninus saith: "Pope John held this error in the time of his popedom, and pronounced words savouring of heresy openly in the consistory," (being pope<sup>20</sup>.) [Anton. Chron. iii. 333, 334.] *Nauclerus* saith: *Imo papam Johannem magni et multi theologi, scientia et vita probati, dogmatizabant esse hæreticum propter errores certos: quos tamen die obitus sui dicitur tepide revocasse: et ejus successor Benedictus* Nauclerus Genera. 45. anno 1324. [p. 997.] *Tepide.* *eos errores fertur publice damnasse:* "Nay, many great and famous divines, of great learning and good life, proclaimed" (not one or other by the name of *John*, but) "*pope John*, by the name of *pope*, to be an heretic for certain errors: which errors, notwithstanding, it is said, that he coldly revoked at the time of his death:" (but not before; neither then, but coldly.) "Again it is said, that pope *Benedictus*, his next successor, openly condemned the same errors." Benedictus condemnat. *Christianus Massæus* saith:

<sup>19</sup> [This is a mistake. Clement V. was crowned at Lyons A. D. 1305; and it was not till two or three years after that event, that he established himself at Avignon: from whence Gregory XI. returned to Rome A. D. 1376. Platina him-

self gives the date of the removal to Avignon 1305.]

<sup>20</sup> [Antoninus: "Erat autem multum literatus dictus papa Joannes: unde sermonem faciens in publico consistorio dixit quædam hæresin sapientia."]

Massæus, lib.  
18. an. 1332.  
[p. 247.]

*Papa Johannes prædicavit errorem, &c. Misitque Parisios duos, alterum Dominicanum, alterum Franciscanum, qui eandem hæresim prædicarent, &c.*: “Pope John preached and professed an error, &c. And sent two preachers to Paris, the one a black friar, and the other a gray friar, to maintain the same heresy. But one Thomas, a preacher of England, withstood the *pope*. Him the *pope* took, and threw into prison. Hereupon the king summoned a council unto his palace in Vinciana Sylva. The whole assembly subscribed against the *pope*. Immediately the king sent to pope John, and willed him to reform his error, and to set the preacher at liberty: and so he did.”

Thus you see, M. Harding, that pope John, being *pope*, stood in error: that pope John was condemned for an *heretic*: that pope John professed and preached false doctrine: that pope John sent out preachers to maintain his *heresy*, and they were friars: that pope John was controlled by an English preacher: that pope John was reproved by a council: that pope John was willed by the *king* to reform his error. And yet can you tell us, all this notwithstanding, that pope John was then a private man, and no *pope* at all.

M. Harding,  
66, b.

Further you say: “Touching that you have alleged out of the council of Constance, what a great falsehood is it, to put in your book<sup>21</sup> the name of pope John XXII. for pope John XXIII.? The name of this John XXIII. was

M. Harding,  
67, a.

(before he took upon him to be pope) Balthazar de Cossa, as there ye have it declared. Neither was it certain, that he held that detestable opinion. Howsoever it be, pope John XXIII. was not a true pope lawfully elect, but an usurper.” *The Answer*. And what if I should here confess an error, M. Harding? or what if I should say, I had not advisedly considered the story, but had taken one number for another? Yet have you not one heretic pope John the less, but one the mo. For howsoever ye number them, as it shall well appear, both were *Johns*, and both were *popes*, and both were *heretics*. But as you can

<sup>21</sup> [The book here alluded to is “The View of Untruths.”]

so favourably tell us, it is no *heresy* in a *pope* wilfully to maintain an open error touching the state of the soul: so I trust of your courtesye ye will not so hastily condemn it for heinous *heresy*, if a man happen only to misreckon the name or number of a *pope*. For more than that you cannot make it. Otherwise it may happen, that you yourself, even in this selfsame place, may find yourself in like error, and yield yourself to be an *heretic*. For where you say, "It was *Benedictus Undecimus* that followed Johannes XXII.," Onuphrius calleth him *Benedictum Decimum*: and Sabellicus saith it was *Benedictus Duodecimus*. In this reckoning, if every misnumbering of a *pope* be an *heresy*, by your judgment we must needs have two *heresies* at the least. As for Balthazar a Cossa, whom you call *pope John XXIII.*, Platina calleth him *pope John XXIV.* Onuphrius calleth him, even as I did, *pope John XXII.*, and not as you do, *pope John XXIII.* And the other *John*, whom you call *pope John XXII.*, he calleth *pope John XXI.* Look on your books, and you shall find it. Now, M. Harding, you see the very causes of all this error: and yet no great cause, why you should so fiercely upbraid us with so great falsehood<sup>22</sup>.

The matter wherewith this pope John the latter was charged, was this, as it is specially objected against him in the *council of Constance*: *Quin imo dixit, et pertinaciter credidit, Animam hominis cum corpore humano mori et*

<sup>22</sup> [Although this variation in the numbering of the popes may account for bishop Jewel's mistake, still he cannot be acquitted of a singular anachronism, inasmuch as the two popes were separated from each other by the interval of a century. Pope John XXII. (Ossa) elected himself pope A. D. 1316, and was censured by the university of Paris under Philip of Valois; whereas John XXIII. (Balthasar Cossa) was elected (conditionally) by the cardinals at Pisa, (or, as Platina says, at Bologna,) A. D. 1410, and was condemned and deposed by the

council of Constance, A. D. 1415. It is remarkable, that Humphrey, in Juelli Vita, p. 195, falls still more palpably into the same mistake: "Negat Joannem papam Vicesimum Secundum de animarum immortalitate perperam sensisse: ait *schola Parisiensis*, ait ejus cancellarius *Gerson*, aiunt *patres Constantienses*:" as if all these referred to the same pope. Bp. Jewel, however, is quite right in saying, that the detection of this mistake only strengthens his argument, as it shews that there were two heretical popes of this name, instead of one.]

Sabel. Enn.  
9. [lib. 8.]

*extingui, ad instar animalium brutorum*: “Pope John said, and stubbornly believed, that the soul of man dieth together with the body, and is consumed to nothing, as the soul of brute beasts.” Therefore, M. Harding, the greatest fault ye can find in me in this behalf is this, that seeking to find *heretics* among the *popes*, I thought there had been but one pope John condemned of *heresy*, whereas indeed there were two.

You say, “This heresy was objected only against pope John XXIII., but never proved.” But it was objected against him, M. Harding, in the *council of Constance*, and of his part never purged. Seek his purgation where you will, ye shall never find it. And the want of purgation is called in law a plain conviction.

Yet, the better to countenance a bad matter, you say, “This later pope John *was no true pope, nor lawfully chosen, as appertained.*” Who saith so, M. Harding, but only yourself? And what is your own only authority against all others? In the *council of Constance*, where all the enormities and villanies of this pope John’s whole life were blazed abroad, yet this article of his *election*, and title of *popedom*, was never laid to his charge. Platina, touching his *election*, saith thus: *Bononicè omnium consensu pontifex creatur*: “This John was chosen *pope* at Bononia, by the consent of all the cardinals.” Having the consent of all the cardinals, he wanted none, no not one. And what election can be more *canonical*, or lawful, than when the voices of all the electors agree together? Certainly in any reasonable judgment he was much more lawfully chosen than pope John XXII., that chose himself. And yet was that pope John a lawful *pope*. Indeed the other two *popes* were set up in schism and division, only by a part of the cardinals. But pope John XXIII. was lawfully chosen by the consent and agreement of the whole: and had he not been charged with other crimes, he had never been removed<sup>23</sup>.

Platina in Jo-  
han. 24.

<sup>23</sup> [This does not seem so certain; he was elected pope, with the express condition, and on the full understanding, that in certain

To conclude: you say, "The heretics, that of St. Augustine are called *Arabici*, were not the first authors of this error: but the Armenians and Grecians, if we believe Guido." *The Answer*. And why so, M. Harding? Did not the *Arabian heretics* hold this same error? Verily St. Augustine's words are plain: *Arabici dixerunt, animas cum corporibus mori atque dissolvi: et in fine sæculi utrumque resurgere*. But you say, "The Armenians were the founders of this error: and they were long before the Arabians." For, I trow, so saith your Guido. But examine you better the course of times. You may happen to find your error. St. Augustine saith: "The Arabians were in the time of Origen," wellnear fourteen hundred years ago. As for the Armenians, Alphonsus saith, "They began about eleven hundred years ago, after the council of Chalcedon," about the year of our Lord 450<sup>24</sup>, that is to say, two hundred and fifty years after the Arabians. Now, M. Harding, tell us, I pray you, whether of these two sorts of *heretics* was the former? It is not a likely matter, that the Arabians, that were fourteen hundred years ago, learned first their heresy of the Armenians, that followed two hundred and fifty years after them.

Aug. ad  
Quodvult-  
deum. [viii.  
24.]

Arabici, ann.  
212.

Alphonsus,  
de Hæresib.  
lib. 2. [p. 116.]  
De Adam et  
Eva Armenii,  
ann. 450.

As for Guido the *Carmelite friar*, no doubt, he was wise and worthy doctor, to be brought forth for a witness against the authority of St. Augustine<sup>25</sup>.

Now, that the truth of your words may appear the better, let us lay forth a brief hereof by way of comparison, as in a table.

#### M. HARDING.

This was an error in pope John XXII., I deny not. Yet for the same is not he to be counted an heretic.

#### THE ANSWER.

*Antoninus*: "Pope John uttered words of *heresy*. And many judged him to be an *heretic*."

contingencies he should resign. The council of Constance compelled him to fulfil his promise.]

<sup>24</sup> [Alphonsus de Castro does not state this positively, but thinks it probable. He says, however,

that it is certain that they had not yet separated from the church in the time of St. Augustine.]

<sup>25</sup> [Guido's work is "Summa de Hæresibus."]

*Massæus*: "Pope John sent preachers to Paris to maintain his *heresy*."

M. HARDING.

Gerson never said, that pope John made any such decree.

THE ANSWER.

*Gerson*: "Pope John professed it, and taught this *heresy*."

*Massæus*: "Pope John preached and published this error." *Prædicavit errorem*.

M. HARDING.

This error of pope John XXII. was not condemned by the divines of Paris, in the presence of the king, when he was *pope*, but before, when he was a private doctor.

THE ANSWER.

Pope John XXII. was *pope* thirteen years before king Philip was *king*.

*Antoninus*: "Pope John spake words savouring of *heresy*, in the consistory," that is to say, being *pope*.

*Nauclerus*: "The most famous divines proclaimed pope John, being *pope*, to be an *heretic*."

*Massæus*: "Pope John preached error, and sent preachers abroad to maintain his *heresy*."

M. HARDING.

Pope John was condemned before he was *pope*, when he lived in the realm of France.

THE ANSWER.

Pope John, during the whole time of his *popedom*, continued still at Avignon in France, and never departed thence to Rome. *Sabellicus*.

M. HARDING.

Pope John held this error only as his private opinion.

THE ANSWER.

*Gerson*: "Pope John professed and taught this doctrine."

*Massæus*: "Pope John *preached* it, and sent out *preachers* to maintain it, and imprisoned them that durst to withstand it."

M. HARDING.

You name pope John XXII. for pope John XXIII.

## THE ANSWER.

*Onuphrius* calleth him as I do, pope John XXII.

*Platina* calleth him pope John XXIV., and not, as you do, pope John XXIII.

Instead of one heretical pope John, we have found two, and the later much more horrible than the former.

## M. HARDING.

This heresy was objected against pope John XXIII. in the council of Constance, but never proved.

## THE ANSWER.

This heresy was objected against pope John, but never purged.

## M. HARDING.

Pope John XXIII. was never lawfully chosen.

## THE ANSWER.

*Platina*: "Pope John was chosen at Bononia, by the consent of all the cardinals. Whoso hath the consent of all the electors, is lawfully chosen."


## M. HARDING.

The Arabians were not the authors of this error, but the Armenians.

## THE ANSWER.

*St. Augustine*: "The Arabians were the authors hereof."

The Arabians were two hundred and fifty years before the Armenians.

So many ways, M. Harding, have you corrupted and altered the truth of this story. And yet you think it lawful for you to cry out against us, "All is false: wicked impudency: ye belie the doctors: ye are malicious: ye are ignorant: ye are shameless shifters." 

For the rest, ye say, we belie pope Zosimus: "he corrupted not the council of Nice." For trial whereof I refer myself to my former Reply unto your Answer. Certainly, whatsoever learned man will stand to the denial hereof, he must needs want colour in his face. The fraud was notoriously found, and detected to the whole world by the ancient learned fathers, Cyrillus and Atticus, the one being patriarch of Alexandria, the other of Antioch, and was

Pope Zosimus.

Art. 4. Div. 6.  
[supra vol. ii. 162.]

Concl. Afr. Can. 101. [iv. 513 et 514.]

reproved and published by two hundred and seventeen bishops, openly in the *council of Africa*. The peevish forged *epistle* that ye allege under the name of the learned godly father Athanasius: the fantastical burning of the *canons of Nice* without fire, with other your like childish vanities, scarcely meet for children to play withal, are likewise answered.

An epistle forged under the name of Athanasius.

The council of Nice corrupted. In the Reply. Art. 4. Div. 6. [Supra vol. ii. 15.]

Copus, p. 78. Concil. Florence. Sessione 20. [xxx1. 773.]

Concil. Carthag. 6. cap. 4. [iv. p. 404.]

One of your own *Louvanian company* confesseth, that in the late *council of Florence* the *Greeks* there made open complaint, that the *bishop of Rome* had corrupted the *canons of the council of Nice*. Alypius, the bishop of Tagasta, speaking hereof in the *council of Carthage*, saith thus: *Adhuc tamen me movet, quoniam cum inspiceremus Græca exemplaria hujus synodi Nicenæ, ista ibi, nescio qua ratione, minime invenimus*: “Yet this thing moveth me, that when we examined and conferred the *originals of the Nicene council, written in Greek*, I know not by what means, these things we found not there.”

*Addition.* ¶ Howbeit, all this may be easily holpen Addition. by a writ of error. For you will say, pope Zosimus alleged the *council of Sardica* instead of the *council of Nice*<sup>27</sup>. And herein he was deceived: and this was his whole fault. If this were all the fault, M. Harding, yet were it a great fault for *Christ's vicar*, and *St. Peter's successor*, in maintenance of his own inordinate ambition, to allege one *council* for another, and therewith to face down two hundred and seventeen bishops in general council. If it were the *council of Sardica*, and not of *Nice*, why then did pope Zosimus so often and so stoutly allege it for the *council of Nice*? How durst he say, he had seen it, he had read it, and had the very true copy of it in his library in Rome? Why did he cause the *bishops of Africa* to send so many hundred miles, to Constantinople in Thracia, to Alexandria in Egypt, and to Antioch in Syria, to search the originals of the *council of Nice*, himself knowing there was

<sup>27</sup> [Supra vol. ii. p. 132. note <sup>69</sup>, p. 163. notes <sup>3</sup> and <sup>4</sup>, and vol. iv. p. 466. note <sup>29</sup>. It is remarkable that bishop Jewel has likewise confounded the council of Nice and

the council of Sardica, when he erroneously maintains that Julius was pope at the time of the council of Nice. *Infra* p. 586. fol. edit.]



no such thing written in the *council of Nice*? Was this plain dealing, M. Harding? Was this no corruption of a *council*? The *law* saith: *Magna negligentia culpa est: magna culpa dolus est*: “Great negligence is a fault, and a great fault is guile and falsehood.”

As for the *council of Sardica*, Nicolaus Cusanus saith: *Sardicense concilium pro statuto Niceni concilii per legatos apostolicæ sedis falso fuit allegatum*: “The *council of Sardica* was deceitfully or falsely alleged by the legates of the apostolic see of Rome, sent from pope Zosimus instead of a canon of the *council of Nice*.” Here, M. Harding, I beseech you of your courtesy, forget not this: Nicolaus Cusanus, one of your principal doctors, telleth you, that pope Zosimus and his legates *deceitfully and falsely* alleged the *council of Sardica* under the name of the *council of Nice*.  
Nicol. Cusan. De Concordia, lib. 2. cap. 25. [p. 757.]

But yet let us see, of what authority and credit was this *council of Sardica*? Nicolaus Cusanus saith: *Augustinus non putavit illud concilium esse catholicum, sed potius Arianum*: “St. Augustine held not the *council of Sardica* for a catholic council, but rather for a *council of Arian heretics*.” It goeth hard with the *pope*, M. Harding, when he is driven to leave all *catholic councils*, and to hold by such evidence.  
Nicol. Cusan. De Concordia, lib. 2. cap. 15. [p. 732.]

Verily, Cusanus, opening his own judgment touching the said *council of Sardica*, saith thus: *Verum est, ipsos patres Africani concilii (in quo et S. Augustinus interfuit) in epistola ad Cælestinum scribere, se hanc constitutionem..... nulla patrum synodo invenisse constitutam. Quare satis posset dubitari, an Sardicensis concilii constitutio existat*: “It is certain, that the bishops, in the *council of Africa*, (among whom also was St. Augustine,) in their letters unto pope Celestine, write thus, that they never found this constitution decreed, in the council of any bishops: wherefore it may well be doubted, whether this be a constitution of the *council of Sardica*, or rather no.” Thus, M. Harding, you see, pope Zosimus falsely alleged a *canon* of the *council of Sardica*, for a *canon* of the *council of Nice*: you see, the said *council of Sardica*, whereby ye would hold, was a *council of heretics*: you see, your own doctor, Cusanus, doubteth whether ever there were any such *canon* written,  
Nicol. Cusan. De Concordia, lib. 2. cap. 25. [p. 757.]

or no, either in the *council of Nice*, or in the *council of Sardica*, either by *catholics*, or by *heretics*. And yet will you say, *It cannot be proved, that pope Zosimus was a corrupter of councils?* ☞

Epist. Bonif. II. ad Eulaliū. [Mansi viii. 732.]

Yet pope Boniface, to save the credit of the *see of Rome*, was forced to say, and publish openly, that the said Alypius, and Aurelius, the *bishop of Carthage*, and St. Augustine, the *bishop of Hippo*, and two hundred and fourteen other *bishops*, that had espied and revealed this falsehood, were all inflamed and led by the devil<sup>28</sup>. And one of your own sudden doctors of Louvain saith: *Hæc omnia, tanquam somnia, tanquam fabulæ, tanquam superflua, abolita, antiquata, calcata sunt*: “All these decrees” (of these *councils of Carthage and Africa*) “are abolished, and repealed, and trodden under foot, as dreams, and fables, and things superfluous<sup>29</sup>.” This, M. Harding, is the weighing of your *councils*. If they like you, they are the express voices of the *Holy Ghost*: if they like you not, they are dreams, and fables, and things superfluous.

Copus, p. 93.

Johan. Camotensis.

Camotensis (ye say) is some worshipful doctor, such as by our own judgment might pass in the black guard. Yet was he a *bishop*, M. Harding, in all respects far better than either your Leontius, or your Hippolytus, or your new found Clemens, whom ye call the *apostles' fellow*, or your vain fable of Amphilochius. Ye would seem to find fault with the name; and think we should not have written *Camotensis*, but rather *Ivo Carnotensis*. Your guess ye shew us: but reason thereof ye shew us none. Ye might as well have said, *Fulbertus Carnotensis*, who being very much consumed and spent with sickness, as it is learnedly noted among other your verities, for a restorative, sucked our *Lady's breast*, and by virtue thereof was made whole. Ye might likewise have guessed it had been *Johannes Sarisburiensis*<sup>30</sup>, otherwise called by some, *Rupertus*

Herm. Rtd. [p. 143.]

<sup>28</sup> [This epistle is not genuine, as Bp. Jewel intimates supra ii. 273., where see note <sup>86</sup>.]

<sup>29</sup> [Copus quotes these words from Vincentius Lirinensis.]

<sup>30</sup> [The writer in question, how-

ever, was Johannes Sarisburiensis. See supra vol. ii. 217. note <sup>46</sup>. The sentences in the text occur in different parts of his work “de nugis curialibus” or “Polycraticus:” Bibl. magn. patr. vett.

*Carnotensis*. For he saith: *In ecclesia Romana sedent scribae et Pharisei*: "In the church of Rome sit the scribes and the Pharisees." But indeed this writer's name is *Johannes Camotensis* alleged by Cornelius Agrippa. His words be these: *Angelis præcipiunt: potestatem habent in mortuos: vim faciunt scripturis, ut habeant plenitudinem potestatis. Ipse papa jam factus est intolerabilis. Ejus pompam et fastum nullus tyrannorum unquam æquavit. Legati Romanorum pontificum sic bacchantur in provinciis, ac si ad flagellandam ecclesiam Satan egressus sit a facie Domini*: "They lay their commandments upon the angels of God: they have power upon the dead: they wrest and rack the scriptures, that they may have the fulness of power. The pope himself is now become intolerable. No tyrant was ever able to match him in pomp and pride. The pope's legates keep such revel in kingdoms and countries, as if Satan were sent abroad from the face of the Lord, to scourge the church." This is not your *Ivo Carnotensis*: it is *Johannes Camotensis*: and this is his judgment of your church of Rome.

Jo. Sarisburiensis in Polycratico. [lib. 6. c. 24. et lib. v. c. 16.]  
Cornel. Agripp. de vanit. Scientiarum. [De magistrat. Eccles. et de Jure Canonico.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis. 1.*

What will ye say, if the pope's advocates, abbots, and bishops, dissemble not the matter, but shew themselves open enemies to the gospel, and though they see, yet will not see, but wry the scriptures, and wittingly and knowingly corrupt and counterfeit the word of God, and foully and wickedly apply to the pope all the same things which evidently and properly be spoken of the person of Christ only; nor by no means can be applied to any other? And what though they say, "*The pope is all, and above*

Host. [de Transl. Episc.] cap. Quanto. [tom. 1. pt. 1. fol. 84. col. 1.]  
Abbas Panor. de Elect. cap. Venerabil. [tom. 1. fol. 156. col. 1.]

tom. xv. p. 427. lib. v. c. 16., lib. 6. c. 24. They are quoted also by Agrippa in his chapter "de magistratibus ecclesiae," and in that "de Jure Canonico." Bp. Jewel himself seems to have had

some doubts respecting the true author, as we learn from his letter consulting Bullinger, (March 10, 1566.) which is printed infra in vol. viii.]

[Vol. iv. p. 74.]

all?" Or, "That the pope can do as much as Christ can do:" and, "That one judgment-place, and one council-house, serveth for the pope, and for Christ, both together?" Or, "That the pope is the same light which should come into the world:" which words Christ spake of himself alone: and, "That whoso is an evildoer, hateth and fleeth from that light?" Or, "That all the other bishops have received of the pope's fulness?"

Cornel. E-  
pisc. [Bi-  
tont.] in  
Conc. Trid.  
[inter Con-  
cion. Tri-  
dent. p. 16.  
col. 2.]

M. HARDING.

You have never done with your "*what ifs.*" Your interpreter, good gentlewoman, that favoureth your pleasant divinity so much, seemeth to be weary of it herself. For here she turneth your *Quid si* into "What will ye say if." And now, sir, do you demand of us, as madam interpreter maketh you to speak, what we will say? Forsooth, for this you allege against the pope's advocates, abbots, and bishops, we say, that the most part is very false and slanderous: somewhat may be taken for truth in a right sense. As for the advocates, I mind not to be their advocate, neither have they need of my help. Let them answer one for another: Hostiensis for abbot Panormitane, and he for Hostiensis. In good sooth, were those excellent men at this day living, I think verily they would not do you that honour, as to answer you themselves. Or if they would vouchsafe to do so much, I doubt not, but they would make short work with you, and take you up roundly for halting, with one word, *mentiris*, dashing all your allegations, which word in your divinity is a *verb commune*.

Thus leaving Hostiensis and Panormitane to defence of the canonists, telling you by the way, that in questions of divinity we stand not always to their sayings; we answer you on the behalf of Cornelius, the bishop of Bitonto in Italy, (for him ye mean, I suppose, putting in your margin the name of Cornelius only,) that he never said, <sup>a</sup>the pope is the light which should come into the world, in that sense as it is spoken of Christ. If you were hardly charged to shew, where he said it, or where he wrote it, you would be found a liar, as in many other points you are found already. That he never wrote it in any of his eloquent Italian sermons, set forth in print, I am assured. And more hath he not set forth. Now it remaineth that you tell us, where he saith so, <sup>a</sup>or else confess your slanderous lie.

a Untruth, blasphemous, unadvisedly defended. For the words be plain, *Papa lux venit in mundum.*

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Where ye say, M. Harding,—I think ye have learned of a child,—that *mentiris* is a *verb common*, if ye hold on as

ye have begun, ye will shortly alter the property thereof to yourself, and make it henceforth a *verb private*. Touching Hostiensis and Panormitane, I will say nothing, but only refer you to the places.

As for *Cornelius*, the *bishop of Bitonto*, forasmuch as, contrary to your nature, ye plead ignorance, and say ye cannot find the place, read therefore these words in his *oration* openly pronounced in your late *chapter at Trident*:

*Quis erit tam injustus rerum æstimator, qui non dicat, Papa lux venit in mundum? sed dilexerunt homines tenebras magis quam lucem. Omnis qui male agit, odit lucem, et non venit ad lucem, ut non arguantur opera ejus, quia mala sunt:* “Who will so unjustly weigh things, but he will say, *The pope is the light that is come into the world? But men have loved darkness more than*” (the *pope*, that is) “*the light*. Whosoever doth evil, hateth the *light*, and cometh not to the *light*, lest his works should be discovered, for that they be evil.”

Conc. Trident. sub Paulo 3.  
Oratio Cornel. Episc. Bitontin.  
[inter Conciones Trident. p. 16. col. 2.]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis. 2.*

Shortly, what though they make decrees expressly against *God's word*, and that, not in hucker mucker, or covertly, but openly, and in the face of the world: must it needs yet be gospel straight, whatsoever they say? Shall these be *God's holy army*? Or, will Christ be at hand among them there? Shall the *Holy Ghost* flow in their tongues, or can they with truth say, We and the *Holy Ghost* have thought so?

M. HARDING.

After a great many of your foolish and false “*what ifs*,” you conclude shortly with “What if they make decrees expressly against God's word, and that openly in the face of the world?” Hereto we answer, requiting your What if with another What if, say, What if the learned and holy fathers, &c.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 6. *Divis.* 3.

Hosius contra Brent. lib. 2. [ed. 1562. fol. 165. E.]

Christ worthy to die.

Indeed, Peter Asotus<sup>31</sup> and his companion Hosius<sup>[Vol. iv. p. 74.]</sup> stick not to affirm, that the same *council*, wherein our *Saviour Jesus Christ* was condemned to die, had both the *spirit of prophesying*, and the *Holy Ghost*, and the Spirit of truth: and, that it was neither a false, nor a trifling saying, when those bishops said, “*We have the law, and by our law he ought to die:*” and, that they, so saying, did light upon the very *truth of judgment*: (for so be Hosius’ words:) and, that the same plainly was a just decree, whereby they pronounced, that *Christ* was worthy to die. This, methinketh, is strange, that these men are not able to speak for themselves, and to defend their own cause, but they must also take part with Annas and Caiaphas against Christ<sup>32</sup>. For if they will call that a lawful and a good *council*, wherein the *Son of God* was most shamefully condemned to die the death<sup>33</sup>, what *council* will they then allow for false and naught? And yet (as all their *councils*, to say truth, commonly be) necessity compelled them to pronounce these things of the council holden by Annas and Caiaphas.

## M. HARDING.

<sup>34</sup>.....Such unhoneſt toys better become Brentius, that ſhameleſſe railing heretic<sup>35</sup>.....Now to you, ſir defender. You belie Hoſius, as Brentius, of whom you borrowed this, belied the

<sup>31</sup> [Apol. Lat. “*Petrus à Soto.*”]

<sup>32</sup> [These words, “against Christ,” are added in the translation.]

<sup>33</sup> [Apol. Lat. “*ad crucem.*”]

<sup>34</sup> [Harding comments on “the lady interpreter” turning the “*à Soto*” of the Latin into “*Asotus*.”]

<sup>35</sup> [Harding proceeds: “For who taketh these virtues (truth, honesty, and womanly shamefast-

ness) from you, shall leave you little worth for all your pretty Greek, Latin, and English. . . . If this be the fault of the author himself, by whom your translation hath been corrected and allowed, beshrew his fingers for so writing, and blame your own shrewd head for willing it to pass abroad in your name A. B., if these two letters report your name.”]

reverend father Peter a Soto. Either you have readen the place of Hosius, or you have not. If you have not, then are you to blame to say so much evil that you know not. If you have readen the place, then is your fault plain malice, in putting that to Hosius, the contrary whereof you find in the place by yourself alleged, by which you lead us, as it were by the hand, to behold and consider your own dishonesty. How just cause you have to reprehend Hosius, for that he wrote against Brentius in defence of Petrus a Soto, touching the council in which Christ was condemned by Caiaphas, it should best appear to him, that would read the whole place where Hosius treateth that matter. The same would I here have rehearsed, to the discovering of your false dealing, and shameless lying, were not the same very long.....

First, this is the truth touching the whole : <sup>a</sup>The acts of those priests of the Jews' synagogue were wicked, and contrary to Christ. <sup>a</sup>But their sentence, though themselves were never so evil, was not only true, but also to mankind most profitable. And St. John in his Gospel witnesseth, it was the oracle of God. For when, after long deliberation of the council, Caiaphas the high bishop and president of that council had pronounced his sentence, whereunto all the rest almost gave their consent, "It is expedient for us, that one man die for the people, and not that all the nation perish;" the evangelist thereto added his verdict, saying, "This he said, not of himself, but whereas he was high bishop of that year, he prophesied." Therefore let this be the true conclusion of the whole matter: The acts of that council were wicked, the sentence was true, and good. Now Hosius treateth this matter so learnedly, and so substantially, as you cannot truly take any advantage of his words to reprehend him. He stayeth himself upon the scripture, a good ground to stand upon. Which scripture referreth doubtful and hard questions to the priests of the Levitical order. Of whom it is said, *Indicabunt tibi iudicii veritatem*: "<sup>b</sup>They shall shew unto thee the truth of judgment." In this judgment, saith Hosius, though it were never so wicked, yet was the truth of judgment. How that might be, there he proveth it to Brentius by most manifest argument.....

Where ye impute to Hosius, to have said, that the same plainly was a just decree, <sup>c</sup>whereby they pronounced that Christ was worthy to die, that is your slanderous lie, not Hosius' saying. <sup>c</sup>For he saith the clean contrary, and that sundry times, that it was a wicked council, and most unjust decree. God forbid any Christian man should say that Christ was worthy to die. <sup>d</sup>He saith, it might have been truly pronounced by Caiaphas, that he was guilty of death. And there he sheweth how, very religiously and wisely admonishing the reader, that he was most innocent, and deserved not to die. And thus, sir, you may see, we take

<sup>a</sup> A discreet and a worthy proctor. The acts were naught, and the sentence good. The sentence was, that Christ should die the death.

<sup>b</sup> This truth of judgment was, that the Son of God was a blasphemer, and had deserved to die.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For thus said Caiaphas: and his judgment Hosius defendeth, as true and godly.

<sup>d</sup> Christ, by Hosius' judgment was guilty of death.

not part with Annas and Caiaphas, as you rail, and yet be able, God be thanked, to defend our true cause, and declare you to the world to be false teachers. Therefore belie us no more.....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Good Christian reader, this whole matter concerneth only the credit and certainty of *general councils*. Sotus and Hosius say, whatsoever is determined in *council*, must be taken as the undoubted *judgment and word of God*. Hercunto the godly learned father Johannes Brentius replieth thus: "Councils sometimes have erred, and have utterly wanted the *Spirit of God*, as it may appear by that in a *council* the Son of God was condemned, and judged to die the death." Hosius answereth: "When Annas and Caiaphas sat as *presidents* in the *council*, and *Christ* the Son of God was by them condemned to die, yet nevertheless the same *council* had the assistance of the *Holy Ghost*, and the undoubted *Spirit of truth*." For, speaking of the same *council*, he saith thus: *Vides, Brenti, quemadmodum non defuerit sacerdotio Levitico spiritus propheticus, Spiritus Sanctus, Spiritus veritatis*: "Ye see, friend Brentius, how that the *Levitical priesthood*" (that pronounced sentence of death against Christ) "wanted not the *spirit of prophecy, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of truth*." Again he saith: *Ex quo tempore primus parens noster de vetito ligno gustavit, factus est mortis reus Christus Dei, &c. Nec falsum fuit illud, quod dixerunt, Nos legem habemus et secundum legem hanc debet mori*: "From the time that our first father tasted of the forbidden fruit, *Christ the Son of God* became *guilty of death*: neither was it false, that the Jews said, *We have a law, and according to that law he ought to die*." With this *spirit*, I trow, he was inspired, that wrote this *marginal note* upon your Decrees: *Judæi mortaliter peccassent, nisi Christum crucifixissent*: "The Jews had committed mortal sin, if they had not nailed Christ unto the cross." Again Hosius saith: *Nulla esse potest tanta pontificum improbitas, quæ impedire queat, quo minus vera sit illa Dei promissio, Qui indicabunt tibi judicii veritatem*:

Hosius, lib. 2.  
contra Brent.  
[fol. 165. E.  
ed. 1562.]

Pag. 62. b.  
[fol. 165. F.  
G.]

Dist. 13.  
Item: in  
Glossa, et in  
margine.

Pag. 63. [fol.  
165. H.]



“ Be the wickedness of bishops never so great, it can never hinder, but that this promise of God shall ever be true, *The bishops shall shew thee the truth of judgment.*”

This, therefore, M. Harding, is by your doctor’s meaning : it is sufficient that *bishops* only meet in *council*. God will supply all the rest. Whatsoever they determine, the Holy Ghost will assist them : they cannot err. All this is as true, as that Hosius your doctor saith : “ *Annas and Caiaphas could not err in pronouncing sentence of death against*

Hosius contra Brent. p. 63, b. [fol. 165. H.]

*Christ.*” But for excuse hereof, somewhat to salve a festery matter, ye tell us a long tedious tale, without head or foot : and that your reader may think ye say somewhat, ye cry out aloud, “ Shameless railing heretics, we belie Hosius, we belie Sotus. Our false dealing, our shameless lying ! we are impudent, and continue in lying.” These, M. Harding, be the proofs and grounds of your doctrine, and the most savoury and fairest flowers in your garland.

The substance of your tale is this : “ The acts of the council, where Christ was condemned, were lewd and wicked : but the sentence of death pronounced by the bishops against Christ, was just and true.” And thus by your dalliance in dark words, and by your blind distinction between *act* and *sentence*, ye seek shifts to mock the world. Ye should plainly have told us, what were these *sentences* : and what were these *acts* : and what great difference ye can espy between *act* and *sentence* : or when ever ye heard of *sentence in judgment* without *act* : or of perfect *act* without *sentence* : or how the *sentence* of the *judge* may be true, if the *act be false* : or how the *act* may be right, if the *sentence* be wrong. For the *act* is a direction to the *sentence* : and the *sentence* groweth upon the *act*. For your credit’s sake, leave these toys, M. Harding. Ye have used them overlong. They are too childish for a child : they become not your gravity : they deceive the simple.

Indeed, I can easily believe, that neither Sotus nor Hosius was ever so wicked to say that *Christ was rightly*

and worthily done to death. Howbeit, he that saith: "The sentence of death pronounced in council against Christ, was just and true," seemeth indeed to say no less. For if the sentence of Christ's death were just, then had Christ undoubtedly deserved to die. The very case and course of your doctrine undoubtedly forced them thus to say. For if all councils be good and holy, without exception, then must that also be a good and a holy council, that was assembled against God and against his Christ.

Hosius, your doctor, to make the matter plain, saith thus: *Judasne sit, an Petrus, an Paulus, Deus attendi non vult: sed solum hoc, quod sedet in cathedra Petri: quod apostolus: quod Christi legatus: quod angelus est Domini exercituum: de cujus ore legem requirere jussus es. Hoc solum spectari vult. Si Judas est, quandoquidem apostolus est, nihil te moveat, quod fur est:* "God will never have thee consider, whether the pope be a Judas, or a Peter, or a Paul. It is sufficient only that he sitteth in Peter's chair: that he is an apostle: that he is Christ's ambassador: that he is the angel of the Lord of hosts: from whose mouth thou art commanded to require the law. This thing, only, Christ would have thee to consider. Be he Judas, forasmuch as he is an apostle, let it not move thee, though he be a thief."

But Caiaphas said, "It is good that one man die for the people, lest all the people perish." Ergo, say you, "Caiaphas had the Spirit of God." Alas, M. Harding, although you little pass for your divinity, yet why have you no more regard unto your logic. Every child knoweth, that this is a paralogismus, or a deceitful kind of reasoning, called fallacia accidentis. And that ye may the better espy your oversight, like as ye say, "Caiaphas prophesied blindly, himself not understanding what he said, ergo, he had the Holy Ghost:" even so may ye say, "Balaam's ass reproved his master, and spake the truth, as Caiaphas did: ergo, Balaam's ass had the Holy Ghost." St. Paul saith: "No man can say, The Lord Jesus, but in the Spirit of God." Hereof by your logic ye may reason thus: "The

Hosius in  
Confessione  
Petricovien.  
cap. 29. [fol.  
22. c.]

devil said unto Christ, I know that thou art Christ the Son of the living God; *ergo*, the devil had the Spirit of God."

It pitieth me, M. Harding, to see your follies. Although Caiaphas, unwares and against his will, by the enforcement and power of God, at one only time spake words of truth, as did also *Balaam's ass*, and the *devil*, yet it followeth not, that we should therefore at all times run to Caiaphas to seek the truth.

St. Augustine saith: *Quando Deus voluit, etiam mutum jumentum rationabiliter loquutum est. Nec ideo admoniti sunt homines, in deliberationibus suis, etiam asinina expectare consilia*: "When it pleased God, *Balaam's ass*, being a dumb beast, was able to speak as a man. Yet are not men, therefore, commanded in all their consultations and doubtful cases to seek *counsel of an ass*." Aug. Epist. 58. [L. 57. Tom. ii. 685. P.]

As for the *lies*, *shames*, and *slanders*, ye would so liberally lay upon us, it may please you to take them freely home again. If ye be full freight, and have store sufficient of your own, yet may you divide them among your poor *Louvanian brethren*. It shall be a work of supererogation. For yewiss, they have of their own enough already. To conclude, your whole drift herein is, to force your reader to have a good opinion of Annas and Caiaphas, that condemned Christ to die the death: for that, as Hosius saith, they had the *Spirit of prophesy*, the *Holy Ghost*, and the *Spirit of truth*: and therefore could not err in their judgment.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis.* 1.

But will these men (I say) reform us the *church*, being themselves both the persons guilty, and the judges too? Will they abate their own ambition and their pride? Will they overthrow their own causes, and give sentence against themselves, that they must leave off to be unlearned *bishops*, slowbellies, heapers together of benefices, takers upon

them as princes and men of war? Will the *abbots*, the *pope's* dear darlings, judge that *monk* for a thief, which laboureth not for his living: and that it is against all law to suffer such a one to live and to be found either in city or in country, all of other men's charges? Or else, that a *monk* ought to lie on the ground, to live hardly with herbs and *peason*<sup>36</sup>, to study earnestly, to argue, to pray, to work with hand, and fully to bend himself, to come to the ministry of the *church*? In faith, as soon will the Pharisees and Scribes repair again the *temple of God*, and restore it unto us a house of prayer, instead of a den of thieves.

## M. HARDING.

Ye leap with a light skip from one thing to another, neither dwell ye long in any one point, but in lying. ....

But ye say, they be both the persons guilty, and the judges also. Judges doubtless they be. For their vocation is lawful; ye cannot disprove it. Guilty also they be, we deny not, but whereof? Of frail living, not of false teaching (FOR COMMONLY THEY TEACH NOTHING). And where? In the court of conscience, <sup>a</sup> not in the court of man. Or if any of them be, both before this council, and in this council godly orders have been decreed for wholesome reformation. ....

<sup>a</sup> Untruth.  
For their life  
is notorious  
to the world.

As for monks, ye may not look now, that either they get their living only by their hand labour, or that they be bound to the hard discipline which monks lived in for twelve hundred years past. Now be other days, other manners. Such great austerity is to be wondered at, and to be wished for. But whether the religious men of our time be to be compelled thereto, I leave it to wise consideration. If it may be lawful to direct us in such spiritual cases, by an old example of extern prudency, me thinketh the discretion of Jacob's answer to his brother Esau is worth to be thought on. When Esau courteously offered his brother Jacob, returning from Mesopotamia with all his train of household and cattle, to go with him and keep him company the rest of the journey that remained from the place of their first meeting; Jacob full mildly said, "Sir, you know, if it like your lord-

Gen. xxxiii.  
13, 14.

<sup>36</sup> ["Peason," (Apol. Lat. "ciceribus,") an old plural for "pease," Todd's Johnson.]

ship, that I have here with me tender babes, <sup>b</sup> ewes with lamb, <sup>b</sup> and kine with calf: if I overlabour them with fast going, my flocks will die all in a day: may it please your lordship to go before me your servant? I will follow after the flock fair and soft, so as I shall see my little ones able to bear it.”

<sup>b</sup> M. Harding likeneth his monks to droves of cattle.

Likewise if there be not a discreet moderation used, but all monks be rigorously driven to the austerity of life they lived in of old time, in this so great looseness of manners, specially the discipline of all religions being so far slacked in comparison of the ancient severity, it is to be feared we shall rather see cloisters forsaken (WHICH GOD GRANT) than a godly reformation procured (WHICH WILL NEVER BE).

In the end of this paragraph ye shew yourself to despair of our amendment. God give you grace so to do for your parts, as we may have good cause to hope better of you. But whether we amend our faults, or otherwise, what pertaineth that to the justification of your new gospel, and to the disproof of the catholic faith by us defended? You know it is no good argument *a moribus ad doctrinam*. Who would not hiss you, and tramp you out of schools, if ye made this fond reason: the papists' lives be faulty, *ergo*, their teaching is false? To this head all the reasons of your Apology in effect may be reduced: and they hold, *Per locum topicum novi evangelii a malis moribus*. <sup>c</sup> Doth not Christ himself confute all such your feeble reasons, where he saith, The Scribes and Pharisees sit in the chair of Moses; whatsoever they say to you do ye, but after their works do ye not?

<sup>c</sup> Here M. Harding compareth the pope and his bishops with the Scribes and Pharisees.

Matt. xxiii.  
2, 3.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Ye say, If your monks and friars should now be forced to keep the old discipline and severity of their foundations, they would rather break their cloisters, and leave altogether. And, therefore, by a fit comparison, ye resemble them to the heavy droves of Jacob's cattle. Whereby ye seem secretly to give us to imagine, that the *monks' cowl* is not always so holy a weed as is pretended. St. Hierom, describing the life and order of *monks* in his time, saith thus: *Nihil arrogant sibi de continentia supercilii. Humilitatis inter omnes contentio est. Quicumque novissimus fuerit, hic primus putatur. In veste nulla discretio, nulla admiratio. Utcunque placuerit incedere, nec detractionis est, nec laudis. Jejunia neminem sublevant: nec defertur inedia: nec moderata saturitas condemnatur. Suo Domino stat unusquisque, aut cadit. Nemo judicat alterum, ne a Domino judicetur*: “They brag not of their sole or single

Hier. [*leg. Paul. et Eustoch.*] ad Marcellam, ut commigret Bethlehem. [iv. pt. 2. 531.]

life. All their contention is, who may be most humble. Whosoever is last, he is counted first. There is neither difference nor wondering in apparel. Howsoever it pleaseth a man to go, he is neither slandered for it, nor commended. No man is advanced for his fasting. Neither is abstinence praised, nor sober refreshing condemned. Each man either standeth or falleth to his Lord. No man judgeth other, lest of the Lord he himself be judged."

But (ye say) your monks now-a-days are waxen nice and crank<sup>37</sup>. Such extreme rigour and severity they may not bear.

Such holy men they were, of whom Sulpitius Severus writeth: *Sedentes munera expectant, atque omne vitæ decus mercede corruptum habent, dum quasi venalem præ se ferunt sanctimoniam*: "These friars sit still, and look for money: and have all the beauty of their life corrupted with hire, setting their holiness out to sale." Of such holy persons, St. Hierom telleth us: *Post cœnam dubiam apostolos somniant*: "After they have well filled their bellies, they dream of the apostles." In like sort he writeth of certain monks: *Apud hos affectata sunt omnia: laxæ manicæ: caligæ follicantes: vestis crassior: crebra suspiria: visitatio virginum: detractio clericorum: et si quando dies festus venerit, saturantur ad vomitum*: "Among these men, all things are counterfeit: their wide sleeves, their great boots: their coarse gown: their often sighs: their visiting of virgins: their backbiting of priests. And if there come a holy day, they eat until they be fain to perbreak<sup>38</sup>." This, no doubt, is that holiness that Christ brought into the world.

Nicolaus Cusanus, a cardinal of the church of Rome, thus setteth out the whole life and holiness of your monks: *Apud plures non nisi habitus extrinsecus remansit, et nihil de spiritu fundatoris*: "In the most part of them there appeareth only an outward shew in their apparel: but they have left themselves no part of their founder's spirit."

<sup>37</sup> ["Crank," i. e. "weak, sickly," from the German, "krank." This meaning of the word has been overlooked in Todd's Johnson.]

<sup>38</sup> [To "perbreak, or parbreak," "to vomit." Germ. "erbrechen."]

Sulpitius Severus in Chronic.

Hier. ad Eustochium de Virginita. servanda. [iv. pt. 2. 34.]

In eadem epist. ad Eustochium. [ib. p. 35.]

Nicol. Cusanus Excit. lib. 9. Anima. [p. 651.]

Again he saith: *Fallacia illorum, qui sub habitu Christi apparent, vix potest sciri, ob suam varietatem. Nam alius quidem sub hac veste, alius sub alia, alius sub caputio, alius sub hoc religionis signo, alius sub alio se Christo militare asserit: licet pene omnes non quæ Christi, sed quæ sua sunt quærant. Omnes enim student avaritiæ a maximo usque ad minimum:* “The falsehood of them that walk under the apparel of Christ can hardly be known, they are so divers. For they all say, they serve Christ, one under one weed, another under another: one under a cowl, another under a hood: one under one badge of religion, and another under another. Notwithstanding, the whole sort of them, for the most part, seek their own, and not that pertaineth to Jesus Christ. For they are all bent to covetousness, even from the greatest to the least.”

These are your *monks*, M. Harding, this is their holiness. *They have no part of their founder's spirit: they seek their own: they seek not the glory of Christ.*

But your life (ye say) is no prejudice to your faith: howsoever you live, yet is your doctrine right good and catholic: and that ye prove by the words of Christ: “*The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses' chair: whatsoever they say to you, do ye, but after their works do ye not.*” If this be the best claim ye can hold by, then suffer us, M. Harding, to say to you, as Christ sometime said to them, whom ye confess to be your *fathers*: “Woe be unto you, ye *scribes and Pharisees, ye hypocrites. Ye devour and raven up poor widows' houses*, under the colour of long prayer. Outwardly ye seem holy: but within ye are full of hypocrisy and wickedness.”

St. Augustine saith unto the old heretics called the *Manichees*: *Dicitis, non oportere omnino quæri, quales sunt homines, qui vestram sectam profitentur: sed qualis sit ipsa professio.—Quid vobis fallacius, quid insidiosius, quid malitiosius dici aut inveniri potest?* “Ye say, we may not examine what men they be that profess your sect: but only what is their profession. What thing can there be found more false, more deceitful, more malicious, than you are?”

Thus said St. Augustine to the Manichees. Take heed, M. Harding, lest the same may be said to some of you.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 7. Divis. 2.*

There have been, I know, certain of their own companions, which have found fault with many *errors in the church*, as pope Adrian, Æneas Sylvius, cardinal Pole, Pighius, and others, as is aforesaid: they held afterwards their *council at Trident*, in the selfsame place where it is now appointed. There assembled many *bishops* and *abbots*, and others, whom it behoved for that matter. They were alone by themselves: whatsoever they did, nobody gainsayed it<sup>38</sup>; for they had quite shut out and barred our side from all manner of assemblies: and there they sate six years, feeding folks with a marvellous expectation of their doings. The first six months, as though it were greatly needful, they made many determinations of the *holy Trinity*, of the *Father*, of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghost*, which were godly things indeed, but not so necessary for that time. Let us see, in all that while, of so many, so manifest, so often confessed by them, and so evident *errors*, what one *error* have they amended? From what kind of *idolatry* have they reclaimed the people? What *superstition* have they taken away? What piece of their tyranny and pomp have they diminished? As though all the world may not now see, that this is a *conspiracy*, and not a *council*: and that these bishops, whom the *pope* hath now called together, be wholly sworn and become bound to bear him their faithful allegiance, and will do no manner of thing, but that they perceive pleaseth him, and helpeth to advance his power, and as he will have

<sup>38</sup> [Apol. Lat. "nemo erat, qui obstreperet."]

[Vol. iv. p. 75.]



it: or that they reckon not of the number of men's voices, rather than of the weight and value of the same: or, that might there doth not oftentimes overcome right.

M. HARDING.

.....As you proceed, you talk your pleasure of the godly and learned fathers assembled in the late council of Trent. By the way, as your manner is, you drop lies. Of which one is, that they had quite shut out and barred your side from all manner of assemblies: <sup>a</sup>which is a foul lie. That the first six months they occupied themselves with making many determinations of the holy Trinity: that also is another lie. For then the world had no need of any new determinations or decrees concerning the Trinity; what it shall have hereafter, by occasion of your chief master John <sup>b</sup>Calvin's doctrine, it is more feared, than yet perceived.....

Where ye would fain see of so many, so manifest, so often confessed by themselves, and so evident errors, what one error they have amended: they are not like to satisfy your longing. And yet they have taken order for the amendment <sup>c</sup>of so many as they know. Neither is any of the same about any point of our faith, but about things of less weight. Your exaggeration of the terms, "so many, so manifest, so often confessed by them, and so evident," reporteth in one sentence your so many, so manifest, so often confuted by us, and so evident lies. When you follow your hot humour, and ask, from what kind of idolatry the fathers of the Tridentine council have reclaimed the people, you go too far. Whatsoever blasphemy ye utter in books and sermons against the adoration of the blessed sacrament of the altar, we know no kind of idolatry used in the church: <sup>d</sup>neither is any idolatry committed by us in worshipping of saints, in praying to them, nor in the reverence we exhibit to their images, as ye bear the people in hand. <sup>e</sup>As I cannot well take a hair from your lying beard, so wish I, that I could pluck malice from your blasphemous heart.....

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whether the learned men of our side were shut out from the right and liberty of your *council*, or no, it may soon appear, partly by that is already said: partly by that shall be said hereafter. Verily, the *pope*, for his *præmunire*, will not suffer any bishop to give voice in *council*, unless he have him first solemnly sworn to the *see of Rome*, and therefore they be all called his *creatures*. So Cicero saith, Verres, when he had bribed and spoiled the whole island of Sicilia, thought it not good to suffer his

a Untruth, manifest, as hereafter it shall appear.

b A slanderous untruth. For M. Calvin was ever an enemy unto the Arians. c Untruth most impudent. For their own confessed and known errors, they never once touched.

d Untruth, confessed by M. Harding's own fellows. Read the Answer. e O profound divinity!

Part. 1. Division 19. [leg. cap. 6. div. 1. Supra vol. iv. p. 238.] Part. 6. cap. 8. Division 1. [infra p. 305.] Cic. in Verrem Actione 1.

name, or any part of his doings, to come in hazard, but only before a *judge* or *arbiter* of his own.

Therefore the *French king's ambassador*, as it is said before, protested thus openly even in your said *council*: *Minus legitima, minusque libera dicuntur fuisse illa concilia: qui aderant, ad voluntatem alterius semper loquebantur*: "These *councils* are counted neither so free, nor so lawful, as they ought to be: they that were there, spake evermore to please *another*:" (by which *other*, he meant the *pope*).

And for that cause, the *emperor's majesty*, by his *ambassador Hurtadus Mendoza*, solemnly protested against the assembly of the same *council*. His words be these: *Ego Jacobus Hurtadus Mendoza, nomine pietissimi, et invictissimi domini mei, Caroli Cæsaris Romani imperatoris, ex illius speciali mandato, ac nomine totius sacri Romani imperii, aliorumque regnorum ac dominiorum suorum, protestor, nullum posse esse auctoritatem assertorum legatorum sanctitatis vestræ, et eorum episcoporum qui sunt Bononiæ, sanctitati vestræ majori ex parte obnoxiorum, atque ab illius nutu omnino pendentium, ut in religionis, et morum reformationis causa, &c. legem præscribant*: "I, *James Hurtado Mendoza*, in the name of the most godly, and most mighty prince my lord Charles, *the Roman emperor*, by his special commission, and in the name of the *whole Roman empire*, and all others his realms and dominions, do protest, that the authority of the pretended legates of your holiness, and of such other *bishops*, as be now at *Bononia*," (unto which town the *council of Trident* was then adjourned,) "for the most part bound unto your holiness, and wholly hanging upon your beck, is of no force, namely, to make laws in cause of reformation of religion and manners."

And that it may appear, in what obedience, and servile subjection, all *bishops* be unto the *pope*, *Æneas Sylvius*, otherwise called *pope Pius the Second*, saith thus: *Quod si episcopus papæ contradicat, etiam vera loquendo, nihilominus peccat contra jusjurandum papæ præstitum*: "If a *bishop* speak against the *pope*, yea, although he speak the truth, yet, nevertheless, he sinneth against the oath that he

In Conc.  
Trid. Anno  
1562. [Inter  
orationes  
Tridentinas,  
No. 31.]

Anno 1547.

Citatur ab  
Illyric. in  
Protestatione  
contra Con-  
cil. Trident.  
[p. 23.]

Paratipo-  
men. Ur-  
spersg.  
Æneas Sylv.  
ad Capitulum  
Moguntinum.

hath made unto the *pope*." Therefore whereas at the late conference at Noremburg, it was required by the *princes and states of Germany*, that all *bishops* coming to the council, might both be discharged from their oath made to the *pope*, and also sworn to speak and to promote the truth, the *pope's legate* there made answer in great disdain, that it might not so be: *for that so the pope's hands should be bound*. Hereby, M. Harding, a blind man may easily see the form and freedom of your *councils*. If the *bishops* be free to say the truth, then is the *pope* left in bondage.

Joh. Steldanus, anno 1523. lib. 4. Hoc enim esse colligare manus pontificis.

Whether your fathers in the *chapter at Trident* sat there six whole months, debating and reasoning about the *Trinity*, or no, of certain knowledge, I cannot tell. But certainly, what thing else they did, either in all that time, or long after, you can hardly shew us. Therefore, if they did not this, forasmuch as nothing else appeareth of their doings, we must imagine, they sat mute in a mummery, and said nothing. Notwithstanding Cassander saith, they bestowed one whole summer in great and holy disputations about meaner matters than the *Trinity*: I mean, only about the *communion of the cup*. Martinus Kemnitius saith, they held disputations there, and kept great stir, seven whole months together, about the *justification of faith and works*: and yet, in the end, left it worse than they found it. We say, *You yourselves have espied many disorders in your church of Rome, as it is plain by your own confessions*. To reckon them all in particular, it were too long. I have partly touched them heretofore. Albertus Pighius confesseth, there be *abuses* in your *mass*. The *French king's ambassador* at your late *Tridentine chapter*, saith thus: *Vel præfectorum ecclesiæ incuria, vel etiam (ne quid gravius dicam) præpostera pietate, irrepsisse in ecclesiam res nonnullas antiquatione, abrogatione, vel moderatione dignas, fateamur necesse est*: "We must needs confess, that either by the negligence of the *bishops*, or by some disordered opinion of holiness, for I will say no more:" (he meaneth falsehood, and mockery, and wilful avarice,) "certain things are brought into the *church*, worthy either to be put away and abolished, or at least to be qualified."

Cassander in Consultatione de Communionem sub utraque specie: in præfatione [Typograph. p. 1017]. Anno 1562.

Mart. Kemnitius in Examin. Conc. Trident. pag. 638. [pt. 1. p. 128.]

Albert. Pighius, in controver. [Ratisp. vi.] De Miss. priv.

In Concil. Trident. an. 1562.

Picus Mirand. ad Leonem Pap. 10. In Concil. Luteran. [Opp. tom. ii. 890.]  
 Copus Dialog. 1. p. 115.

Picus Mirandula besought pope Leo X. to abate the vain multitude of your *ceremonies*, to reform your *prayers*, and to cut off your *fables*<sup>39</sup>.

One of your own *Louvanian fellows* saith: "Even nowadays many good men mislike so many *appeals to Rome*." Some others find fault with your *pardons*: some with your *simony*: some with your *stews*: some with your licentious keeping and maintaining of *concubines*.

I will not enlarge the matter further. These and other like things are confessed by yourselves. Other greater matters I will not touch. For in cases of faith, for your credit's sake, ye may grant no manner error. For otherwise it might be thought, ye have neither the faith, nor the life of Christian men.

Now therefore tell us, M. Harding, what one *abuse*, of all the *abuses* in your *mass*: what one disorder or deformity, of so many disorders and deformities in your church: what one vain *ceremony*, what one childish *fable*, what *appeal to Rome*, what *simony*, what *pardon*, what *stews*, what *courtegiants*, what *concubines*, have ye reformed? If ye redress not those gross and sensible abuses, that ye see with your eyes: how then will ye redress other more secret matters, that pertain only to faith, and be not seen? If ye will not reform your open *stews*, when will ye reform the *church of God*? But ye are bold to assure us, that there is no kind of *idolatry*, nor ever was any, in your whole *church of Rome*. Notwithstanding, some others of your best learned friends have thought otherwise, as it shall appear.

Epiph. lib. 3. in Oratione de Fide Catholica. [1. 1094.]  
 Οί εἶδωλα μὲν βδελυτόμενοι, εἰδώλοισ δὲ προσκυνού-  
 τεσ.

First, Epiphanius saith of certain Persians, named *Magusai*: *Idola quidem detestantur: tamen idolis cultum exhibent*: "They abhor the sight of *idols*: yet they fall down and worship *idols*." And what if a man would say the same of your *clergy of Rome*? Verily, notwithstanding ye would seem to mislike of *idols*, yet your churches and chapels are full of *idols*. Again, he reporteth certain words

<sup>39</sup> [The greater part of this Oratio is taken up with a frightful description of the enormous depravity prevailing in the church of Rome.]

of St. Paul, as uttered of him by the spirit of prophecy :  
*Erunt mortuis cultum divinum prastantes, quemadmodum etiam in Israel impie coluerunt* : "They shall give godly honour unto dead men, like as also they did in Israel"<sup>40</sup>.

Epiph.  
contra Colly-  
ridian.

What opinion ye have had of saints departed, I need not here to remember. Cardinal Bembus, in an epistle unto the emperor Charles V., calleth the *blessed Virgin, Dominam Deam nostram*, "Our lady and goddess." Your great Hercules Lipomanus crieth out in his marginal agony : *Ecce quam potentissima est sancta Dei genetrix : et quomodo nullus salvus fieri possit nisi per eam !* "Behold, how mighty is the holy mother of God, and how no man may be saved, but by her !" If this be not manifest *idolatry*, it may please you to give it some other name.

Bembus in  
Epist. ad  
Carolum 5.

Lipomanus  
[Vit. Sanct.]  
p. 289.

It seemeth this error began to spring long sithence, even in the time of the old fathers : and that hereof Faustus the heretic took occasion thus to charge the *catholics* for the same : *Idola vertistis in martyres* : "Ye have changed the heathen idols into your martyrs." Further ye say, the reverence that ye give unto *saints' images* is no *idolatry*. Yet Polydorus Vergilius speaking hereof, saith thus : (*Quia sacerdotes populum non docent, et vulgo ex usu suo tacere putantur, idcirco*) *eo insanie deventum est, ut hæc pars pietatis parum differat ab impietate* : "For that the priests instruct not the people, and are thought to hold their peace for gain's sake, the matter is brought to such a dotage, that this part of devotion differeth but little from extreme wickedness"<sup>41</sup>.

August. con-  
tra Faustum,  
lib. 20. c. 21.  
[viii. 346.]

Polyd. Verg.  
De inventor.  
rerum, lib. 6.  
c. 13.

And Ludovicus Vives saith, he seeth no great difference between many Christian men worshipping their *images*, and an heathen man adoring his *idols*. Catharinus, one of your great doctors of Trident, saith thus : *An licet adorare imagines ipsas, et illis cultum præbere ? Sunt qui hoc*

Ludov. Vives  
in lib. de Civ.  
Dei.

Catharinus  
in libello de  
Imaginibus.

<sup>40</sup> [This passage occurs, not in the special account of the Collyridian heresy (No. 79), but incidentally in the chapter immediately preceding, that is, No. 78. contra Anticomarianitas : in the Lat. ed. of 1562. p. 469.]

<sup>41</sup> [The words in parenthesis are not *there*; but Polydore says that the idolatry was practised by *rudiores stupidioresque*, conveying obliquely a reflection on their teachers.]

*omnino negent, et clament esse idololatriam. Videntur autem non futilibus argumentis moveri: nec absque majorum, imo etiam scripturarum autoritate: "Whether is it lawful to worship the very images, or no? Some men say nay, and call it idolatry. And they seem to be moved with no light arguments, nor without the authority as well of the fathers as of the scriptures."*

Jacob. Nanclantus in Epist. ad Rom. cap. 1.

Jacobus Nanclantus saith: *Non solum fatendum est, fideles in ecolesia adorare coram imagine, sed et adorare imaginem, sine quo voveris scrupulo: quin et eo illam venerari cultu, quo et prototypon ejus. Propter quod, si illud habet adorari latria, et illa habet adorari latria: "We must grant, that the faithful people in the church, do not only worship before the image, but also worship the image itself: and that without any manner scruple of conscience whatsoever. And further, they worship the image with the selfsame honour wherewith they worship the thing itself, that is represented by the image. As, if the thing itself be worshipped with godly honour, then must the image itself likewise be worshipped with godly honour."* Hereto agreeth

Jacob. Payva, lib. 9.

Fortalltum Fidel. [lib. 3. fol. exliiii.]

Rob. Holcot. in librum Sapient. Lektion. 158. [p. 524.]

Aug. de Verbo Domini, secundum Matth. serm. 6. [v. 301.]

one other of your late writers, Jacobus Payva. And another of your like doctors saith: "This is the very use and practice of your church of Rome." But Robertus Holcot saith: "*This kind of worshipping is plain idolatry.*" Therefore, I trow, there hath been some *idolatry* in the church of Rome. Ye will say, *ye know the image is no god.* And this ye think is excuse sufficient. But so likewise said the *heathens of their idols*: and yet, as St. Augustine saith, they were idolaters notwithstanding.

Aug. ad Quodvultdeum. Hæres. 7. viii. 7.]

Ye will say, It is the image of an apostle of Christ, or of God himself, and therefore it can be no idolatry. But St. Augustine saith: *Marcellina colebat imaginem Jesu et Pauli, et Homeri, et Pythagoræ, adorando, incensumque ponendo: "Marcellina worshipped the image of Jesus, and of Paul, and of Homer, and of Pythagoras, by kneeling unto them, and burning incense before them."* Yet nevertheless she was an *idolater*. The *Saracens* this day make their sacrifices in mount Mecca, not to *devils*, or *heathen gods*, but to *Abraham*, to *Isaac*, and to *St. Thomas*: yet

are they not therefore excused of *idolatry*. Gregorius, the bishop of Nyssa, St. Basil's brother, saith thus: *Qui creaturam adorat, etsi in nomine Christi id faciat, tamen simulachrorum cultor est, Christi nomen simulachro imponens*: Greg. Nyss. In Orat. funebri de Placilla. [iii. 533.]

“He that worshippeth a creature, notwithstanding he do it in the name of Christ, yet is he a worshipper of images, as giving the name of Christ unto an image.” By these few, M. Harding, it may soon appear, that your *churches* are not void of all *idolatry*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 7. *Divis.* 3.

[Vol. iv. p. 76.]

And therefore we know, that divers times many good men and catholic bishops did tarry at home, and would not come, when such councils were called, wherein men so apparently laboured to serve factions, and to take parts, because they knew they should but lose their travail, and do no good, seeing whereunto their enemies' minds were so wholly bent<sup>42</sup>. Athanasius denied to come, when he was called by the emperor to his *council at Cæsarea*, perceiving plainly he should but come among his enemies, which deadly hated him. The same Athanasius, when he came afterward to the *council at Syrmium*<sup>43</sup>, and foresaw what would be the end, by reason of the outrage and malice of his enemies, he packed up his carriage, and went away immediately. John Chrysostom, although the emperor Constantius commanded him by four sundry letters to come to the *Arians' council*, yet kept he himself at home still. When Maximus, the *bishop of Jeru-*

[Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. lib. 1. cap. 28. tom. III. p. 60.]

Hist. Tripart. lib. 10. cap. 13.

Ruffin. lib. 1. [at. lib. 10.] cap. 17.



<sup>42</sup> [The author of the letter to Scipio, (printed infra vol. viii.) refers to these same precedents in the same order and nearly in the same words.]

<sup>43</sup> [No authority is given by bishop Jewel for this statement; and the Editor is unable to supply the omission.]

*salem, sat in the council of Palestine, the old father Paphnutius took him by the hand, and led him out at the doors, saying, "It is not lawful for us to confer of these matters with wicked men." The bishops of the east would not come to the Syrmian council, after they knew Athanasius had gotten himself thence again. Cyril called men back by letters, from the council of them which were named *Patro-*  
*passians*. Paulinus, *bishop of Trier*, and many others mo, refused to come to the *council at Milan*, when they understood what a stir and rule Auxentius kept there: for they saw it was in vain to go thither, where, not reason, but faction should prevail: and where folk contended, not for the truth and right judgment of the matter, but for partiality and favour.*

And albeit those fathers had such malicious and stiffnecked enemies, yet if they had come, they should have had free speech at least in the *councils*.

## M. HARDING.

First, here I note the falsehood of the lady interpreter, who turneth the Latin speaking of Athanasius, *Cum vocatus esset ab imperatore ad concilium Cæsariense*: "When he was called by the emperor to <sup>a</sup> *his* council at Cæsaria." Where by adding the word *his* of her own, she (or a worse shrew under her name) goeth about to persuade, as heretics do, that the councils be to be accounted the councils of temporal princes, not of bishops: and that they be the heads of them, not the bishop of Rome. This much to her. Now, sir, to you, defender. All these examples serve you to no purpose. It is not denied you, but that in cases men may refuse to come to councils. Your examples declare, that catholic bishops shunned to come to the unlawful councils of heretics. But ye, holding strange opinions, condemned by the church, deny to come to the lawful councils of catholic bishops. When ye have proved us to be heretics, I mean the fathers of the late council, then may ye justly allege the example of Athanasius, Chrysostom, Maximus, Paphnutius, Cyril, Paulinus, and such other, for not coming to the council.

[Histor. Tri-  
part. lib. 5. c.  
15.]

a And why  
not, as well  
as M. Hard-  
ing may call  
the whole  
church the  
pope's vine-  
yard? p. 283.  
b. Or, all the  
bishops  
through the  
world the  
pope's  
sheep? pag.  
308. b.



## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Had you not had a shrewd sharp wit, M. Harding, and a very good liking of the same, ye could never have made yourself so great sport of so small a matter. The *lady interpreter* pitieth your case, and wisheth you a little more discretion, and would be much ashamed to answer your follies.

If the *council* we speak of were not the *emperor's council*, then much less was it the *pope's council*. For in those days, as hereafter it shall be declared more at large, *councils* were summoned by *emperors*, and not by *popes*. And what reason have you to shew us, that the *council*, being summoned by the *emperor*, might not be called the *emperor's council*, as well as the *pope*, being admitted and allowed by the *emperor*, might be called the *emperor's priest*? Odoacer<sup>44</sup>, in the third *council of Rome*, in the time of pope Symmachus, said thus: *Miramur, præter-* In Concil.  
Romano 3.  
Sub Symma-  
cho pap.  
[viii. 267. a.]  
*missis nobis, quicquam fuisse tentatum: cum etiam, sacer-*  
*dote nostro superstite, nihil sine nobis debuisset assumi:* “ We marvel that any thing was attempted without our knowledge, forasmuch as *our priest*” (he meaneth the *pope*) “ being alive, nothing may be done without us.” As the *pope* may be called the *emperor's priest*, so may the *council* be called the *emperor's council*, without any impeachment of Christian faith. Again, why might not a *general council* holden in *Rome* be called the *emperor's council*, as well as a *general council* holden in *France* might be called the *king's council*? Gerson, speaking of a *council* holden in *Paris*, saith thus: *Infamare regem cum* Gerson. Tri-  
logus in Ma-  
teria Schis-  
matis. [l. 297,  
298.]  
*generali concilio suo conati sunt:* “ They sought to dis fame the king with *his general council*.” It was a *general council*, and a *council of bishops*; and yet was it called the *king's council*. Liberatus saith: *Flavianus episcopus.....* Liberat. cap.  
11. [p. 62.]  
*Eutychem ad concilium suum venire præcepit:* “ Flavianus, the bishop” (not of *Rome*, but of *Antioch*) “ commanded

<sup>44</sup> [This is an extract from a re-  
script by Basilius Præfectus Præ-  
torio, acting as Odoacer's repre-  
sentative, read by Symmachus the  
deacon, in the third council held  
at Rome under pope Symmachus.]

Eutyches to come to *his* council." Hereafter, M. Harding, ye may take time to study for some better quarrel. Surely, this was very simple.

Ye excuse Athanasius, Chrysostomus, Maximus, Paphnutius, Hilarius, Cyrillus, Paulinus, and other learned bishops, and holy fathers, for not appearing at *general councils*; for that they were summoned to appear before *heretics*. As for the fathers of your late *Tridentine chapter*, whatsoever they were, ye must in any wise call them *catholics*. Yet, notwithstanding, ye may remember, that by such good *catholics* as you be, the same holy fathers, Athanasius, Chrysostomus, Maximus, Paphnutius, Hilarius, Cyrillus, Paulinus, and others, were called *heretics*.

Hilar. contra  
Arianos et  
Auxentium.  
[p. 1269.]

Hilarius saith: *Congreget nunc Auxentius quas volet in me synodos, et hæreticum me, ut sæpe jam fecit, publico titulo proscibat*: "Now let Auxentius, the Arian heretic, call what councils he list against me: and by open proclamations let him publish me for an heretic, as he hath oftentimes done already." The Arian heretics said, that the *catholic Christians*, whom they called *Homousians*, which in their meaning was as much as *heretics*, were the cause of all division.

Theod. lib. 2.  
cap. 3. [iii. p.  
70.]

Hier. ad Mar-  
cum Presby-  
terum Cele-  
densem. [1.  
Chalciden-  
sem. tom. iv.  
pt. 2. p. 21.]

St. Hierom saith unto Marcus: .....*Hæreticus sum: quid ad te? quiesce: jam dictum est*: "I am an heretic: what is that to thee? hold your peace: ye have told your tale <sup>45</sup>." By like right, Christ himself, by certain your ancient fathers, was called a *Samaritan*, a deceiver of the people, and an *heretic*. And, if it may please you soberly and advisedly to consider the matter, ye shall find throughout the whole body of the *scriptures*, that no people made ever so great crakes of the *church*, as they that were the deadly enemies of the *church*: nor none were so ready to condemn others of *heresy*, as they that indeed were themselves the greatest *heretics*.

<sup>45</sup> [Hieron. "Hæreticus vocor, " cum Ægypto, hoc est cum Da-  
" Homousion prædicans Trinita-  
" tem . . . si eis placet, hæreticum " maso Petroque condemnent.  
" me cum occidente, hæreticum " Hæreticus sum, &c."]

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 8. *Divis.* 1.

[Vol. iv. p. 76.] But now sithence none of us may be suffered so much as to sit, or once to be seen in these men's meetings, much less suffered to speak freely our mind: and seeing the *pope's legates, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots*, all being conspired together, all linked together in one kind of fault, and all bound by one oath, sit alone by themselves, and have power alone to give their consent, and at last, when they have all done, as though they had done nothing, bring all their opinions to be judged at the will and pleasure of the *pope*, being but one man, to the end he may pronounce his own sentence of himself, who ought rather to have answered to his complaint: sithence also the same ancient and *Christian liberty*, which of all right should specially be in *Christian councils*, is now utterly taken away from the *council*: for these causes, I say, wise and good men ought not to marvel at this day, though we do the like now, that they see was done in times past in like case, of so many fathers and catholic bishops: which is, though we choose rather to sit at home, and leave our whole cause to God, than to journey thither: where as we neither can have place, nor be able to do any good: where as we can obtain no audience: where as *princes' ambassadors* be but used as mocking stocks: and where as also we be all condemned already, before trial: as though the matter were aforehand dispatched and agreed upon.

M. HARDING.

If I wist ye would take my counsel in good part, and listen unto it, <sup>a</sup> as it standeth you upon, I would advise you to call in all the books of your Apology, and that with no less diligence

a A sage piece of counsel, and meet for a doctor of divinity.

than ye went about to suppress the books of my answer to M. Jewel's challenge at their first coming abroad. That done, to cast bruits abroad, that the Apology was made and counterfeited by some crafty papist, to bring you quite out of credit with all the world. So might ye perhaps in time recover some part of your lost estimation. For whiles your books be in men's hands, they shall be an evident witness to all the world of your shameless lying.....

The book of the canons and decrees of the council hath been printed almost in all parts of Christendom. Look who list, in every book he shall find three several solemn safe-conducts granted by the council, and confirmed by the three popes, under whom the same was celebrated. Which safe-conducts contain first, in most ample wise, full liberty, power, authority, and assurance for all and singular persons of all Germany, of what degree, state, condition, or quality soever they be, that would come to that oecumenical and general council, to confer, propound, and treat with all freedom, of all things to be treated there, and to the same council freely and safely to come, there to tarry and abide, and to offer and put up articles, so many as they thought good, as well in writing as by word; and with the fathers, and others thereto chosen, to confer, and without any reproaches or upbraidings to dispute, also at their pleasure safely again from thence to depart.....

*An extension to other Nations :*

The same holy council, in the Holy Ghost lawfully assembled, the same legates *de latere* of the see apostolic being president in it, to all and singular others which have not communion with us in those matters that be of faith, of whatsoever kingdoms, nations, provinces, cities, and places, in which openly and without punishment is preached, or taught, or believed the contrary of that which the holy Roman church holdeth, giveth faith public, or safe-conduct, under the same form and the same words with which it is given to the Germans.

This being most true, as the better part of the world seeth, and the books and public instruments extant do witness, your excuse of your refusal to come to the council, as bishops of other Christian realms did, is found false. <sup>a</sup>Ye had all free liberty and security granted unto you for that behalf, in so ample and large manner as man's wit could devise.

<sup>a</sup> A full discreet kind of mockery. They offer men liberty to come and speak, but reserve the whole judgment to themselves.

The second cause why ye came not, is, for that the pope's legates, patriarchs, archbishops, bishops, and abbots, all being conspired together, all linked together in one kind of fault, and all bound in one oath, sit alone by themselves, and have power alone to give their consent. What is here, that should let you to

join with others for procuring unity and peace in Christendom? Complain ye of the fathers' concord and agreeing together? <sup>b</sup>That is a sign the Spirit of God, author of charity and unity, governeth their hearts. In that respect they seem to come together in the Holy Ghost.....And indeed had ye gone thither, your heresies had been confuted, yourselves required to yield, and to conform you to the catholic church; or else ye had been anathematized, accursed, and condemned.....

<sup>b</sup> They agree together against God and his Christ.

Your third cause is, for that the determinations and decrees of the council be referred to the pope. To that we have answered before. The pope confirmeth all, being head over the council.

<sup>c</sup>Doth not the queen so pardy confirm your acts of parliament, by giving her royal assent unto them at the end of the parliament? What thing can be done perfectly by a body without the head? And who might better confirm councils than he, whose faith in pronouncing sentence rightly and duly, in matters concerning faith, we are assured by Christ's prayer to be infallible?

<sup>c</sup> But who made your pope a king? And when will he give his real consent against himself?

Your fourth cause is, forasmuch as the ancient and Christian liberty, which of right should specially be in Christian councils, is now utterly taken away. This cause is not different from your first.

Your fifth cause is a false lie, that princes' ambassadors be used but as mocking stocks. <sup>d</sup>Truth it is, they have most honourable seats in all councils. In this council they sate by the legates. Every ambassador hath his place there according to the degree of honour, the kingdoms, commonweals, states, and princes be of, from whence and from whom he cometh.....

<sup>d</sup> They are allowed a place, but touching judgment they may say nothing.

The sixth and last cause ye allege for your not coming to the council, is, for that ye be condemned already before trial, as though the matter were aforehand despatched and agreed upon. Indeed <sup>e</sup>your heresies for the more part be and have been condemned above a thousand years' past. And therefore they are not now to be called unto a new trial, as though the church until this day had been deceived, and so many fathers overseen..... This, notwithstanding, may ye well say, touching that point, your matter is aforehand despatched and agreed upon. For they know what ye can say, and see that ye say nothing, but only stand wilfully and stubbornly in your false opinions and fleshly pleasures.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth, without any colour of honest shame.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We never suppressed any of your *books*, M. Harding, as you know: but are very well contented to see them so common, that as now children may play with them in the streets. Your manifest *untruths*: your simple *conclusions*: your often contrarieties to yourself: your new found *authors*: your childish *fables*: your uncourteous *speeches*:

your racking, corrupting, and misreporting of the doctors, therein contained, have much bewrayed the miserable feebleness of your cause. Your fellows have no cause greatly to glory in such helps, no more than in other your like pamphlets, unmeet of any wise man to be answered. This was your only and special policy in the time of your late kingdom: ye suppressed, and called in, and burnt all our writings whatsoever, yea, the very *testament* and *gospel* of *Christ*, truly translated into English, naming them heretical and unlawful books. And if any man had concealed and kept unto himself for his comfort any such book written by any of our side, by most terrible and bloody proclamations ye made it felony. So much ye despaired and doubted your own follies.

As for the books of our *Apology*, they have been spread so far, and printed so often in *Latin*, in *Italian*, in *French*, in *Dutch*, in *English*, that as now it were hard to suppress them. Touching the shameless lying, wherewith ye charge us, we are well content to stand to the judgment of the wise. Certainly it shameth us much, to see so little shame in your writings.

Ye say: "The pope gave out his safe-conduct to all the princes, and free cities, and to the whole people of Germany, to come to the council, to propound, to dispute at their pleasure, and, when they should think it good, freely and safely to return, with a large extension to other nations, as ye say, to like purpose."

But, first, M. Harding, what safety can there be in his *safe-conduct*, that is not able to save himself? Pope Eugenius the Fourth, if he had come to the *council of Basil*, as you know, had been quite deposed from his *poppedom*, all his *safe-conducts* notwithstanding. Pope John XXII. [*al.* John XXIII.]<sup>46</sup> gave out as sure a *safe-conduct* for the *council of Constance*, as pope Pius could devise any for your late *chapter of Trident*: yet, notwithstanding all his *safety*, being himself present in the *council*, he was pulled out of *Peter's chair*, and deprived of his dignity, and stript

Concil. Basil.  
Sess. 3.  
[xxix. 25.]  
et 4. [p. 27.]

Conc. Con-  
stan. Ses-  
sione 2. 3. 4.  
[xxvii. 568.]

<sup>46</sup> [The same numbering of this pope occurs in the letter to Scipio infra vol. viii., and is not corrected by the translator Brent.]

out of his *pontificalibus*, and turned home again in his *minoribus*, and allowed only to be a *cardinal*, and no longer to be a *pope*. Ye may remember Cicero saith: *Qui multorum custodem se profiteatur, eum sapientes sui primum capitis aiunt custodem esse oportere*: “Wise men say, Whoso will take upon him to save others, ought first to save himself.”

And what credit may we give to your *safe conducts*? Jacobus Nachiantes, the *bishop of Chioca*, for that he had simpered out one half word of truth to the misliking of the *legates*, was fain to run to *Rome*, to creep to the *pope's feet*, and to crave *pardon*. Ye shamefully betrayed, and cruelly murdered John Huss and Hieronymus Pragensis, in your *council of Constance*. Neither the *protection* of the *emperor*, nor the *pope's safe-conduct*, was able to save them. No, yourselves have already ruled the case in your said *council*. For thus ye say: *Fides non est seroanda hæreticis*: “Ye may hold no faith unto them that ye call *heretics*.” Such is the safety and liberty of your *councils*.

Ye say: “Our learned men were allowed to propound, to talk, to dispute.” What should this avail? For ye reserved the *determination* and whole *judgment* to yourselves; and yourselves are sworn to submit your whole *judgment* to the *pope*, and without his *judgment* to *judge* nothing. And how may this seem a *free council*, where the guilty party shall be the *judge*?

Ye say: “There is an extension granted to other nations.” All this is true indeed. But this same truth descrieth your open mockery. For if ye had seen the *instrument* itself, in the end thereof you should have found your said *extension* restrained only to them that would repent, and recant the truth of God, which you call error, and yield themselves thrall unto the *pope*.

Howbeit, not long sithence, the *bishops* of your said *chapter at Trident* were very loath to allow any tolerable *safe-conduct* at all, either to the Germans, or to any others.

But ye say: “If we had come to your chapter, we had been confounded.” No doubts, by the reverend authority

of your Amphilochius, your Abdias, your Leontius, or some other like doctors, whom ye have so lately raked out of your channels, or at least by your *fiery arguments* of swords and faggots: for such proofs must help you when others fail.

As for the gay stuff that your *Tridentine fathers*, after their mature deliberation, as they call it, and more than twenty years' study, have sent us out lately into the world, it is too simple to mock children. Had they not been men impudent and void of all shame, they would rather have stolen home secretly in the dark, and have uttered nothing.

We find no fault with you, M. Harding, for that your *bishops* and *abbots* agree together: but for that they agree together as did *Herod* and *Pilate*, the *Sadducees* and *Pharisees* against *Christ*.

Matt. xxii.  
et xxvi.

Neither may you well vaunt yourselves of your great agreements. Ye may remember that two of the principal pillars of your *chapter*, Dominicus à Soto<sup>47</sup>, and Catharinus, dissented even there openly and shamefully, and that in great points of *religion*: and wrote the one mightily against the other: the one charging the other with error and heresy, and could never yet be reconciled.

Domin. a  
Soto. Catha-  
rinus.

Notwithstanding, against other points of *God's truth* both they and the rest joined stoutly together. St. Augustine saith: *Tunc inter se concordant, quando in perniciem justi conspirant. Non quia se amant, sed quia eum qui amandus erat,.....simul oderunt*: "Then they agree together, when they conspire to destroy the *just*: not for that they themselves love one another, but for that they both hate him whom they ought to love." Of such kind of *consent*, St. Hierom, although to a far contrary purpose, imagineth Jovinian thus to say: *Quod me damnant episcopi, non est ratio, sed conspiratio. Nolo mihi ille, vel ille respondeat, quorum me autoritas opprimere potest, docere*

Aug. In Psal.  
36. concione  
2. [iv. 265.]

Hieron. In  
Apologetico  
ad Dominio-  
nem. [iv. pt.  
2. 246.]

<sup>47</sup> [Bp. Jewel has here corrected a mistake into which he fell in the ed. of 1567: the quarrel was between Catharinus and Dominicus

à Soto, and not (as first stated) Petrus, who came to the council ten years after the death of Catharinus. See Harding, Detect. fol. 406.]



*non potest*: "That the *bishops* condemn me, there is no reason in their doings, but a conspiracy. I would not that this man or that man should answer me, which may oppress me by their authority, and cannot teach me."

Whether it be convenient that the *pope*, being notoriously accused of manifest corruption in *God's religion*, should nevertheless be the whole and only *judge* of the same, and pronounce sentence of himself, let it be indifferently considered by the wise.

The law saith: *Qui jurisdictioni præest, non debet sibi jus dicere*: "No man may be his own judge" Such authority (ye say) kings have in parliaments. Hereof I am not able to dispute. The *prince's* right many times passeth by composition: and therefore is not evermore one in all places. Howbeit, the *pope* is a *bishop*, and not a *king*, and other *bishops* be not his subjects, but his brethren.

Your fourth objection is but a cavil. Ye say, ye mock not princes' ambassadors, but place them next unto your legates: to sit still, I trow, and to tell the clock; for voice in judgment ye allow them none. Thus ye proine their authority, and allow them honour, and set them aloft to say nothing. Notwithstanding, whether the *emperors'* and *princes' ambassadors* may sit so near to the *pope's legates*, or no, I cannot tell. Verily the *emperor* himself may not be so bold to press so near unto the *pope*. For thus it is ordered in your *book of ceremonies*: *Advertendum est, quod locus ubi sedet imperator, non sit altior loco ubi tenet pedes pontifex*: "This is to be noted, that the place where the *emperor* sitteth" (*in general council*) "be no higher than the place where the *pope* setteth his feet." That is to say, the *emperor* must sit at the *pope's* footstool, and no higher. And this, saith your *magister ceremoniarum*, is a thing specially to be noted.

All the parts of our *religion*, which you call *heresies*, ye say are already condemned, just a thousand years past. If all this be not true, then have you foully abused your pen, to slander *God's* truth, and to beguile the world. But I pray you, M. Harding, leave some part of your wont, and tell us the truth. Was the *public ministration*

<sup>ff</sup> [vetus, lib. 2. tit. 1. l. 10.] De jurisdiction. omnium judicium.

Ceremoniar. Rom. lib. 1. sect. 14. c. 2. [fol. 140.]

of the holy sacrament, was the *holy communion* in both kinds, was the *public order of common prayer in the common known tongue*, was the withstanding of the *ambition and pride of Rome*, condemned for heresy so long ago? How could you dare thus to say, and the same to publish so openly and so boldly unto the world, if ye had any regard to your sayings? It would have won you some good credit, if ye could have told us in what *general council*, under what *emperor*, by what *doctors*, by what *catholic learned fathers*, these great errors were thus condemned: as now ye rove only at large, and feed your simple reader with your empty *calendars* of thousands of years, and speak at random. If it had been true, ye would better have shewed it: but being most untrue, as you know it to be, for very shame ye should never have said it.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 9. Divis. 1. and 2.*

Nevertheless, we can bear patiently and quietly <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 77.]</sup> our own private wrongs. But wherefore do they shut out *Christian kings*, and good *princes*, from their *convocation*? Why do they so uncourteously, or with such spite, leave them out, and, as though either they were not *Christian men*, or else could not judge, will not have them made acquainted with the causes of *Christian religion*, nor understand the state of their own *churches*?.....

Or, if the said *kings and princes* happen to intermeddle in such matters, and take upon them to do that they may do, that they be commanded to do, and ought of duty to do, and the same things that we know both David and Solomon, and other good princes have done; that is, if they, whiles the *pope* and his *prelates* slug and sleep, or else mischievously withstand them, do bridle the *priests'* sensuality, and drive them to do their duty, and keep them still to it: if they do overthrow *idols*, if they take away

*superstition*, and set up again the true worshipping of God, why do they by and by make an outcry upon them, that such *princes* trouble all, and press by violence into another body's office, and do therein wickedly and malapertly? What scripture hath at any time forbidden a *Christian prince* to be made privy to such causes? Who, but themselves alone, made ever any such law?

## M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup>Ye confound the offices of the spiritual governors, and temporal magistrates. What kings and princes may do, what they be commanded to do, and ought of duty to do, in God's name let them do, and well may they so do. Who is he that gainsayeth? If by the pretended example of David and Solomon ye <sup>b</sup>animate them to intermeddle with bishoply offices, then beware they (say we) that God's vengeance light not upon them for such wicked presumption, which lighted upon king Ozias for the like offence.

Ye teach princes to use violence against priests, as though their faults could not be redressed by the <sup>c</sup>prelates of the clergy, of whom ye speak by spiteful surmise, as though God had utterly withdrawn his holy Spirit from them. But forasmuch as Christ assisteth his church always, and shall never fail in things necessary, it is not to be doubted, but the church shall ever be provided of some good governors, so as, though some slug and sleep, yet some others shall wake, and diligently attend their charge. Priests have their ecclesiastical courts, where their defaults and offences may duly and canonically be punished; and the offenders by priestly discipline be redressed. Neither is it convenient for a king to come into priests' consistories, <sup>d</sup>nor to call priests before him to his own seat of judgment.

So many as be necessary to minister, and perform those things that appertain to the building up of Christ's body, the church, until it come to his perfection, St. Paul reckoneth by name in his epistle to the Ephesians, saying, that Christ hath to that end placed in his church <sup>e</sup>some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some shepherds and teachers. Kings and princes be not there named, as they who have their proper rank.....That the people be to be stirred by us to more fervent devotion to worship God, and some perhaps to be warned of some cases of superstition, we grant. But that any other manner or kind of worshipping of God is either by us or by temporal princes to be set up in Christ's church, that we deny.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, vain and unadvised: read the answer.

<sup>b</sup> Untruth. It is not our doctrine. But why embolden you the pope to intermeddle with princes' offices?

<sup>c</sup> Your prelates be as blameworthy and as negligent as the priests.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth, reproved by the ancient practice of the church, as it shall appear.

<sup>e</sup> Mark, that popes and cardinals in this rank are not named.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

We *confound* not these *offices*, M. Harding, as ye best know: but rather we teach each man carefully to attend his own office. You and your fathers have brought *confusion* of *offices* into the *church of God*, in that ye have made your pope *heir apparent* unto the *empire*, and have armed him with all manner *authority, spiritual and temporal*, and have given him the right of *both swords*.

Dist. 22. Omnes.

For thus your own pope Nicolas telleth you stoutly in his own behalf: *Christus Petro æternæ vitæ clavigero, terreni simul et cœlestis imperii jura commisit*: “Christ hath committed unto Peter, the key-bearer of everlasting life, the right as well of the earthly, as also of the heavenly empire.” No doubts. For Christ by his commission made Peter a *king* of this world, and dubbed him accordingly with sword and sceptre, and bade him sit under his cloth of estate. Thus, by your doctrine, *priesthood, kingdom, popedom, empire*, are all conveyed wholly into one man’s hands: and so, by your handling, one man is *priest, king, pope*, and *emperor*, all at once. This perhaps unto the wise may seem to be some *confusion of offices*.

2 Chron. xxvi. 16.

Touching that ye write of the rash attempt of king Ozias, ye seem not to understand, neither our words, nor your own. For we teach not *princes* to offer up incense in sacrifice, as Ozias did: or by intrusion to thrust themselves into *bishops’ rooms*: or to preach, or to minister sacraments, or to bind, or to loose<sup>48</sup>: but only to discharge their own *offices*, and to do that duty that David, Solomon, Ezechias, Josias, and other noble and godly *kings* did, and evermore was lawful for the prince to do. As for right of place, and voice in *council*, it pertaineth no less to the *prince* than to the *pope*, as hereafter it shall better appear.

Ye say: “Christ shall always assist his church, and shall evermore provide her of good governors.” Thus, be your negligence and careless slothfulness never so great, be

<sup>48</sup> [See the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, Art. XXXVII.]

your lives never so loose, be you *dumb dogs*, not able to bark, be you *lanterns without light*, be you *salt without savour*, yet ye evermore dream sweetly of Christ's promise, and assure yourselves undoubtedly of his assistance: even as he that sometime said, *Pan curret oves, oviumque magistras*. Would God your *bishops* would do their duty, and do it faithfully: the world should have less cause to complain. Notwithstanding, Christ is evermore mindful of his promise. For when he seeth his *church* defaced, and laid waste, he raiseth up faithful *magistrates*, and godly *princes*, not to do the *priests'* or *bishops'* duties, but to force the *priests* and *bishops* to do their duties.

But ye say: "Christ hath placed in his church some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some teachers. Kings" (ye say) "and princes be not there named." Hereof ye conclude, *ergo*, *The prince may not cause the abuses of his church to be reformed, nor oversee the priests and bishops* if they be negligent, nor force them to do their duties.

I marvel, M. Harding, where ye learned so much *logic*. How frame ye this argument? In what *mood*? in what *figure*? With what cement can ye make these silly loose pieces to cleave together? It pitieth me to see your case. For by like form of argument, and with much more likelihood of reason, we may turn the same against yourself, and may say thus: Christ hath placed in his church some *apostles*, some *prophets*, some *evangelists*, some *pastors*, some *teachers*: the *pope* and his *cardinals* are not here named: *apostles* they are not; for the *apostles* were but twelve: *prophets* they are not; for they *prophesy* nothing: *evangelists* they are not; for they *preach* not: *pastors* or feeders they are not; for they feed not: *doctors* or *teachers* they are not; for they teach not: *ergo*, by this authority of St. Paul, and by your own argument, the *pope* and his *cardinals* be utterly excluded, and may not meddle with the charge of the *church of God*.

In such good substantial sort Pope Paulus III, not long  
 sithence, reasoned against the emperor Charles the Fifth: Epist. Paul. iii. ad Carolum V. [inter Dudithæ Orationes, p. 162.]  
*En ego supra pastores meos*: "Behold, saith God Almighty,

I will punish my *priests and bishops* for their negligence and wickedness<sup>49</sup>:" *ergo*, saith pope Paulus, The *prince* or *emperor* may not punish them: as though, when the *king* or *emperor* punisheth the wicked by God's appointment, God himself were not the punisher.

In this your manner of reasoning, M. Harding, there are well near as many errors as there be words. The first is *ignoratio elenchi*, which is the grossest *fallax* of all the rest. Secondly, ye conclude without either *mood* or *figure*, as a very child may easily see. Thirdly, ye reason *a meris particularibus*, or *a non distributo ad distributum*. Fourthly, these words, *rule* or *charge of the church*, are words of double and doubtful meaning. And therefore your *sylogismus*, such as it is, must needs stand of four terms, which error in reasoning is too simple for a child.

Touching these words, *rule* and *charge*, which I said are double and doubtful, notwithstanding we say both the *prince* and the *bishop* have *charge* of the *church*, yet the *prince* and the *bishop* have not both one kind of *charge*. The *bishop's charge* is, to *preach*, to *minister sacraments*, to *order priests*, to *excommunicate*, to *absolve*, &c. The *prince's charge* is, not to do any of these things himself, in his own person, but only to see that they be done, and orderly and truly done, by the *bishops*.

I grant, there be many special privileges granted upon great and just considerations of the mere favour of the *prince*, that a *priest* being found negligent, or otherwise offending in his ministry, should be convented and punished, not by the *temporal* or *civil magistrate*, but by the discretion of the *bishop*. Yet must you remember, M. Harding, that all these and other like privileges passed unto the clergy from the *prince*, and not from *God*, and proceeded only of special favour, and not of right. For from the beginning, you know, it was not so.

And therefore to say, that a *prince* or *magistrate* may not lawfully call a *priest* before him, to his own seat of judgment, or that many catholic and godly *princes* have

<sup>49</sup> ["Dei enim vox est, ad malos " super pastores) requiram gregem  
" sacerdotes: 'Ego ipse (inquit " meum de manu illorum.'"]

not so done, and done it lawfully, it is most untrue. The emperor Justinian himself, who of all others most enlarged the church's privileges, saith thus: *Nullus episcopus invitus ad civilem, vel militarem judicem in qualibet causa producatur, vel exhibeatur: nisi princeps jubeat*: "Let no bishop be brought or presented against his will before the captain, or civil judge, whatsoever the cause be: unless the prince shall so command it." Hereby it appeareth, the bishop was bound to make his answer before the magistrate, if it had been the prince's pleasure.

Cod. lib. 1.  
[tit. 3.] de  
Episc. et Clericis. Nullus.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. "Justinian, in the law that you rehearse, M. Jewel, is to be understood to speak of civil and temporal cases: and that in those cases no bishop should be brought before the lieutenant and civil magistrate, except the prince so command it.....It is a *maxima*, and a principle with the lawyers, that such laws speaking indefinitely, must be understood by another law, that speaketh specially and particularly, &c. It had been your part to have understood those words, *in qualibet causa*, spoken there indefinitely, by the other laws, that speak more specially. But then had you lost a peevish sophistical argument, and men had not known your worthy skill in the law, which no doubt will appear great by your practice." *The Answer.* We must take these words, you say, to be spoken of *civil or temporal cases* only: in which only cases you grant the *temporal judge* may call a *priest* before him, by the commandment of the *prince*. Herein I will not greatly contend against you. Notwithstanding, Justinian's words be general, and include all kinds of cases. For thus he saith, as I have alleged his words: *In qualibet causa*, that is, "Whatsoever the action be: be it ecclesiastical, be it civil." But, that you may the better conceive both Justinian's *meaning*, and also the weakness and vanity of your *Gloss*, Photius, the patriarch of Constantinople, saith thus: *Clerici Constantinopolitani, si non sint actores apud patriarcham agere, a solis præfectis prætorio judicantur, sive convenient, sive convenientur, tam pro privatis, quam pro ecclesiasticis*: "The priests of Constantinople, if they will not plead before the patriarch, are

M. Harding,  
fol. 379. b.

[Photius de  
Peccat. et Ju-  
dic. Episcop.  
tit. 9. cap. 1.  
p. 950.]

judged only before the *lord chancellor*, whether they plead or be impleaded: and whether it be their own private matter, or ecclesiastical<sup>50</sup>." Howbeit, by this exposition it appeareth, if the case be *temporal*, that then a *priest* may be convented before a *temporal judge*. But what say you then to Thomas Becket? He alone, as you know, withstood all the bishops of this realm, and would never yield, that a *priest*, although he were a thief or a murderer, should submit himself to *temporal judgment*. *Theft* and *murder* doubtless be *cases temporal*. And it was the express will and commandment of the *prince*. Yet, as I have said, Thomas Becket would never yield, that the *temporal magistrate* should judge of it: and therefore the *pope* made him a *saint*. Now if he did well, why do you by this exposition controul his doing? If in so doing he did evil, why was he sainted for the same? Doth the *pope* make folks saints for evil doing?

Gull. Neubri-  
gens. lib. 2.  
cap. 16. [p.  
172.]

As for the rest, whereas it pleaseth you to make yourself some pretty sport, and to say, Men had not known the worthy skill I have in law, &c. Despise not, M. Harding, lest you yourself be despised. For ought that I know, the law is your profession no more than mine. ☞

The emperor Martianus commandeth, if the cause be criminal, that the bishop be convented before the lieutenant: *Ut coram præside conveniatur*.

[Detect. 380.  
a.]

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. "The law *cum clericis* Addition.  
hath not these words, *Ut coram præside conveniantur*, nor any clause or sentence sounding to that purpose. For trial whereof, I refer me to the book." *The Answer.* The book will condemn you, M. Harding. The words there are plain<sup>51</sup>: *Cum clericis in iudicium vocatis pateat episcopalis audientia, volentibus tamen actoribus, si actor disceptationem sanctissimi archiepiscopi noluerit experiri,*

Cod. [lib. 1.  
tit. 3.] de E-  
pisc. et Cle-  
ricis. L. Cum  
Clericis.

<sup>50</sup> [Balsamon, Nomocanon. tit. 9. cap. 1. ὅτι οἱ κληρικοί Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, τῶν ἐναγόντων μὴ βουλομένων αὐτοῖς ἐνάγειν παρὰ τῷ πατριάρχῃ, παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν δικάζονται ἐνάγοντες καὶ ἐναγόμενοι χρηματικῶς καὶ ἐγκληματικῶς

ὑπὲρ ἰδικῶν καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν.]

<sup>51</sup> [The exact words, "ut coram præside conveniatur," are not found, but the law is addressed "ad Præfectum Prætorio Constantinum," and clearly justifies bishop Jewel's interpretation.]



*eminētissimæ tuæ sedis examen.....tam de suis, quam de ecclesiasticis negotiis sibi met noverit expetendum: qui in nullo alio foro, vel apud quenquam alterum iudicem, eosdem clericos litibus irretire, et civilibus, vel criminalibus negotiis tentet innectere:* “Whereas priests, when they be sued in law, may have access to the bishop’s audience,” (if the plaintiff think it good, and none otherwise) “if the plaintiff will not yield himself to stand to the most holy archbishop’s judgment, then let him know that he must come to the trial of your most high court, whether it be in his own, or in ecclesiastical cases. Neither shall it be lawful to the said plaintiff to implead the said priests in any other court, or before any other judge, (saving only before the archbishop, or before thee, being the president or lieutenant there,) whether the matter be civil or else criminal.” Here you see that the plaintiff, if he thought it good, might sue a *priest* before the lieutenant; yea, and that in *causes ecclesiastical*: and that the *priest* was bound to make his appearance, and to stand to his judgment. Yet will you tell us, M. Harding, that in this law there are no such words, nor any clause or sentence to that purpose? Or can you, without blushing so vainly, blaze your margin with M. Jewel’s *forgeries*? ➔

Pope Innocentius III. himself confesseth<sup>52</sup>, that the pope may make a layman his delegate, to hear and determine in *priests’ causes*. The like thereof ye may find in your own Gloss: *Papa laico delegat causam spiritualem*: “The pope committeth the hearing of a spiritual matter unto a layman.”

Addition.

*Addition.* ➔ But forasmuch as M. Harding saith, It is not written *papa delegat*, but *si papa delegat*, which nevertheless is nothing else but an empty quarrel, he may also find this self-same sentence in the same place specially noted without any *si*, or condition at all. The words there are these: *Clericus coram sæculari quandoque convenitur*: [Ibid. in margine.]

<sup>52</sup> [The reference to “De Major. et Obed. cap. 2. Innocentius,” is here restored from the edition of 1567.]

“A priest sometimes is called to make answer before a temporal judge.” ☞

Yea, further, ye shall find, even in the *pope's* own *decrees*, that the *pope* hath committed a spiritual matter in a cause of *simony*, to be heard and ended by a *woman*: and that Brunichildis being a *woman*, by virtue of the *pope's commission*, summoned a *bishop* to appear, and solemnly to make his purgation before her. Notwithstanding, in your Gloss upon the same it is noted thus: *Fuit tamen hic nimium papaliter dispensatum*: “The *pope* was too popelike in this dispensation.”

2. Quest. 4.  
Mennam. [In  
Gloss.]

M. Harding,  
382. a.

*Addition.* ☞ *M. Harding.* “But what if we cannot *Addition.* find in the *pope's* decrees, to which you refer us, that the *pope* ever committed a spiritual matter in a cause of *simony* to be heard and ended by a *woman*, and that Brunichildis had neither commission from the *pope* to summon a *bishop*, nor ever summoned a *bishop* to appear, and solemnly to make his purgation before her? What then shall we say, but that *M. Jewel* is a shameless falsifier, and a deceiver of all that believe him? &c.

M. Harding,  
383. a.

“I beseech you, sir, where is it said in all this decree, that the *pope* committed a spiritual matter in a cause of *simony* to be heard and ended by a *woman*? &c. In the text it is not, nor in the Gloss, that you so solemnly allege. Had your lawyer forgotten to tell you, or were you so simple that you could not conceive that which is commonly said, *Maledicta Glossa quæ corrumpit textum*? &c. To let pass your scoffing and your minister-like interpretation, let us come to the matter, &c. You say, the *pope* committed a spiritual matter in a cause of *simony* to be heard and ended by a *woman*. And this is a vain tale and untrue fancy of yours, not able to be gathered by any word of that decree. For the cause of *simony* was heard and ended by the *pope*, and the *bishop* was absolved and sent home” (or else *M. Harding* over boldly reporteth untruth, as his manner commonly is to do). “And a cause once heard and determined by the *pope*, is not wont to be committed afterward to the hearing and determination of a

M. Harding,  
383. b.

woman. After this, as though this lie had not been loud enough, you tell us that Brunichildis summoned the bishop to appear before her, &c. Brunichildis being so holy, so virtuous, so religious a lady, as St. Gregory reported she was, it is to be presupposed, that she would not disquiet a good and innocent man, nor put him to further trouble."

*The Answer.* "A shameless falsifier," (you say) "a deceiver of them that believe him, scoffing and minister-like interpretation; as though this lie had not been loud enough," &c. This eloquence, M. Harding, becometh no man but yourself. It is reason ye should have the whole glory of it without copartner. Howbeit, such intemperance of speech, and such uncivil dealing, will win small credit to your cause in the judgment of the wise. You say, "It cannot be found, that queen Brunichildis had any such commission from the pope." You hunt wantonly and rove at pleasure, M. Harding, and will find nothing but that may like you. But pope Gregory's *commission* is so plain, that I marvel with what good countenance you could deny it: saving that I see you are armed with boldness to deny what you list. These be pope Gregory's own words: *Purgationem ante te, duobus sibi sacerdotibus junctis, eundem ex se præbere tuo commisimus arbitrio:*

2. Quæst. 4.  
Mennam.

"I have given commission to your discretion, that the said bishop, taking to him two other priests, or bishops, shall make his purgation before you<sup>53</sup>." And thus he

<sup>53</sup> [Decret. 2. Qu. 4. (See supra vol. ii. 238. note <sup>55</sup>.) "Mennam vero reverendissimum fratrem et coepiscopum nostrum, postquam ea quæ de eo dicta sunt, requirentes, in nullo invenimus esse culpabilem: qui insuper ad sacratissimum corpus beati Petri Apostoli sub jurejurando satisfaciens, ab his quæ objecta fuerant ejus opinionioni, se demonstravit alienum: reverti illuc [*al. illum*] purgatum absolutumque permisimus: quia sicut dignum erat, ut si in aliquo reus existeret, culpam in eo canonicè punirem, ita di-

gnum non fuit ut eum adjuvante innocentia diutius retinere vel affligere in aliquo deberemus; (purgationem tamen *antè* duobus sibi sacerdotibus junctis, ubi accusatur cessaverit, eundem ex se præbere tuo commisimus arbitrio.)" The writer then proceeds to prohibit his resorting to boiling water, hot iron, &c. Some editions of the Decretum read (as bp. Jewel did) "*antè te,*" whilst others read "*antè.*" It should be observed, that not a word of the passage, after "*deberemus,*" is found in St. Gregory's original letter to

said to Brunichildis, being the *queen of France*. Is not this enough to prove, that the *pope* gave commission that the *bishop* should make his purgation before the *queen*? Is not here the plain and express word *purgatio*? Are not here two other *priests* or *bishops* appointed to be *compurgators*? Is not here the Latin word *commisimus*? whereby the *pope* gave the *queen* to understand, that he had sent her his special *commission*? Are not here these other two Latin words *ante te*, that is to say, *before thee*, or *in thy presence*? Are not here these other two Latin words, *tuo arbitrio*, whereby it is signified, that the matter was committed to *her discretion*? Doth not the same *pope* immediately afterward, in the same decree, straightly charge the said *queen* Brunichildis, that she should not require the said *bishop* to clear himself by any *vulgar purgation*, as by standing in scalding water, or by bearing a gad of burning iron in his bare hand, as many then used to try their innocency, and to purge themselves? Sought you so busily for these things, M. Harding, and could you not find them? Or could you see all these things in a heap together, and yet could you see nothing? Or, all this notwithstanding, can you so assuredly tell us, that the *pope* never committed any *spiritual* matter to be heard by a woman? Or, that the *queen* had no *commission* to any such purpose from the *pope*? The *pope* himself saith, Yea: you only say, Nay. And may we safely give credit to you alone against the *pope*?

Purgation.

Compurgators.  
Commisimus.

Ante te.

Vulgaris Purgatio.

M. Harding,  
fol. 383. b.M. Harding,  
fol. 384 a.

It is not likely (you say) that being once purged before the pope, he should afterward be purged again before a woman. It is not likely (you say) that Brunichildis, being so holy, so virtuous, and so religious a lady, would disquiet a good and an innocent man, or put him to any further trouble, after his cause had been heard and

Brunichildis, (Epist. 6. lib. xiii. tom. ii. 1219.) The editor of the Paris edition of the Decretum, 1612, notices this fact with great satisfaction, and asserts that the interpolated words belong properly to another chapter in 2 Qu.


4. There seems some mystery to hang over this subject, as both the Decretum and the Gloss are ancient, and it is not impossible that the passage was fraudulently expunged in St. Gregory's Epistle.]

ended by the pope. And are not these good and substantial and likely reasons, M. Harding? Or, were it not well worth the while, that your reader, contrary to the *pope's* plain words, should believe you, and rather yield to such *pretty likelihoods*? It is not *likely*, that M. Harding, so boldly maintaining manifest falsehood, will ever give place to any truth. I beseech you, how had this *bishop* made his sufficient purgation before the *pope*? By what words of *Gregory* can you learn it? Indeed he offered an oath for himself. And so far forth only, and none otherwise, he was purged. But there was no proclamation given out unto his accusers, if any man had to allege against his purgation; neither had he any man there to be his compurgator. Nor was he fully restored to his fame; nor had the *pope* thoroughly concluded and ended the matter. And therefore he committed it over, to be ended at home before the *queen*. For the *law* saith: *Ibi fieri debet purgatio, ubi quisque est infamatus: ut ibi moriatur malum, ubi contigit*: “There ought every man to make his purgation, where he is defamed: that the evil may die, and have an end, where it began to spring first.” To be short, whereas you tell us, M. Harding, that queen Brunichildis had no such commission from the *pope*, the expositor of that decree, if it might have pleased you to have seen him, would have taught you the contrary. For thus he saith: *Papa mandat reginæ, ut indicat eidem episcopo purgationem cum duobus sacerdotibus: et delegatur hic laico negotium spirituale: et episcopus expurgatus coram papa, cogitur adhuc coram muliercula se purgare*: “The *pope* giveth commission to the *queen* to appoint the said *bishop* to make his purgation, together with two other *priests*.” again: “Here a spiritual matter is committed over to a lay person:” and again: “A *bishop* being purged” (in part, and after a sort) “before the *pope*, yet, nevertheless, is compelled afterward to purge himself before a woman.” I know not what I should say further; *committere*, is Latin, to give commission: *purgatio*, in English, is a *purgation*: *simony* is a *spiritual cause*: *queen Brunichildis* was a lay person: *ante reginam*, is before the *queen*: the text is

*In Margaritha.*

2. Quest. 4.  
Mennam. [in  
glossa et in  
marg.]

plain: the Gloss is plain: the words are plain: the sense is plain. The *pope* himself saith: "I have given out my commission, that the bishop should appear before the *queen*:" the *expositor* saith: "A spiritual cause is committed to the judgment of a person temporal."

Yet, M. Harding, it is lawful for you to say, "M. Jewel is a loud liar, and a shameless falsifier, and a deceiver of all them that will believe him." Thus may you lawfully and boldly say: for full well it becometh you thus to say, as a man that recketh not what he say. 

Socrates, lib.  
I. cap. 12.  
[al. cap. 34.  
tom. ii. p.  
70.]

The emperor Constantinus wrote thus unto the *bishops* that had been at the *council of Tyrus*: *Cuncti quotquot synodum Tyri complevistis, sine mora ad pietatis nostræ castra properate: ac re ipsa, quam sincere, ac recte judicaveritis, ostendatis: idque coram me, quem sincerum esse Dei ministrum, ne vos quidem negabitis*: "All ye that have been at the *council of Tyrus*, come without delay unto our camp, and shew me plainly and without colour, how uprightly ye have dealt in judgment: and that *even before myself*, whom you cannot deny to be the true servant of God."

Authen. con-  
stitutione,  
123. [ed.  
Haloand.]

Justinian the emperor, in the *law* that he maketh touching the *public prayers of the church*, saith thus: "We command all *bishops and priests*, to minister the holy oblation, and the prayer at the holy baptism, not under silence, but with such voice, as may be heard of the faithful people, to the intent, that the hearts of the hearers may be stirred to more devotion, &c." Afterward he addeth further: "And let the *holy priests* understand, that if they neglect any of these things they shall make answer therefore at the dreadful judgment of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. *And yet, nevertheless, we ourselves, understanding the same, will not pass it over, nor leave it unpunished*<sup>54</sup>."

Hereby we see, that *godly princes* may summon *bishops*, to appear before them, even in *causes ecclesiastical*, to receive such punishment as they have deserved. Likewise the emperor Constantinus, in his letters unto the people of

<sup>54</sup> [Supra vol. ii. p. 43. note <sup>25</sup>, Haloander's edition, is printed at where the original, according to length: see also vol. vi. p. 60.]

Nicomedia, speaking of the wilful errors and heresies of *priests* and *bishops*, saith thus: *Illorum temeraria præsumptio, mea, hoc est, ministri Christi, manu coercebatur*: Theodore-tus, lib. I. cap. 19. [iii. 51.]  
 “Their rash attempts shall be repressed by my hand, that is to say, by the hand of Christ’s servant<sup>55</sup>.”

Addition. *Addition.* ☞ M. Harding: “Where you say, that the M. Harding, 387. emperor spake of the wilful errors and heresies of the priests and bishops, and add not, Arian priests and Arian bishops, you declare your malicious heart against priests and bishops. But I will leave that cankered spite of yours, &c. Why do you not report the emperor’s words as they are in your author? Will you never leave this your accustomed vile corruption?” *The Answer.* And will you never leave this vanity, M. Harding? You say, I speak of errors and heresies of priests and bishops, but I add not, Arian priests and Arian bishops. And therein, you say, I declare my malicious heart. Of such good words your gentle heart wanteth no store. It is your skill with such terrors and outcries to amaze the simple. For no wise man, I trow, would thus demean himself without some cause. I said not, *the errors and heresies of Arian priests and of Arian bishops*. What then? Think you therefore I meant the *errors and heresies of catholic priests, and godly bishops*? Or can any man imagine heresies without an heretic? Fie, M. Harding, such wantonness is not fit for your gravity: when I spake of *errors and heresies*, a very babe might well know, I spake only of *heretics*, and of none others.

But I have not reported the *emperor’s* words as I found them. And this, in your accustomed courteous speech, you call my *accustomed vile corruption*. Howbeit, indeed, I corrupt no part of the *emperor’s* words. He speaketh none otherwise, but as I report him. Add hardly the words that you would seem to miss. You can add nothing to the meaning. Thus saith Theodoretus, even as you

<sup>55</sup> [Theodoret. Εἴ τις δὲ πρὸς τὸλμης διὰ τῆς τοῦ θεράποντος τοῦ μνήμην τῶν λυμεῶνων ἐκείνων, ἢ Θεοῦ, τουτέστιν ἐμοῦ, ἐνεργείας πρὸς ἔπαινον ἀπρονοήτως ἐξαφθῆναι ἀνασταλήσεται.]  
 τόλμησει, παραχρήμα τῆς ἰδίας

have translated him yourself: "If any man be inflamed boldly and uncircumspectly at the remembrance and commendation of those wicked and pestilent heretics, his boldness shall be repressed straightway by my working, that is to say, by the minister of God<sup>56</sup>." This is all that I say, M. Harding: I say no more. ☞

August. contra epist. Parmen. lib. 1. cap. 7. [al. cap. 9. ix. 20.]

So likewise saith St. Augustine unto the Donatists: *An forte de religione fas non est ut dicat imperator, vel quos miserit imperator? Cur ergo ad imperatorem legati vestri venerunt?* "Is it not lawful, that the emperor, or the emperor's deputy, should pronounce in a case of religion? Wherefore then went your own ambassadors to the emperor?"

M. Harding, 388. a.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding: "St. Augustine, reasoning *Addition.* against Parmenian, the Donatist, took advantage of his own doings, not as allowing the appeal to the emperor, but as proving him unreasonable, who for advantage would appeal to the emperor, and, when the emperor had pronounced sentence against him, would strive and repine at the sentence, and say, that he, being a temporal prince, ought not to punish bishops, &c. St. Augustine, in this talk against the Donatists, cannot be said to allow the emperor's authority in condemning of bishops and other ecclesiastical causes. For he, answering another Donatist that said, *Non debuit episcopus proconsulari judicio purgari*, said, if he be worthy to be blamed, whom the temporal judge hath absolved, whereas he himself did not require it, how much more are they to be blamed, which would have a temporal prince to be judge in their cause? By this it appeareth that he thought that princes could not be judges over bishops. Moreover he reporteth that Constantine, who appointed judges to hear their cause, did it, *a sanctis antistitibus veniam petiturus*, as minding to ask pardon of

<sup>56</sup> [Harding, however, adds, that the words were meant only to apply to the laity of Nicomedia; and certainly there is nothing in the letter to contradict him; so that the words left out by bishop Jewel were not so unimportant as

he represents them, inasmuch as they serve to shew, that the persons, whom the emperor here threatens to punish, were not the heretical bishops themselves, but their partizans, whether lay or clerical, at Nicomedia.]



the holy bishops for his fact. And the same emperor, seeing their importunity in repairing to him, as judge, said, *O rabida furoris audacia! Sicut in causis gentilium solet fieri, appellationem interposuerunt.*" *The Answer.* The very story hereof is this: *The Donatian heretics*, being condemned by an assembly of bishops in *Africa*, and appealing for aid unto the *emperor*, were, by his authority, appointed over by special commission to be judged by *Miltiades, the bishop of Rome*, with certain others. Wherein two things are specially to be noted: first, that the *pope* in those days thought not himself to be superior to the *emperor*, but could be contented to be his delegate, and to receive authority by his commission: again, that the *pope* was not appointed to judge alone, but had other *bishops* joined with him. *The Donatians* being condemned before the *pope* and the other commissioners, and once again appealing to the *emperor*, were eftsoons appointed over by like commission to be judged by the *bishop of Arle in France*, with certain others. And here also it is to be noted, that, in those days, it was lawful to appeal from the *pope*, and that an inferior *bishop* might lawfully judge of his judgments. But the *Donatians* seeing themselves condemned by the *bishop of Arle*, as they were before by the *bishop of Rome*, last of all appealed to the *emperor's* own person, complaining of the partiality of the *bishop of Rome*, and of the *bishop of Arle*, as at whose hands they could find no justice. In the end, being likewise condemned by the *emperor* himself, they found themselves also grieved with his majesty, and condemned his judgment too, as they had done the others. Hereof St. Augustine saith thus: *Judex eligitur imperator: judicans contemnitur imperator:* "They choose the *emperor* to be their judge: and after judgment they despise the *emperor.*" This is it, that the *emperor* so much misliked in the *Donatists*. Therefore he abhorred them as impudent and perverse wranglers, that seeing judgment so many ways, and so clearly pass against them, yet would not submit themselves to any order. Such, this day, M. Harding, is the perverseness and impudency of all them, that, seeing their follies laid open to the

[S. August.  
Epist. 162.  
il. 97.]

Euseb. lib.  
10. cap. 5.  
[l. 484, 485.]

The pope the  
emperor's  
delegate.

Appeal from  
the pope.

Aug. epist.  
162. [il. 99.]

world by God's holy word, and so many kingdoms and countries departing from them, yet, nevertheless, have hardened their faces against all shame, and will never yield to the confession of any one error. Therefore St. Augustine saith unto the *Donatists*, as we likewise may say unto you: *Quid vultis amplius homines, quid vultis amplius?* "O ye men, tell me, what would ye have more? What more would ye have?"

Aug. in eadem epist.  
[ii. 90.]

As touching the matter that lieth between us, the question is this, *Whether a prince may be judge in ecclesiastical causes, or no.* "He may not," say you. Here we allege the example of the godly *Christian emperor Constantinus*, who being only a *temporal prince*, nevertheless took upon him to judge in *causes ecclesiastical* between the *Donatian heretics* and the *catholics*. Unto this you answer: "Thus he did, *a sanctis antistitibus veniam petiturus*, as minding to ask pardon of the holy bishops for his fact." For what his fact, M. Harding? Why deal you so darkly? Will you tell us, that Constantinus knew in his conscience he did ill, and committed sacrilege, and wickedly intruded upon the *bishops' offices*, and wilfully deserved God's vengeance, as did Ozias, or Oza, and yet would do it notwithstanding, upon the hope of pardon? Verily this had been the sin of presumption, which some men have reckoned as the sin against the *Holy Ghost*, that shall never be forgiven, neither in this life, nor in the life to come. Or do you think, that these holy fathers would so easily have forgiven so great an offence, so presumptuously committed against God? Or is it likely, that the emperor Constantinus, for thus doing, stood *excommunicate ipso facto*, and was therefore divided from the sacraments and prayers, and all other communion and comfort of the church? Or that afterward he waited three days together bareheaded and barefoot, as did that noble emperor Henry IV. upon pope Gregory VII., to receive absolution for his sins? I know, you dare to say many things: but thus much, I trow, you dare not say. What *pardon* then was it, that the *emperor* minded to seek at the *bishops' hands*? Indeed, the place itself is very dark, and such as whereof it is hard to gather a ready and

Sabell. Ennead. 9. lib. 3.

perfect sense. Thus stand the words: *Atque utinam, saltem ipsius iudicio, insanissimis animositatibus finem posuissent, atque, ut eis ipse cessit, ut de illa causa post episcopos iudicaret, a sanctis antistitibus postea veniam petiturus, dum tamen illi, quod ulterius dicerent, non haberent, si ejus sententiæ non obtemperarent, ad quem ipsi provocaverunt, sic et illi aliquando cederent veritati?*

If ye understand this sentence thoroughly, M. Harding, ye are more than Davus: ye are as good as Œdipus. Notwithstanding, that silly sense, that you have imagined, cannot possibly be gathered hereof by any reasonable order of construction. This only is it, that St. Augustine saith, The *emperor* minded to excuse himself unto the *bishops*, not for that he had dealt in a cause *ecclesiastical*, but for that he had dealt therein, after that it had been twice heard and determined by the *bishops*. These are his words: *Ipse eis cessit, ut de illa causa post episcopos iudicaret, a sanctis antistitibus postea veniam petiturus.* You know right well, M. Harding, *veniam petere* is not always to *ask absolution*, as for some heinous offence against God. *Bona tua venia dicam: dabis mihi hanc veniam, &c.* are phrases commonly used among the learned. In this place, St. Augustine saith, the *emperor* minded courteously to excuse his doing unto the *bishops*, for that calling the matter before himself, that had been before thoroughly considered and debated by them, he might seem to judge of their judgments, and to call their doings into question. This only was the thing, that he would have excused. And this was his courtesy only, and not his duty.

As for the hearing of *ecclesiastical causes*, which is the matter that lieth between us, he neither thought he offended God therein, for any thing that may appear, nor minded to ask pardon for the same. For he did no more therein than was lawful for him to do; nor ever was there any pope so uncivil, that durst to condemn him for so doing. St. Augustine saith plainly in the same *epistle*: *Diximus, .....* *Felicem Aptungitanum, ad Constantini jussionem, proconsularibus gestis fuisse purgatum.*—*Ait quidam, Non debuit episcopus proconsulari iudicio purgari: quasi vero*

Aug. epist.  
162. [il. 90.]

*ipse sibi hoc comparaverit, ac non imperator ita quæri jussit: ad cujus curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus esset, res illa maxime pertinebat:* “ We told you, that Felix, the bishop of Aptungita, was purged before the lord lieutenant by the commandment of the emperor. But one of the Donatian heretics saith, ‘ A bishop should not have made his purgation before the lieutenant:’ as though it had been the lieutenant’s seeking, and not rather the emperor’s commandment: to whose charge, whereof he shall yield account unto God, that matter specially did belong.” Behold these words, M. Harding: lay them abroad: cast no cloud over them: St. Augustine telleth you, that the purgation of a bishop, notwithstanding it were an ecclesiastical matter, yet belonged specially to the emperor’s charge. And thus he saith even in the selfsame epistle and place that you have alleged. And yet must we believe you upon your word, that the emperor could not deal herein without offending of God, and craving of pardon? Again, St. Augustine saith: *An forte de religione fas non est, ut dicat imperator.....? Cur ergo ad imperatorem legati vestri venerunt?* “ What, is it not lawful, perhaps, that the emperor should give sentence in a case of religion? Wherefore then did your legates sue to the emperor?” Here, M. Harding, mark this by the way: *They that said the emperor might not be judge in ecclesiastical cases, were Donatian heretics.* For St. Augustine and the catholics said the contrary. Again, St. Augustine saith: *Si criminis non est, provocare ad imperatorem, non est criminis audiri ab imperatore. Ergo, nec ab illo, cui causam delegaverit imperator:* “ If it be no fault to appeal to the emperor, then is it no fault to be heard or judged by the emperor. And so, consequently, it is no fault to be judged before him, to whom the cause was committed by the emperor.” St. Augustine presupposeth and layeth it as a ground, that it is no fault, neither to appeal to the emperor, nor to be judged before his majesty, be the cause never so much ecclesiastical.

Now, M. Harding, if there were no fault committed by the emperor, why should you thus force him to crave pardon?

Ad cujus curam res ea maxime pertinebat. [ib. 93.]

Specially belongeth to the emperor’s charge.

August. contra epistolam Parmen. lib. 1. cap. 7. [cap. 9. tom. ix. 20.]

Aug. epistol. 162. [ib. 94.] Non est criminis.

Photius, *the patriarch of Constantinople*, saith thus: *Clerici Constantinopolitani, si nolint actores apud patriarcham agere, a solis præfectis prætorio judicantur; sive convenient, sive convenientur, tam pro privatis, quam pro ecclesiasticis*: “The priests of Constantinople, if they will not plead their matters before the *patriarch*, then are they judged only before the *lord chancellor*, whether they be plaintiffs or defendants, and whether their causes be private or *ecclesiastical*<sup>57</sup>.”

Photius de Peccatis et Judicio Episc. tit. 9. [cap. 1. p. 950.]

Again he saith: “Bishops, priests, and monks, are to be sued before the *lord deputy* or *president* of the country: or if they be found in the city of Constantinople” (where the *emperor* hath his court,) “then are they to be sued *only* before the *lord chancellor*<sup>58</sup>.”

In eodem tit. [cap. 1. p. 953]. Apud Præsides provinciarum. Apud solos Præfectos prætorio.

Likewise Balsamon, expounding a *canon of the council of Antioch*, allegeth this sentence of Justinian: *Patriarcha debet rationem reddere imperatori, et ab eo corrigi*: “The *patriarch* is bound to make his answer before the *emperor*, and of him to receive correction.” And thus he speaketh of a cause *ecclesiastical*, as by the place it may appear. Again he saith: *Patriarcha ab imperatore, qui ecclesia habet potestatis scientiam, judicabitur, forte ut sacrilegus, vel male de fide sentiens, vel alicujus alius criminis reus. Hoc enim nos judicialiter factum esse vidimus diversis temporibus*: “The *patriarch* shall be judged of the *emperor*, having the knowledge of the *ecclesiastical* power, whether the matter be of *sacrilege*, or of *heresy*, or of any other crime. For this have we seen done oftentimes in form of judgment.”

Balsamon. Conc. Antioch. can. 12.

Balsamon, eodem loco.


What would ye have more, M. Harding? *Heresy* is a *cause ecclesiastical*: the *patriarch* is a *bishop*: the *emperor* is a *civil* or *lay magistrate*. Yet Balsamon telleth you, that this *bishop* in this cause, is to be tried before the

<sup>57</sup> [Supra vol. vi. p. 314 note 50.]

<sup>58</sup> [Photius, in Nomocanone: ὅτι οἱ ἐπίσκοποι καὶ οἱ κληρικοὶ καὶ οἱ μοναχοὶ διάξιμοι οὐ γίνονται, ἀλλὰ παρὰ ἄρχουσι τῶν ἐπαρχῶν αὐτῶν ἐνάγονται. ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει


ἐρρισκόμενοι παρὰ μόνοις τοῖς ὑπάρχοις ἐνάγονται, ἔνθα καὶ ἡ τιμὴ αὐτοῖς φυλάττεται, καὶ συνηγόρους λαμβάνουσιν. The words in parenthesis are added by bishop Jewel.]

*emperor*: and that he himself hath oftentimes seen the same judicially put in practice, no restraint or law being to the contrary.

Gerson standing before the *French king*, and answering his adversaries in a *cause ecclesiastical*, said thus unto him: *Loquimur sic ad eos, rex serenissime, te audiente, te iudice*: “Thus we say to them, O most gracious king, in your hearing: your grace shall be judge.” Here, you see, M. Harding, the *cause is ecclesiastical*, and the judge is the *king*. 

But what speak we of other *priests* and *inferior bishops*? The *popes* themselves, notwithstanding all their *universal power*, have submitted themselves, and made their purgations before *kings* and *emperors*. Pope Liberius made his humble appearance before the emperor Constantius: pope Sixtus was accused, and made his purgation before the emperor Valentinian<sup>59</sup>: pope Leo III. being accused by Paschalis and Campulus, pleaded his cause before Carolus Magnus at Rome, not yet chosen *emperor*. Pope John XXII. was accused of *heresy*, and forced to recant the same unto Philip, the French king.

Pope Leo IV. in this wise humbly submitted himself unto the judgment of Lewis, the *emperor*: *Nos, si incompetenter aliquid egimus, et in subditis justæ legis tramitem non conservavimus, vestro admissorum nostrorum cuncta volumus emendare iudicio*: “If we have done any thing out of order, and if we have not followed the right course of the law over our subjects, *we will amend all our faults by your majesty’s judgment*.”

*Addition.*  M. Harding. “If this submission had Addition. not been made voluntarily by them, nor king nor Cæsar could have had authority or power to be judges over them. The good emperor Constantine said to the bishops, *Vos non potestis ab hominibus iudicari*: ‘You cannot be judged of men,’ that is, of laymen.” *The answer*. This is wisely

<sup>59</sup> [It should be stated, however, that this took place in a synod summoned, as the pope asserts, by his own authority, and that he protested against its being drawn into a precedent.]

Gerson, Trilogus. In materia schismatis, [l. 298. a.]

Theod. lib. 1. cap. 16. [leg. lib. 2. tom. iii. 92.]  
2. qu. 4. Mandastis, 2. qu. 4. Auditum.

Gerson in Sermone paschal. [vol. iv. 491. d.]

2 Qu. 7. Nos sl.

M. Harding, fol. 389. a.

[Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 17.]

considered, M. Harding, and for good advantage. *Laymen be men*: all others be angels. Otherwise if *bishops* were *men*, as others be, then could no *priest* or *bishop* be judged before them: for Constantinus saith: *Vos non potestis ab hominibus judicari*: “You cannot be judged by men.” And yet in the selfsame place he seemeth to say, that a *bishop* may not be judged, neither before any other *bishop*, nor before the *pope* himself, or any other creature, but only before God alone. For thus he saith unto the *bishops*: *Istæ accusationes vestræ opportunum tempus habent magni judicii diem, et judicem tunc omnibus judicaturum*: Sozomen. lib. 1. cap. 17. [li. 35.]

“These quarrels of yours have a meet time of trial, I mean the day of great judgment, and a meet judge, that shall judge over all<sup>60</sup>.” Happy are you, M. Harding, that may do what ye list, and never come to answer before the day of our Lord.

*M. Harding*. “Pope Liberius, you say, made his humble appearance before Constantius. It is true. But Liberius’ dealing with the emperor Constantius, was such as became a bishop of the apostolic see.<sup>61</sup>.....For in that cause he would neither be overborne by the authority of the emperor, nor yield unto his wickedness against Athanasius for a long time,” (YET AT LENGTH HE YIELDED, AND SUBSCRIBED TOO, AS IT BECAME A BISHOP OF THE APOSTOLIC SEE,) “much less acknowledge him for his superior, or judge.” (AND YET POPE GREGORY, THAT FOLLOWED LONG AFTER POPE LIBERIUS, CALLED THE EMPEROR HIS LORD AND MASTER: *Ego sum vester servus, o imperator: ego sum vestræ jussioni subjectus: imperatori obedientiam præbui*: THESE BE HIS WORDS.) “As for pope Sixtus, it is certain he made his purgation before the emperor Valentinian. But he did it<sup>62</sup>.....of humility, &c. The

<sup>60</sup> [Sozomenus:—αὐται μὲν ἔφη αἱ κατηγορίαι καιρὸν οἰκίον ἔχουσι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς μεγάλης κρίσεως· δικαστὴν δὲ, τὸν μέλλοντα πᾶσι τότε κρίνειν, ἐμοὶ δὲ οὐ θεμιτὸν ἀνθρώπων ὄντι τοιαύτην εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἔλκειν ἀκρόασιν, ἱερέων κατηγορούντων καὶ κατηγορουμένων. ἤκιστα γὰρ χρὴ τοιού-

τους ἑαυτοὺς παρέχειν, ὡς παρ’ ἐτέρου κρίνεσθαι.]

<sup>61</sup> [Harding adds: “but appearance is not purgation,” &c.]

<sup>62</sup> [“He did it in Concilio, in a council of bishops, and not in a court of the prince. He did it of humility,” &c.]

Gregor. lib. 3. epist. 61. [leg. 62. tom. ii. 677.]

[M. Harding, fol. 389. b.]

emperor of himself had no power to summon the pope to his judgment seat, nor any jurisdiction to force him to make his purgation before his majesty. He gave him licence to hear his purgation. Concerning Leo III. and Leo IV., their case is like, &c. And, therefore, we say, the emperor was not their judge, nor superior, by any princely authority, but by these popes' permission and appointment."

*The answer.* O what a blessed thing it is to be a *pope!* Be he never so wicked, yet if he be also stout and wilful, and refuse judgment, then may he not be judged by any creature under heaven, neither by *king*, nor by *emperor*, nor by the *church*, nor by the whole people of *God*. For so it is enacted by pope Innocentius himself: *Kings and emperors* live under laws; but the *pope's* prerogative is, to do what him listeth, without controulment, or fear of laws.

9. qu. 3.  
Nemo.

Ennodius [p.  
1622]. Concil.  
tom. 1.

And so is it true that Ennodius<sup>63</sup> saith: *Successores Petri, una cum sedis privilegiis, peccandi quoque licentiam accepisse*: "That the successors of Peter, together with the privileges of their see, have also gotten free liberty to do ill." ☞

Dist. 63. In  
Synodo: in  
Glossa.

Your own Gloss saith: *Papa potest dare potestatem imperatori, ut deponat ipsum: et sese in omnibus illi subijcere*: "The *pope* may give the *emperor* power to depose himself: and may in all things submit himself unto him<sup>64</sup>." Now, M. Harding, if the *pope* may give the *emperor* this authority, what scripture find you to the contrary, why the *emperor* may not take it of himself? To be short, Francis-

Fran. Zabarella. de Schismate, et Concilio. [in Synt. Tract. de Imp. fol. 237. col. 2. A.]

cus Zabarella saith: *Papa accusari potest coram imperatore de quolibet crimine notorio: et imperator requirere potest a papa rationem fidei*: "The *pope* may be accused before the *emperor* of any notorious crime: and the *emperor* may require the *pope* to yield an account of his faith."

M. Harding,  
fol. 391. b.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. "Zabarella saith not, as Addition. you report, *Papa potest accusari coram imperatore*, &c. These words, *coram imperatore*, are of your own inter-

<sup>63</sup> [It is not Ennodius who says this, but the accusers of pope Symmachus IV., whose words he alleges in order to refute them.]

<sup>64</sup> ["Sed nunquid papa posset ei potestatem dare ut deponeret ipsum? . . . imo in omnibus se potest subijcere ei."]



lacing, and be not in the author. You ought to be ashamed, so foully to corrupt your authors, and deceive the people. Again, Zabarella saith not, *Imperator requirere potest a papa rationem fidei*. They are your words, M. Jewel. That which Zabarella saith, is this: *Si papa erit suspectus de hæresi, potest imperator ab eo exigere, ut indicet quid sentiat de fide*. Now, sir, to require a man to yield an account of his faith, and to require him to declare what he thinketh touching the faith, are two diverse things." *The answer*. "You ought to be ashamed," you say: verily, and so I am, and so ought I to be, in your behalf, M. Harding, to see your vanity. These words, *coram imperatore*, are not interlaced by me: you may easily find them in the author<sup>65</sup>. Wherein I will use no other proof but only the very same words that you yourself have alleged. These they be: *Nec quenquam moveat, quod imperator est laicus, ut ex hoc putet esse inconveniens, quod se intromittat de clericis. Non enim semper prohibetur judicare de clericis. Sed tunc prohibetur, quando non subest ratio specialis*: "Let no man be moved, for that the emperor is a layman, to think it therefore a thing inconvenient that he should intermeddle with priests' causes. For he is not always forbidden to judge of priests. But then is he forbidden, when there is no special cause."

M. Harding,  
fol. 392.

You see, therefore, M. Harding, that upon some cause (him specially moving) *the emperor may lawfully judge in ecclesiastical matters*. Again you say: "Zabarella saith not, *Imperator requirere potest a papa rationem fidei*: but thus he saith, *Imperator exigere potest a papa, ut indicet quid sentiat de fide*." Here have I put *requirere* instead of *exigere*; and, *rationem fidei*, instead of *quid sentiat de fide*. "To require a man to yield an account of his faith, and to require a man to declare what he thinketh touching the faith," (say you) "are two diverse things." Is not here a wonderful difference, and a foul corruption of

<sup>65</sup> [The Editor has not been able to discover the sentence in question. It is evident that Bp. Jewel was here deceived by his memory: what he adds, however, shews that Zabarella's meaning virtually amounted to the sense of these words.]

authors, M. Harding? Is not this a foul deceiving of the people? Are not these weighty and worthy matters to be proclaimed and published to the world? I marvel, if you be not ashamed in your own behalf.

The words of Zabarella are plain: *Imperator exigere potest a papa, ut indicet quid sentiat de fide*: "The emperor may require the *pope* to shew him what he thinketh of the faith." That is to say, the *emperor* may require the *pope* to yield a reckoning of his *faith*. Where also it is to be noted, that the *pope* may be an *heretic*, or at least suspected of *heresy*. For thus saith Zabarella: *Si papa erit suspectus de hæresi*. Cry out, therefore, M. Harding, no more of *deceiving the people*. For, as it appeareth, the *pope* himself may be an *heretic*, and a *deceiver of the people*. ➔

Now, therefore, M. Harding, I report me to your own indifferent judgment, how true it is, that ye say, "It is not convenient for a king to call priests before him to his own seat of judgment." Verily, this note ye might have found glossed in your own Decretals: *Quæritur, Quis exemit clericum de jurisdictione imperatoris, cum prius esset illi subjectus? Dicit Laurentius, quod papa de consensu principis*: "A question is moved, Who hath exempted a priest from the jurisdiction of the emperor, whereas before he was subject to the emperor's court? Laurence saith, the *pope* hath exempted him by the consent of the *prince*<sup>65</sup>." Ye see therefore, M. Harding, your *priests*, *abbots*, and *bishops* have their *privileges* and *exemptions*, not by any right of God's word, but only by the *pope's policy*; and by the special favour of the *prince*.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 9. Divis. 3.

They will say to this, I guess, *Civil princes* have <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 77.]</sup> learned to govern a commonwealth, and to order matters of war: but they understand not the secret mysteries of *religion*. If that be so, what is the

<sup>65</sup> [This marginal note is not in the ed. of the Decretals of 1612. after the papal revision.]

*pope*, I pray you, at this day, other than a *monarch*, or a *prince*? Or, what be the *cardinals*, who must be none other now but *princes* and *kings' sons*? What else be the *patriarchs*, and, for the most part, the *archbishops*, the *bishops*, the *abbots*? What be they else at this present in the *pope's kingdom*, but worldly *princes*, *dukes*, and *earls*, gorgeously accompanied with bands of men whithersoever they go: oftentimes also gaily arrayed with chains and collars of gold? They have at times, too, certain ornaments by themselves, as *crosses*, *hats*, *mitres*, and *palls*: which pomp the ancient *bishops*, *Chrysostom*, *Augustine*, and *Ambrose*, never had. Setting these things aside, what teach they? what say they? what do they? how live they? I say not, as may become a *catholic*<sup>66</sup> *bishop*, but, as may become a Christian man? Is it so great a matter to have a vain title, and, by changing a garment only, to have the name of a *bishop*?

## M. HARDING.

The duty of civil princes consisteth in civil matters; the duty of bishops, in spiritual things: that serveth to the preservation of men's persons; this, to the salvation of their souls. "Every high priest" (saith St. Paul) "that is taken from among men, is ordained for men in things appertaining to God." <sup>a</sup>Ye move temporal princes to take upon them the office of the pope, and bishops, as though it were a thing so indifferent, and so common, that, when bishops be negligent, temporal men may do their stead. But the reason which to this end ye make, is so slender, as (I ween) few princes that fear God will be greatly moved to adventure that thing so much subject and thrall to God's revenge. <sup>b</sup>In effect your reason is this, consider it who will: They of the clergy be no other but civil princes: *ergo*, temporal princes may bear the office of bishops. Sir, both your argument is naught, and your antecedent is false. For although bishops had but a title, and the name of bishops by changing a

a Untruth, manifest. For we move no prince to take upon him the bishop's office. h Untruth. For this is our reason: "A temporal prince," say you, "may not meddle in ecclesiastical causes." But the pope, say we, is nothing else but a temporal prince: *ergo*, by your judgment the pope may not meddle in ecclesiastical causes.

<sup>66</sup> [There is no word in the Lat. corresponding to "catholic."]

garment only, as you say, yet that defect in them should not give ability to the mere lay, as to kings and queens, to do the office of bishops. Now is your antecedent manifestly false: for the bishops of the catholic church, which in scoff ye call the pope's kingdom, be duly ordained and consecrated.

Though the pope have a princely dominion, and some other bishops of Christendom have dukedoms and earldoms; though they ride well accompanied with men and horse; yea, though some of them, otherwise than becometh that vocation, do wear chains and collars of gold, <sup>c</sup> as you belie them: though they have other ornaments to their states pertaining, which grieveth you much in comparison of the <sup>d</sup> beggary of your married estate, yet all this embarreth them not, but that they be bishops.....

Though they teach not, though they say not, though they do not, though they live not as becometh bishops, neither as becometh even a Christian man, <sup>e</sup> as you rail; all this notwithstanding, yet be they bishops, though evil bishops. Neither, for all this, may it be lawful for laymen to take their office upon them. <sup>f</sup> Judas was an apostle till the rope choked him. Neither for his wickedness might Stephen, Matthias, or any other of the disciples, of his own presumption, have stept into his room. Now, as this is true, so is your railing talk false, which malice has stirred you to utter.....

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Once again we tell you, M. Harding, we confound not these *offices* <sup>67</sup>: notwithstanding you so often and so lewdly report us to your own discredit. Our *princes* never took upon them the office of *bishops*: but your *bishops* have taken upon them the *office of princes*. Of your *bishops* it is written in your own *councils*: *Ecce, jam pene nulla est actio sæculi, quam non sacerdotes administrent*: "Behold, there is now in a manner no worldly affair, but *priests and bishops* have it in hand." Such *bishops* be they, of whom St. Chrysostom writeth thus: *Qui non credunt iudicium Dei, nec timent, abutentes primatu suo ecclesiastico sæculariter, convertunt eum in sæcularem*: "They that neither believe nor fear the judgment of God, abusing their ecclesiastical dignity in secular sort, turn the same into secular dignity." Such *bishops* they be, of whom St. Hierom saith thus: *Ipsi sibi et laici sunt, et episcopi*: "They themselves

c Untruth: read the answer.

d O glorious Thraso! Then was the apostles' state much more beggarly.

e This railing is not ours, but St. Bernard's.

f The pope by M. Harding compared with Judas.

Conc. Marense. [xvii. 540. c. 2.] Citatur ab Illyric. inter Testes Veritatis, p. 121. [Art. 110. ed. 1672.]

Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 3. [Op. imp. vi. app. 153.]

Hieron. contra Luciferianos. [lv. pt. 2. 302.]

<sup>67</sup> [See the XXXIX Articles; Art. 37.]

be to themselves both *laymen* and *bishops* too<sup>68</sup>." And again: *Adorant Dominum et Melchom, qui sæculo pariter et Domino putant se posse servire, et duobus dominis satisfacere, Deo et Mammonæ: qui militantes Christo, obligant sese negotiis sæcularibus, et eandem imaginem offerunt et Deo et Cæsari:* "They worship the Lord and Melchom both together, thinking that they may serve both the world and the Lord, and satisfy two masters at once, *God and Mammon*: who, fighting under Christ, bind themselves to worldly affairs, and offer up one *image both to God and to Cæsar.*"

Hier. in Sophoniam, cap. 1. [lib. 1647.]

And, therefore, cardinal Cusanus saith: *Maxima ex hac re deformitas oritur, quod prælati tantum sæcularibus curis invigilant:* "Hereof groweth a great deformity, that *bishops are bent only to worldly cares.*" Mark well these words, M. Harding: he saith, "*Your bishops are bent only to worldly cares.*"

If ye will believe none of these, yet your *pope's own legates*, in your late *chapter at Trident*, speaking of your priest-like apparel, say thus: *Nihil a laicis, præterquam in vestis genere, ac ne in hoc quidem differunt:* "Our priests differ nothing from *laymen*, saving only in apparel: nay, indeed, they differ not so much from them as in apparel."

Conc. Trid. sub Paulo III. Admonitio legator. [p. 3. Orat. Trident. ed. 1567.]

Ye say your bishops are gay and gallant, attended and guarded with prince-like routs, both behind and before. And therefore ye make no small account, specially in respect of our estate, which you call beggarly. In such disdain the heathens sometime said, that *Christ* was the *beggarliest and poorest* of all the *Gods* that were in heaven. Howbeit, our bishoprics, saving that certain of your fathers have shamefully spoiled them, are now even as they were before. Certainly, the *poorest bishopric in England*, as it is reported, is better in revenues than some three of your *pope's Italian bishoprics* in the *kingdom of Naples*. Howbeit, the gospel of Christ standeth not by riches, but by

Aventinus, lib. 3. de Ruperio. [p. 152.]  
Christum omnium Deorum esse pauperrimum.

<sup>68</sup> [Hieron. contr. Lucif. "Sed "ausculta quid de omni ecclesia  
"ommissis paucis homunculis, qui "sentiendum sit.)  
"ipsi sibi et laici sunt et episcopi,

truth. In comparison of the one, we make small reckoning of the other.

Nevertheless, the wise and godly have evermore found fault with the ecclesiastical bravery of your *Roman clergy*.

Bernar. in  
Cantic. serm.  
33. [sub fin.]  
Holcot. in  
Sapient. lect.  
23. [l. 24. p.  
87.]

St. Bernard saith: *Inde est, quem quotidie vides, meretricius nitor: histrionicus habitus: regius apparatus. Inde aurum in frænis, in sellis, in calcaribus:* “Therehence cometh their whore-like fineness: their player’s weed: their princely apparel. Therehence cometh their gold in their bridles, in their saddles, and in their spurs.” Again

Bernar. in  
Cantic. serm.  
77. [sub init.]

he saith: *.....Incedunt nitidi et ornati, circumamicti varietatibus, tanquam sponsa procedens de thalamo suo. Nonne si quempiam talium eminus procedentem aspezeris, sponsam potius putabis, quam sponsæ custodem?* “They go trimly and finely in their colours, as if a spouse should come from her chamber. If thou shouldst suddenly see one of them jetting afar off, wouldest thou not rather think it were a spouse, than the keeper of the spouse?”

Laur. Valla  
de Donat.  
Const. [p.  
62.]

Laurentius Valla, although bitterly, yet not unpleasantly, thus expresseth your lordly bravery: *Existimo, si qua inter dæmones, qui aerem incolunt, ludorum genera exercentur, eos exprimendo clericorum cultu, fastu, luxu, exerceri, et hoc scenici lusus genere maxime delectari:* “I think, if the devils in the air have any games among them, to make sport withal, they are most busily occupied in counterfeiting the *apparel, and attire, and pride, and riot of priests*, and have greatest pastime in this kind of maskery.”

Parallpomen.  
Urspergen.  
[p. 344.]

Pope Bonifacius VIII., in a great *jubilee*, and in a solemn procession, went apparelled in the *emperor’s robes*, and had the *crown imperial* on his head, and the *sword of majesty* borne before him, as an *emperor*.

Bernard. de  
Consider. ad  
Eugen. lib. 4.  
[cap. 2.]

This *spiritual jollity*, M. Harding, liketh you well. Notwithstanding, St. Bernard saith: *Dæmonum magis quam ovium sunt hæc pascua. Scilicet, sic factitabat Petrus: sic Paulus ludebat:* “These be pastures for *devils*, not for sheep. No doubt even thus did *Peter*: even such pastime played *St. Paul*.”

Ye tell us further: “Though they teach not, though

they say not, though they do not, though they live not as becometh bishops, nor as becometh a Christian man, yet be they bishops notwithstanding." Hereat we will not greatly strive. For so the *wolf*, if he once get a sheep-hook and a cloak, may be a shepherd: and a blind man, if he get once into the watchtower, may be a spy. But miserable are the poor sheep that so are fed: miserable is that poor castle that so is watched.

St. Augustine saith: *Episcopatus est nomen operis, non honoris.....; ut intelligat se non esse episcopum, qui præesse dilexerit, non prodesse*: "A bishop's office is a name of labour, and not of honour: that whoso loveth to rule, and not to profit, may understand himself to be no *bishop*." Again he saith of such a one: *Canis impudicus dicendus est, magis quam episcopus*: "He ought rather to be called a shameless *dog*, than a *bishop*."

As for that ye say, "Your bishops be duly ordained and consecrated," St. Augustine replieth: *Ipsum characterem multi et lupi, et lupis imprimunt* [al. *infigunt*]: "Touching the outward consecration of a *bishop*, many give it to wolves, and be wolves themselves<sup>69</sup>."

St. Bernard, speaking of your *priests* and *bishops*, saith: *Habitu milites: quæstu clericos: actu neutros exhibent. Nam neque ut milites pugnant: neque ut clerici evangelizant. Cujus ergo ordinis sunt? Cum utriusque esse cupiunt, utrunque deserunt: utrunque confundunt. Unusquisque, inquit, in suo ordine resurget. In quo isti? An qui sine ordine peccaverunt, sine ordine peribunt.....? Vereor, non alibi ordinandus, quam ubi nullus ordo, sed sempiternus horror inhabitat*: "In their apparel they are *soldiers*: in their gains they are *priests* and *bishops*: but in effect and in deed they are neither of both. For neither do they fight in the field, as do *soldiers*; nor do they preach, as *priests* and *bishops*. Of whether order therefore be they? Whereas they would be of both orders, they forsake both, and confound both. St. Paul saith, 'Every

<sup>69</sup> [S. August. contra Donatistas. This passage is irrelevant, inasmuch as St. Augustine is speak-

ing of baptism as the "character Dominicus," not of "the outward consecration of a bishop."]

man shall rise again in his own order.' But in what order shall these rise? Whether, forasmuch as they have sinned without order, shall they perish without order? I fear me, they shall be ordered none other where, but where as is no order, but disorder, and horror everlasting."

Thus plainly speak your own doctors, touching your *clergy*: which plainness it pleaseth you, M. Harding, to call *false and malicious railing*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 10. Divis. 1.*

Surely, to have the principal stay and effect of all matters committed wholly to these men's hands <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 78.]</sup> <sup>69</sup>, who neither know nor will know these things, nor yet set a jot by any point of *religion*, save that which concerneth their belly and riot; and to have them alone sit as *judges*, and to be set up as overseers in the watchtower, being no better than blind spies: of the other side, to have a *Christian prince*, of good understanding and of a right judgment, to stand still like a block or a stake, not to be suffered neither to give his voice nor to shew his judgment, but only to wait what these men shall will and command, as one which had neither ears, nor eyes, nor wit, nor heart, and whatsoever they give in charge, to allow it without exception, blindly fulfilling their commandments, be they never so blasphemous and wicked, yea, although they command him quite to destroy all religion, and to crucify again Christ himself: this surely, besides that it is proud and spiteful, is also beyond all right and reason, and not to be endured of *Christian* and wise *princes*. For why, I pray you, may Caiaphas and Annas understand these matters, and may not David and Ezekias do the same? Is it lawful for a *cardinal*, being a man of war, and delighting in blood, to

<sup>69</sup> [Apol. Lat. "illis solis."]



have place in a *council*? And is it not lawful for a *Christian emperor or a king*?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Hereto M. Harding saith nothing, but that he hath oftentimes said before.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 11. Divis. 1.*

Verily, we grant no further liberty to our *magistrates*, than that we know hath both been given them by the *word of God*, and also been confirmed by the examples of the very best governed commonwealths.

M. HARDING.

If a man should ask you where that word of God is, that maketh a temporal prince supreme head of that part of the church which he hath government of in all civil matters, I am sure you can bring forth <sup>a</sup> no other word of God, than that wherein St. Peter and St. Paul willeth all men to obey the superior powers, especially kings. Which thing was written to all Christian men, whiles they lived under heathen princes, and infidels, as Claudius Cæsar and Nero were, whom (I suppose) ye will not say to have been heads of the whole church, as they were monarchs and princes of the whole world. If then by those scriptures which cannot prove Nero (being <sup>b</sup> persecutor of Christ's church) to have been head of the same, you will now prove that other princes are supreme heads of the church; it seemeth that either you make Nero head of the church with them, or give more unto them than the word of God will bear. And as for examples of good commonweals, shew us but one since Christ's ascension, wherein, before Luther's time, any emperor Christian, or other prince, did attribute that title unto himself, and we will say, that when you speak of commonweals, in the plural number, you make but one lie: but in case you shew us no one commonweal that hath so done, then you lie in the plural number. Yea further, if at this day the commonweals in christendom, not only that are catholic, but the best also of those that are Lutherish and newfangled, do abhor from that strange and unheard title of <sup>c</sup> Supreme Head of the Church, why do you say, that ye have either word of God for it, or example of approved commonweals?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Concerning the title of *supreme head* of the *church*, we need not to search for *scriptures* to excuse it. For, first,

<sup>a</sup> Untruth. For we allege many other places besides, as it may soon appear.

<sup>b</sup> Then cannot the pope be head of the church: for he hath persecuted the church, as Nero.

<sup>c</sup> Much ado about nothing: for our prince hath not this title. But queen Mary had, and used the same title of Supreme Head, as many ways it may be proved.

we devised it not: secondly, we use it not: thirdly, our princes at this present claim it not<sup>70</sup>. Your fathers, M. Harding, first entituled that most noble and most worthy prince, king Henry the Eighth, with that unused and strange style, as it may well be thought, the rather to bring him into the talk and slander of the world.

Howbeit, that the *prince* is the *highest judge*, and *governor* over all his subjects, whatsoever, as well *priests* as *laymen*, without exception, it is most evident by that hath been already said; by that shall be said hereafter; by the whole course of the *scriptures*, and by the undoubted practice of the *primitive church*. Verily, the *prince*, as it shall afterward better appear, had *both the tables* of the *law of God* evermore committed to his charge: as well the first, that pertaineth to *religion*, as also the second, that pertaineth to civil government.

But now, M. Harding, if a man would ask you, by what *word of God* your *priests* and *bishops* have exempted themselves from the judgment and government of their *princes*: or, by what *word of God* the *prince's* hand is restrained more from his *clergy* than from other his *subjects*: or, by what *word of God* ye would stablish *two supreme governors* in one realm: I marvel in what *scriptures* ye would seek to find it. Your own doctors and glossers say, as it is before alleged: *Queritur, quis exemit clericum de jurisdictione imperatoris, cum prius esset illi subjectus? Dicit Laurentius, quod papa de consensu principis*: "Question is moved, who hath exempted the *priest* from the jurisdiction of the *emperor*, whereas before he was his subject? Laurentius saith" (not the *word of God*, but), "the *pope* exempted him by the consent of the *prince*<sup>71</sup>."

Further, M. Harding, we beseech you, by what *word of God* can your *pope* claim himself to be the *head* of the *universal church of God*? Where is it recorded? Where

Extra, de  
Majorit. et  
Obed. cap. 2.  
in marg. [ed.  
1572.]

<sup>70</sup> [The title was conferred on king Henry VIII., 1531. See Burnet's Reform. i. p. 229. Elizabeth declined it, as we learn from a letter of Jewel to Bullinger, printed infra vol. viii., and in

Burnet's Reform. Records, No. 48. "Regina non vult appellari " aut scribi caput ecclesie Angli- " canae."]

<sup>71</sup> [See the note supra vol. vi. p. 332.]

is it written? In what part of the *Testament*, New or Old? In what *law*? In what *prophet*? In what *epistle*? In what *gospel*? Where is his *headship*? Where is his *universal power*? If ye can find it, then may ye shew it: if it cannot be found, then should ye not say it. As for that you and other your fellows have alleged before, for proof hereof, it is so childish, and so weak, that I think ye cannot now come again with the same, without blushing.

Touching the right that we say belongeth unto all *Christian princes*, it hath been invested and planted in them from the beginning. For, to leave other authorities of the *scriptures*, pope Eleutherius himself wrote thus unto Lucius, sometime *king* of this realm of *England*: *Vos estis vicarius Dei in regno, juxta prophetam regium*: “You are God’s vicar within your own realm, according to the prophet David.”

Epist. Eleuth. Citatur inter Leges Edwardi Primi. [Wilkins, Leg. Anglo-Saxon. p. 201.]

Paul, the *bishop of Apamea*, writeth thus unto the emperor Justinian, in a cause mere ecclesiastical, touching *religion*: *Transtulit ipsum Dominus, ut plenitudinem directionis vestræ custodiret serenitati*: “Our Lord hath taken pope Agapetus away, that he might leave the fulness of order” (concerning these heretics, Dioscorus and Eutyches,) “unto your *majesty*.”

Quintæ Synod. [Constantin.] Act. 1. piissimo. [Crabb. ii. 22. col. 2.]

Tertullian saith: *Colimus imperatorem,.....ut hominem a Deo secundum,.....solo Deo minorem*: “We worship the emperor, as a man next unto God, and inferior only unto God.”

Tertullian, ad Scapulam. [c. 2. p. 69.]

And notwithstanding the name of *head* of the *church* belong peculiarly and only unto *Christ*, as his only right and inheritance, (for as the *church* is the *body*, so *Christ* is the *head*,) yet may the same sometimes also be applied in sober meaning, and good sense, not only unto *princes*, but also unto others, far inferior unto *princes*. Chrysostom saith: *Videntur mihi istæ mulieres caput fuisse ecclesiæ quæ illic erat*: “It seemeth unto me, that these women were the head of the church that was at Philippi.” Likewise again, speaking of the emperor, he saith thus: *Læsus est, qui non habet parem ullum super terram, summitas et caput omnium super terram hominum*: “We have offended him,

Chrys. in ep. ad Phil. Hom. 13. [xi. 301.] A woman head of the church. Chrys. ad popul. Ant. Hom. 2. [ii. 23.]

that in the earth hath no peer, the *top* and the *head of all men in the world.*" If he were the *head of all men*, then was he the head, not only of *bishops* and *cardinals*, but also of the *pope* himself, unless the *pope* were no man.

To conclude, our *princes* need no more to claim their lawful authority and emperial right, by the example of Nero, whereof ye have moved much untimely and wanton talk, than your *pope* needeth to claim his usurped and coloured power by the examples of Annas and Caiaphas.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis.* 2.

For, besides that a Christian prince hath the charge of *both tables* committed to him by *God*, to the end he may understand, that not *temporal* matters only, but also *religious* and *ecclesiastical* causes pertain to his office, &c. [Vol. iv. p. 78.]

M. HARDING.

You will prove, that ecclesiastical causes pertain to a king's office, because he hath the charge of both tables. If you mean, that a king is bound to keep both tables of the law, so is also every private man. And yet as no private man is supreme head of the church by keeping them, so neither the king is proved thereby the <sup>a</sup>supreme head. If you mean, that the king ought to see others to keep both tables of the law: that may he do, either in appointing temporal pains for the transgressors of them, or in executing the said pains upon the transgressors. But as he cannot excommunicate any man for not appearing when he is called, so can he not judge all causes of the law. For if a man sin only in his heart, as, for example, in murder, or advoutery, the king cannot have to do with him: and yet the true supreme head of the church shall have to do with him. For that malicious and sinful thought <sup>b</sup>shall never be forgiven, except the party come to be absolved of their successors, to whom Christ said, "Whose sins ye forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained." To commit murder in heart, is a sin, and it is retained until it be forgiven. <sup>c</sup>Neither can it be forgiven, until he that is judge, by the key of discretion, perceive that it is to be forgiven. Which he cannot know, until it be confessed with a contrite heart by him who only knoweth it, and is bound to tell it for absolution's sake. If then there be a judge who can see the law kept in an higher point, and beyond the reach of the king, surely the king shall not be supreme head, sith another is

a A grave disputer. Ye conclude against that that is not avouched.

b Untruth, fond and manifest, and leading directly to desperation.

c Untruth, joined with blasphemy. Read the answer.

John xx. 23.

more like to God than he: as who is judge of the inward conscience, whereunto no king reacheth, but <sup>d</sup>only the minister of Christ, who is the spiritual king, <sup>d</sup>and hath given the keys of his kingdom to his minister.

<sup>d</sup> A fond folly. For this key is given no more to the pope, than to any other simple priest.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye rove and wander without a mark, and reply to that that was not spoken. I marvel whereof ye can spin yourself such idle talk. For we neither call our *princes, the heads of the church of Christ*, (it was your fathers' invention, and not ours,) nor say we, they have power, either to *excommunicate*, or to *bind*, or to *loose*; nor have we leisure to make such vain conclusions.

Thus we say, the *prince* is put in trust, as well with the first as with the second table of the *law of God*, that is to say, as well with *religion*, as with *temporal government*, not only to keep and perform the contents of *both tables* in his own person (for so much every private man is bound to do), but also to see, that all others his subjects, as well *priests* as *laymen*, each man in his calling, do duly keep them. This is it, that no private man is able to do. Therefore St. Augustine saith: *In hoc serviunt Domino reges, in quantum sunt reges, cum ea faciunt ad serviendum illi, quæ non possunt facere, nisi reges*: "Herein kings serve the Lord, in that they be *kings*, when they do those things to serve him, that no man can do, but only *kings*." We say not, the prince is bound to do the *bishop's* duty. And therefore it is the greater folly of your part, M. Harding, to object it so often. Wise men use not so to adventure their words in vain. But thus we say, *the prince is bound to see the bishops to do their duties*.

Aug. in epist. 50. ad Bonif. [ii. 651.]

But what meant you, so far out of season, to talk so fondly of your *privy confession*, of *binding* and *loosing*, and *power of keys*? For, as it is said before, we say not, that *princes* may either *bind* or *loose*, or minister *sacraments*, or *preach* the *gospel*, or sit down and *hear confessions*. Therefore, with all this great ado, ye foine only at your own shadow, and hit nothing.

Ye say full discreetly, "If a man sin only in his heart,

the king cannot have to do with him, for that he cannot enter, to know his secrets." Here I beseech you, M. Harding, what entrance then hath the *pope*, to know the secrets of the heart? Perhaps ye will say, the *pope* may know all the world by confession. But St. Augustine saith: *Quid mihi est cum hominibus, ut audiant confessiones meas? &c. Unde sciunt, cum a me ipso de me ipso audiunt, an verum dicam? quandoquidem nemo scit hominum quid agatur in homine nisi spiritus hominis, qui in ipso est:* "What have I to do with these men, that they should hear my *confessions*, &c. How know they, when they hear me report of myself, whether I say true or no? For no man knoweth what is in man, but the spirit of man that is within him." Again he saith unto the people:

Aug. Confess. lib. 10. c. 3. [1. 171.]

August. in Psal. 126. [iv. 1429.]

*Intrantes vos et exeuntes possumus videre. Usqueadeo autem non videmus, quid cogitatis in cordibus vestris, ut neque quid agatis in domibus vestris videre possimus:* "We may see you coming in and going forth. But we are so far from seeing the thoughts of your hearts, that we cannot see what you do at home in your houses." Likewise again he saith: *Quid singulorum quorunque modo conscientie dixerint, ad aures meas, quia homo sum, peruenire non potuit. Ille, qui absens est presentia corporis, sed presentis est vigore majestatis, audivit vos:* "What every of your consciences hath said, it could not enter into my ears, for that I am but a mortal man. Notwithstanding, *Christ* that is absent, as touching the presence of his *body*, but present by the power of his *majesty*, hath heard you well." It is not the *pope*, but *God* only, that *trieth the reins and searcheth the heart*.

August. in Psal. 127. [iv. 1440.]

Yet ye say, the true *supreme head* of the *church* shall have to do with him, that sinneth only secretly in his heart: "For that malicious and sinful thought" (say you) "shall never be forgiven, except the party come to be absolved of their successors, to whom *Christ* said, 'Whose sins ye forgive, &c.'" This, M. Harding, is the *supreme folly* of all others *follies*. For, first, where ever heard you, that the *pope* would once vouchsafe to *hear confessions*? And if he would, yet, by your own doctor's judgment, the

*pope* hath no more power to *bind* and to *loose*, than any other poor simple priest. As I have shewed you before, Alphonsus de Castro saith: *Quando absolvit simplex sacerdos, tantum absolvit de culpa, sicut papa*: “When a *simple priest* absolveth, he absolveth as much touching the fault, as if it were the *pope* himself.” Origen saith: *Quæ sequuntur, velut ad Petrum dicta, sunt omnium communia, &c. Quod si nos idem loquimur, quod Petrus loquutus est, efficitur Petrus*: “The words that follow, as spoken unto Peter, are common unto all. If we speak the same that Peter spake, then are we made Peter<sup>72</sup>.” Even in the *pope*’s own Gloss upon his Decretals it is noted thus: *In necessitate laicus potest et audire confessiones, et absolvere*: “In case of necessity, a layman may both hear confessions, and also give absolution.” Yet will ye not say, that every layman is Peter’s *successor*.

To what purpose, then, serveth all this your vain talk, M. Harding, “The true supreme head of the church shall have to do with him that sinneth only in his heart?” For every *simple priest*, having the key of God’s word, entereth into the heart, and hath to do with the same as well, and as much, and as deeply as the *pope*: and, in respect of being *judge* of the *conscience*, is above *kings* and *princes*, no less than he.

But where ye say, “The malicious and sinful thought shall never be forgiven, except the party come to be absolved of their successors, to whom Christ said, ‘Whose sins ye forgive, &c.’” this doctrine is not only strange and false, but also full of desperation. Your own Gratian saith: *Latentia peccata non probantur necessario sacerdoti confitenda*: “It is not proved” (by any sufficient authority either of *scriptures* or of *doctors*) “that secret sins are of necessity to be uttered in confession unto the *priest*.” Again he saith: *Datur intelligi, quod, etiam ore tacente, veniam*

<sup>72</sup> [Origen: εἰ δὲ κοινὸν ἐστὶ καὶ πρὸς ἑτέρους τό· δώσω σοι τὰς κλείδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ πάντα τὰ προειρημένα καὶ τὰ ἐπιφερόμενα, ὡς πρὸς

Πέτρον λελεγμένα;—The concluding words occur earlier (p. 523): εἰ δὲ φήσαντες καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡς ὁ Πέτρος . . . . γινόμεθα Πέτρος, κ. τ. λ.]

Alph. de hæres. lib. 2. de Absolutione. [p. 107.]

Orig. in Matt. Tract. 1. [al. tom. 12. lib. pp. 523. 525.]

Extra, de Offic. Judicis Ordin: Pastoralis: In Glossa. [col. 384.]

De Pœnit. dist. 1. Quls aliquando.

De Pœnit. dist. 1. Convertimini.

*consequi possumus*: "It is given us to understand, that we may obtain pardon, although we utter nothing with our mouth." And again: *Non sacerdotali iudicio, sed largitate divinæ gratiæ peccator emendatur*: "The sinner is cleansed, not by the judgment of the priest, but by the abundance of God's grace." Again he saith: *Confessio sacerdoti offertur in signum veniæ, non in causam remissionis accipiendæ*: "Confession is made unto the priest, in token of forgiveness already obtained: not as a cause of forgiveness to be obtained." Your very Gloss saith: *Apud Græcos confessio non est necessaria: quia non emanavit ad illos traditio talis*: "Among the Christians in Græcia, confession of sins is not necessary: for that this tradition never came among them." Yet, M. Harding, I trow, ye will not say, but their sins may be forgiven.

In eodem cap.

De Pœnit. dist. 1. Omnis qui.

De Pœnit. dist. 5. In penitent: in Glossa.

Chrys. de Confess. et Pœnit. [ed. Paris. 1558. tom. v. 771. ed. Savill. v. 512.]

Certainly Chrysostom saith: *Solus te Deus confitentem videat*: "Let God only see thee making the confession of thy sins<sup>73</sup>."

It was very much, therefore, M. Harding, for you so assuredly and so precisely to say, that sins can never be forgiven without your privy confession: and specially thereby to prove the *universal headship of the pope*.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 3.

Besides, also, that God, by his prophets<sup>73</sup>, often and earnestly commandeth the *king* to cut down the groves, to break down the *images* and *altars* of *idols*, and to write out the *book* of the *law* for himself: and besides that the prophet Esaias saith: "*A king ought to be a patron, and a nurse of the church,*" &c.

[Vol. iv. p. 78.]

#### M. HARDING.

Your second argument for the ecclesiastical power of kings is, because God bade them to cut down superstitious groves, and overthrow idols: "as though this were not an office of executing a commandment, rather than of decreeing any thing. The au-

a The king is the priest's executioner.

<sup>73</sup> [There is nothing in the Latin corresponding to the words "by his prophets."]  
<sup>74</sup> [Supra vol. i. p. 187.]



thority to discern an image of Christ from an idol of the devil, belongeth to them, who know, that an image is a name of art, which is of God: an idol is a name of false worshipping, which is of the devil. So that an image is godly: an idol devilish. When the priest hath judged this or that to be an idol, or when it is evident that so it is, then the king shall do well to break it down. <sup>b</sup>But if the king will break down the image of Christ, when the priest telleth him it is a godly representation, and no idol; then the king doth more than his office requireth, and shall not only not prove his supremacy, but also shall incur danger to be rejected of God, as king Saul was, when he despised to keep the commandment of Samuel the high priest.

r Sam. xxviii.  
17, 18.

b O vanity of vanities! Aaron the bishop set up the golden calf, and cried unto the people, This is thy God. But Moses, the civil magistrate, or prince, brake it down.

Deut. xvii.  
18.

Whereas you allege for a king's ecclesiastical power, that he was commanded to write out the book of the law for himself; why left ye out that which followeth there immediately: *Accipiens exemplar a sacerdotibus Leviticæ tribus?* The king must write out a book of the Deuteronomy: but the example thereof he must receive of the priests that be of the tribe of Levi. If in spiritual matters the king were above the priests, <sup>c</sup>why had he not the keeping of the law in his own hands? Why must he take it of the priests? why did not rather the priests come to him, sith the inferior taketh all his right of the superior? If the priests must give the holy scripture unto the king, then, verily, must he take such as they give him, and with such meaning as they give unto it. So that if you had not <sup>d</sup>falsified the meaning of God's word by leaving out half the sentence, this place had proved against you. It is to be weighed, to what end a king is required to have, and to read that holy book. Verily, not to take upon him the part of a judge in causes of religion; but as there it is expressed, to the intent he learn to fear his Lord God, and keep his words and ceremonies in the law commanded, and that his heart be not lifted up into pride, above his brethren, &c. <sup>e</sup>I omit that you read *Librum legis*, whereas the church readeth *Deuteronomium*, <sup>e</sup>it were too long to enter into that disputation. The book of the law signifieth the whole law, the Deuteronomy is but one of the five books.

c Full discreetly: as though kings had not officers to keep their records.

d Untruth. For we have falsified no part hereof, as it shall appear.

Deut. xvii.  
19, 20.

e Here M. Harding would fain say somewhat, if he wist what it were. Read the answer.

Where Esay calleth a king a patron of the church, I have not found. But were it he called him so, it betokeneth, that he should defend the church from worldly enemies, as in repelling the Turks, in expelling heretics, and such the like kingly acts: which proveth no spiritual supremacy, but, under God, a fealty and serviceable power. I find where Esay saith: *Et erunt reges nutricii tui, et reginae nutrices tuæ*: "Kings shall be thy fosterers, and queens thy nurses." But not every nurse or fosterer is above him who is nourished. <sup>f</sup>A faithful servant oftentimes fostereth the master: yet is he not above his master. Besides, St. Hierom understandeth the kings, whom Esay nameth, to be the apostles, according to which sense it maketh nothing to the purpose it is alleged for.

Isa. xlix. 23.

f By this pretty conclusion, the king is the servant, and the priest is the master.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All Christian princes are much beholden to you, M. Harding ; ye make them so like to Polyphemus, the giant, after his eyes were stricken out, that is to say, to a man mighty in body and great in bones, but stark blind, and no way able to guide himself. A king, ye say, may not take upon him to judge or pronounce in matters of religion, be they never so clear ; but only must hearken, and be ready to execute whatsoever shall be thought good and commanded by your *bishops*, as if he were only your *bishops' man*. So saith your holy father pope Bonifacius VIII. : *Gladius materialis exercendus est manu regum et militum : sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis* : “The material or temporal sword must be used by the hand of kings and soldiers ; but at the beck and sufferance of the *priest* :” by which *priest* he meaneth the *pope*.

De Major. et  
Obed. Unam  
sanctam. [p.  
189.]

Psal. ii. 10.

But David saith : “ Now ye kings, have understanding : be learned, ye that judge the earth.” Good *kings* have oftentimes reformed religion, and have lawfully controlled, and corrected, and deposed idle and wicked *bishops* : as before, in place convenient, it is largely proved. The emperor Justinian threateneth, if the *bishop* offended in saying the public service, or in the ministration of the sacraments, that then he himself would use his authority over him, and see him punished<sup>74</sup>. Franciscus Zabarella saith : “ That for any crime notorious, the *emperor* may summon the *pope* to appear before his majesty, and may require him to yield a reckoning of his faith.” And yet will ye say, “ The *emperor* is still the *pope's man*, and may judge nothing in causes of religion without him ?”

Authen. Con-  
stitut. 123.  
[Haloander.]  
καὶ οὐδὲ  
ἡμεῖς ταῦτα  
... ἀνεκδι-  
κῆτα κατα-  
λείψομεν.  
Franc. Za-  
bar. De  
Schisma.  
et Concil.  
[In Synt.  
Tract. de  
Imp. fol. 237.  
col. 1. A.]

Isa. v. 20.

The king (ye say) is not able to judge, whether an idol be an idol or no, but by the leading and teaching of the priest. So well ye wish all *Christian princes* were instructed, that they should not be able either to see or to speak without you. But what, if your *priests* say, as it hath often happened, *God* is an *idol*, and an *idol* is *God* ? *Light* is *darkness*, and *darkness* is *light* ? What if they say,

<sup>74</sup> [Supra vol. vi. 320 ; also vol. ii. p. 43. note <sup>25</sup>.]

*Great is Diana the goddess of Ephesus?* What if they Acts xlix. 28. condemn the innocent, and say, as they sometime said of *Christ*, “Unless this man were a malefactor, we would John xviii. 30. never have brought him to thy hand?” Yet must the *prince* nevertheless draw his sword, and strike, when and whomsoever the *priest* biddeth: and blindly execute his wicked will? Indeed, M. Harding, you say precisely: “If M. Harding, [Confut.] p. 302. a. the matter decreed be spiritual, and appertaining to faith, the *prince* ought to obey without question or grudge.” Likewise again ye say: “It shall be enough for you, to do as M. Harding, [ibid.] p. 192. a. b. the successors of Peter bid you to do. Christ now requireth of you not to obey Peter and Paul, but to obey him that sitteth in their chair:” whatsoever he say, true or false. For this, no doubt, must be your meaning.

The *king* was bound to write out the *book of the law*: this (ye say) proveth not the king’s superiority over the priests. No, verily, M. Harding: neither was it alleged by us to that purpose. Nevertheless, hereby it appeareth, that *God* would have the *king* to be learned in his *laws*.

“But the *king* must receive the *book* of the *priest*, and of none other:” therefore, say you, the *priest* is above the king. Methinketh, M. Harding, even for your credit’s sake, ye should look better to your *logic*. For what availeth the delivery of a *book*, to make the *priest* either higher or lower? When the *pope* is at his *consecration*, the *cardinal*, that is his *orderer*, delivereth him a *book* of the *epistles* and *gospels*. Will ye therefore conclude, that the said *cardinal* is above the *pope*? Marry, God forbid. Ceremon. lib. 1. sect. 2. [fol. 27. b.]

*God’s* meaning, touching this ceremony, was this, that the *king’s book* should be true and faultless. And therefore *God* commanded him to take a copy thereof out of the registry or records, which were thought to be void of all corruption, and were evermore kept in the temple, under the custody of the *priests*. Paulus Phagius saith: “Every Paul. Phag. in Deut. cap. xvii. private man was commanded to have one book severally to himself: but the king was commanded to have two. And, forasmuch as the king was a public person, therefore *God* willed him to take his copy out of the public records of the temple.”

Hugo in  
Deut. cap.  
17. [tom. 1.  
159.]

Your own Hugo Cardinalis saith: *Accipiet exemplar a sacerdotibus: non a quibuslibet, sed a bonis: ubi nihil futatum est: nihil corruptum:* “He shall take his copy of the *priests*, not of every *priest* whatsoever, but of the good: that in the same copy there be nothing, neither coloured, nor corrupted.”

August. contra Faust.  
lib. 16. cap.  
21. [viii. 29.]  
et in Psal. 58.  
[iv. 569.]  
et sæpe alibi.

All this, M. Harding, will hardly prove your strange conclusion, that the *priest was superior to the king*: it seemeth much better to prove the contrary, that the *priest was the king's inferior*, and his subject, and his clerk of records, as being appointed to keep his books. So St. Augustine saith, the *Jews* this day keep the very true books of the *scriptures*: albeit, not for their own use, but only for ours. And, therefore, he saith, they be not our *superiors*, but our *servants*.

Joh. de Parisiis, de Po-  
test. Reg. et  
Papali, cap.  
5. [p. 113.]

Certainly, concerning the *kings* and *priests* of the *old law*, one of your own friends, whom for many causes ye may not well refuse, saith thus: *In veteri lege sacerdotium indignius erat potestate regia, et ei subjectum:* “In the *old law* the *priest's* office was inferior to the *prince*, and subject unto him.”

Chrysost. in  
Genesim  
hom. 8. [iv.  
59.]

Ye say, “If the priest must give the holy scriptures to the king, then verily must he take such as they give him, and with such meaning as they give unto it.” Yea, I trow, though they tear their robes against Christ as Caiaphas did, and cry out, *He blasphemeth*, yet must we, by your judgment, evermore seek to them for the sense and meaning of the *scriptures*. For this is the ground and foundation of your divinity: *The scripture of God hath none other sense, but as it shall please the priest to give unto it.* But St. Chrysostom, speaking of the same *priests* and *bishops*, from whom we have received the selfsame *scriptures*, saith thus: *Literæ quidem legis apud illos sunt: sensus autem apud nos:* “The letters or words of the *scriptures* are with them, but the true meaning of them is with us <sup>75</sup>.”

Here you much disadvantage yourself, and, as ye say,

<sup>75</sup> [St. Chrysostom, speaking of the Jews, τὰ μὲν γράμματα παρ' αὐτοῖς, τὰ δὲ νοήματα παρ' ἡμῖν.]

“omit that we read, *librum legis*, whereas the church readeth, *Deuteronomium*, for that” (as ye say) “it were too long for you to enter into that disputation.” Therefore, M. Harding, we will patiently abide your leisure, until ye have found out the whole mystery, and considered it better. In the mean season, it shall not be good for you to be overrank with your commentaries, until ye better understand the text. Certainly the wise and learned think, that herein ye are much deceived. For whereas the words are these: *Describet sibi Deuteronomium legis hujus*, they think that *Deuteronomium*, in this place, is not put for any one certain several book of the five books of Moses, as it is otherwise commonly used, but rather for a copy, or a draught of the whole law. And in this sense, they say, that *Δευτερονόμιον* is none other but *Ἀπόγραφον*, that is to say, a *copy*, or a *double*. The *Italian* translation<sup>76</sup> hath thus: *Esso si scrivo* [i. *scriverra*] *questo doppio de la legge*. The *French* translation hath, *Le double*. Leo Judas translatheth it thus: *Questo Dopplo. Le Double.* *Describet sibi exemplum legis hujus*: “He shall write out for himself a *copy* of this law.” And for some proof hereof, it is thus written in the *book of Joshua*: “Afterward Joshua read *Joshua viii. 34.* out of the words of the *law*, both the blessings and the curses, according to every thing that is written in the book of the *law*. And there was not one word of all the things that Moses commanded, but Joshua read the same before the whole *congregation of Israel*.” Thus, ye see, M. Harding, that this word *Deuteronomium*, in this place, signifieth not the fifth book of Moses, as you imagine, but a full *copy* of all the *law*. And, therefore, eftsoons I tell you, ye are much deceived.

Where we allege the words of the prophet Esay: “*Kings* shall be thy fosterers, and *queens* thy nurses:” ye say, “Every nurse or fosterer is not above him that is nourished. A faithful servant oftentimes fostereth his master. Yet is not he above his master.” So loath ye are, the *king* should be superior to a *priest*. And thus have ye brought about by your handsome conclusions, that your *priests* be the

<sup>76</sup> [The Italian version alluded Venet. 1532: the French translation is that by Antonio Brucioli. tion has not been found.]

masters, and kings their servants. And therefore it is discreetly noted in your Gloss: *Imperator Romanus est procurator, sive defensor Romanæ ecclesiæ*: “The emperor of Rome is the steward, or bailiff of the church of Rome.”

Dist. 98. [7. 96.] Si imperat. : in Glossa.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 4. and 5.*

I say, besides all these things, we see by histories, and by examples of the best times, that good princes ever took the administration of ecclesiastical<sup>76</sup> matters to pertain to their duty.....

[Vol. iv. p 79.]

Moses, being a *civil magistrate*, and chief guide of the people, both received from God, and delivered to the people, all the order for *religion* and *sacrifices*, and gave Aaron, the *bishop*, a vehement and sore rebuke for making the *golden calf*, and for suffering the corruption of *religion*.

Exod. xxxii. 21.

M. HARDING.

Moses was not only a civil magistrate,<sup>a</sup> but also a priest. In that he had both offices,<sup>b</sup> it proveth that a priest may have both; but not contrariwise that a king may have both. For the greater may include the less, but the less cannot include the greater. The office of a priest is the highest of all.<sup>c</sup> And Christ coming naturally of the king's line from David, in the tribe of Judah, yet esteemed that honour nothing in respect of that he was a priest according to the order of Melchisedec. Therefore Melchisedec also, being both priest and king, was not yet said to be the figure of Christ so much concerning his kingdom as his priesthood. For David said of Christ, “Thou art a priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.” As for his kingdom, it was included in his priest's office. And, therefore, when we speak of Christ's kingdom, though in every respect he be the very King indeed of all kings, and Lord of all lords; yet we assign it also to have been upon the cross, *ubi regnavit a ligno Deus*, where God reigned from the wood. According to the same meaning, whereas the people of Israel were called *regnum sacerdotale*, a priestly kingdom, St. Peter, writing to the Christians, turned the order of the words, calling the church of Christ, *sacerdotium regale*, a kingly priesthood. Moses was both a priest and a civil governor, as being a figure of Christ, who joined both together, making the tribe of Judah, which was before kingly, now also to be priestly. Therefore

Psal. cx. 4.

Justin. in Dial. advers. Tryph.

Exod. xix. 1 Pet. ii. 9.

a Untruth. For at that time he was no priest. b Untruth. For it proveth the contrary. Read the Answer. c Untruth, confessed by M. Harding's friends. For in the time of Moses' law the priest was inferior to the prince. d Substantial arguments, whereby to prove the pope a king.

<sup>76</sup> [Apol. Lat. “procuracionem plains of the false translation of “ecclesiarum.” Harding com- “the Lady Interpreter.”]

Psal. xcix. 6. St. Augustine, upon those words of David, "Moses and Aaron are in the number of his priests," concludeth that Moses must needs have been a priest. <sup>e</sup> "For" (saith he) "if he were not a priest, what was he?" <sup>e</sup> *Nunquid major sacerdote esse potuit*, "could he be greater than a priest?" As who should say, there is no greater dignity than priesthood. And seeing Moses had the greatest dignity, for he ruled all, and consecrated Aaron high bishop, and his sons, priests, therefore himself must needs have been a priest. <sup>f</sup> Now if Moses were both, and his chief office was priesthood, it followeth by that example, that the pope may rule temporally, but not that a king may rule spiritually. Thus you have gained nothing by this example.

e Discreetly reasoned. For all this pertaineth as well to a simple priest, as to the pope.  
f Louvanian logic. Moses consecrated Aaron: ergo, The pope is a king.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding hath many great words of small weight. The final conclusion and *summa summarum* is this: *The pope must needs be a king*. And that he proveth, as his manner is, by these his young untidy arguments: Moses being a civil magistrate, or a prince, had also the *priesthood*, and was a *priest*: *Ergo*, saith he, the *pope*, being a *priest*, must have also the *kingdom*, and be a *king*. And thus he pieceth these matters handsomely together, as though whatsoever were once in Moses, ought of necessity to be also in the *pope*. But if a man should desire him to prove his argument, and to make it good, and to shew us how these pieces may be framed together, I think he would be fain to take a day. First, whether Moses were a *priest* or no, it is not certain. As for that M. Harding allegeth these words of David, *Moses et Aaron in sacerdotibus ejus*, he himself well knoweth, that the Hebrew word there is doubtful, and signifieth as well a *prince* as a *priest*. And, therefore, ye cannot necessarily conclude by force of these words that Moses was a *priest*: it is sufficient that he was the *captain* and *prince*, and had the leading of the people.

St. Hierom saith: *Unus legis, alter sacerdotii regulam tenuit*: "Moses held the rule of the law: Aaron, the rule of *priesthood*." Hier. in Psal. 98. [ii. pt. 2. 386.]

Again he saith: *Emisit ante faciem nostram Mosen spirituales legem et Aaron magnum sacerdotem*: "God sent out before our face Moses," (not as the *priest*, but as) Hieron. in Michae. cap. 6. [iii. 1540.]

“ the spiritual law, and Aaron the great priest.” Even Hugo, your own doctor, touching the same words, saith thus: *Moses etsi*, &c.: “ Notwithstanding *Moses were not a priest*, yet because he hallowed the people’s prayers<sup>77</sup>, &c. he was called a priest. For in the *scriptures* great and noble men are called by the name of *priest*.”

Here your Hugo telleth you, that, notwithstanding Moses were called a *priest*, yet indeed he was no *priest*.

Whoso listeth to know more hereof, let him read Sanctus Pagninus, David Kimchi, Nicolaus Lyra, &c.

But if Moses indeed were a *priest*, ye should do well, M. Harding, to resolve us, first, whether he were a *priest* born, or else afterward made a *priest*. A *priest* born, I trow, ye will not say. If ye say he was afterward made a *priest*, then tell us by what *bishop* or other creature was he consecrate? At whose hands received he authority? When, where, and to what purpose? What priest-like apparel ever ware he? or in what office or ministry ever shewed he himself to be a *priest*? St. Paul saith: “ A *priest* is appointed to offer up oblations and sacrifices for sin.” What *oblations* or *sacrifices for sin* can ye tell us that Moses offered? If he were neither born a *priest*, nor made a *priest*, nor ever known by office to be a *priest*, then was he, I trow, a very strange *priest*.

If Moses were the highest *priest* and head of the *church*, and Aaron likewise the highest *priest*, and in so much the *head of the church* too, as well as he, then had the *church* two highest *bishops*, and two heads both together: which thing were monstrosities, not only in speech, but also in nature.

Notwithstanding, whether Moses at any one certain time were a *priest* or no, it is a matter not worthy the striving. Certain it is, that before the *law* was written, *kings* and *princes*, and the best born, and inheritors, and the wealthiest of the people, were ever *priests*. St. Hierom saith: *Hebraei tradunt, primogenitos functos officio sacerdotum et habuisse vestimentum sacerdotale: quo in-*

Hugo in Psal.  
98. [vol. ii.  
232.]

Heb. x. 11.

Hier. in Qu.  
Hebraeis in  
Genesisim. [c.  
27. v. 15. tom.  
ii. 531.]

<sup>77</sup> [“ Vota populi, licet non hostias.”]



*duti, Deo victimas offererant, antequam Aaron in sacerdotium eligeretur:* “The Hebrew rabbins say, that the first born children did the office of the *priests*, and had the priest-like apparel, and, wearing the same, offered up their sacrifices unto God, until the time that *Aaron* was chosen into the *priesthood*.”

Again he saith: *Privilegium offerendi primogenitis, vel maxime regibus debebatur:* “The privilege of offering up sacrifices was due to the first born of the children, but most of all unto kings<sup>78</sup>.” The *heathen Roman emperors*, as *Vespasianus, Trajanus*, and others, to increase their *majesty* towards their subjects, beside the state of the *empire*, would also be called *pontifices maximi*.

Therefore we will grant *M. Harding*, seeing he hath taken so much pains about a matter not worthy so long talk, that *Moses* for some little short time bare the office of a *priest*. Yet nevertheless had he no *ordinary priest-hood*: neither was he a *priest* more than for the space of two or three hours, only until he had consecrated *Aaron* and his children, and no longer. Immediately afterward, all this great *priesthood* was at an end. One of your own doctors, *M. Harding*, saith thus: *Non erant sacerdotes legales, dignitate et officio, sicut Aaron: licet in necessitate, et propter defectum sacerdotum, aliquos actus sacerdotum fecerint: ut quod Moses inunxit Aaron: propter quod Moses sacerdos dicitur in psalmo:* “The first born were not *priests* in office and dignity, as *Aaron* was: notwithstanding, in case of necessity, and for lack of *priests*, they did some part of the *priest's* office: as that *Moses* anointed or consecrated *Aaron*: for which thing *Moses* in the psalm is called a *priest*.”

This, *M. Harding*, is that foundation, that must needs bear the burden of your whole *church of Rome*. “The pope” (ye say) “must be a king, because *Moses* was both prince and priest.” And yet your own fellows say, *Moses by office and dignity was never priest*. Ye say, “The pope being a bishop may be a king; but of the other side a

<sup>78</sup> [This work is not genuine.]

king may in no wise be a bishop." And thus, either unwittingly or willingly, ye seem to overthrow your own position. For the example that ye ground upon, of Aaron and Moses, proveth quite the contrary. For Moses, being a *prince*, did also the office of a *bishop*. But Aaron, being the *bishop*, did never the office of a *prince*. Therefore, hereof ye might better conclude, that a *prince* may be a *bishop*, but a *bishop* may not be a *king*. Straighen your bolts, therefore, M. Harding, and shave them better, before ye so suddenly, I will not say so rudely, shoot them from you.

Nevertheless, ye say, "The priesthood, which is the more, may contain the kingdom, being the less." In this respect, I trow, your Gloss, as it is said before, compareth the *pope* to the *sun*, and the *emperor* to the *moon*, and findeth out substantially by good geometrical proportion, that the *pope* is just seven and fifty times greater than the *emperor*. Howbeit, your own doctors say, as I have likewise shewed before, that in the *law of Moses* the *prince* was greater than the *priest*.

That ye allege of the *priesthood* and *kingdom of Christ*, serveth you to small purpose. For I beseech you, what *crown*, what *sceptre*, what *sword*, bare Christ? What *ecclesiastical priesthood* had he, but only that he executed upon the cross? Verily, touching any civil shew or outward office, as he was no *king*, so was he no *priest*. As he said, "My kingdom is not of this world:" so might he also have said, *My priesthood is not of this world*. Otherwise, he was both *king* and *priest* in power and virtue, but not apparently in outward office.

One of your fellows saith thus: *Patet, per sanctos expositores, quod Christus non habuit in temporalibus auctoritatem vel iudicium. Sed dare potuit, et dare habuit virtutis documentum*: "It appeareth by the holy expositors, that Christ had neither authority nor judgment in things temporal. But he could both give, and had to give instructions of virtue."

As for these two words of St. Peter, "Ye are a kingly priesthood," ye would not have alleged them to this pur-

Extr. de Major. et Obed. Solit. in Glos. H. [col. 402.]

Joh. de Paris. de potest. Reg. et Pap. cap. 5. [p. 113.]

John xviii. 36.

Joh. de Paris. de potest. Pap. cap. 8. [p. 117.]

1 Pet. ii. 9.

pose, had ye not been in your dream. For, think you, that St. Peter called the whole body of the church of Christ a *kingly priesthood*, for that you fancy your *pope* to be together both *priest* and *king*? Certainly, the church of God was a *kingly priesthood*, before either the *church of Rome* was a *church*, or the *pope of Rome* was a *pope*. Ye should have some care to deal more reverently with the *word of God*, for it is holy. St. Peter's meaning is this, that every faithful Christian man is now, after a spiritual or ghostly meaning, not only a *priest*, but also a *king*: and therefore he calleth the whole *church* a *kingly priesthood*.

Tertullian saith thus: *Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus?* Tertul. in Exhor. ad Cast. [c. 7. p. 522.]  
*Regnum quoque nos, et sacerdotes Deo et patri suo fecit:*

“And we that be laymen, are we not priests? Truly, Christ hath made even us a *kingdom* and *priests* unto his Rev. 1. 6.

Father<sup>79</sup>.” St. Augustine saith: *Hoc sacerdotio regali* Aug. Q. E-vang. lib. 8. [l. lib. 2.]  
*consecrantur omnes pertinentes ad corpus Christi, summi et*  
*veri principis sacerdotum:* “With this *royal priesthood* cap. 40. [iii. pt. 2. 265.]

all they are consecrate that pertain to the *body of Christ*, which is the high and true *prince of priests*.” Again he saith: *Omnes sunt sacerdotes, quia membra sunt unius* Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 20. cap. 10. [vii. 588.]  
*sacerdotis:* “All be priests, because they are the *members of one priest*.” St. Ambrose saith: ..... *Omnes filii ecclesie sacerdotes sunt:* “All the children of the church be Amb. in Luc. lib. 5. cap. 6. [l. 1364.]  
*priests*<sup>80</sup>.”

St. Hierom saith: [suppl. *quoniam*] *genus sacerdotale et regale sumus, omnes, qui baptizati in Christo, Christi cen-* Hier. in Malach. cap. 1. [iii. 1811.]  
*semur [al. censentur] nomine:* “All we are that priestly and kingly kindred, that, being baptized in Christ, are called *Christians* by the name of *Christ*.”

Chrysostom saith: *Et tu in baptismo, et rex efficeris, et sacerdos, et propheta:* “Even thou in thy *baptism* art made Chrys. 2 Cor. hom. 3. [x. 454.]  
both a *king*, and a *priest*, and a *prophet*.”

Now, M. Harding, let us take the view of your priestly conclusions.

Moses once did one part of the *bishop's* office in conse-

<sup>79</sup> [Tertullian. See this quotation, supra vol. iv. 456, where the same line of argument is taken.] “quod omnes vitam sacerdotalem debemus imitari, sive quia omnes filii ecclesie sacerdotes sunt.”

<sup>80</sup> [S. Ambros. “.... sive

crating Aaron and his children: and that never at any time else, neither after nor before. Again: Christ hath a *spiritual priesthood*, and a *spiritual kingdom*: for otherwise *ordinary priesthood* and *earthly kingdom* he had none. Again: St. Peter calleth the whole *church of Christ*, a *kingly priesthood*: ergo, say you, "The *pope* beareth both the office of a *priest*, and also the right and state of an earthly king."

To dissemble all other the fond weakness of these follies, Christ himself saith to the *pope*, and to all other *priests* and *bishops*: "The kings of nations rule over them, and they that are great exercise authority over the people: *but it shall not be so amongst you.*"

St. Cyprian<sup>80</sup> saith, as he is alleged by Gratian: *Christus actibus propriis, et dignitatibus distinctis, officia potestatis utriusque discrevit*: "Christ, by several duties, and distinct honours, hath set a difference between the offices of both powers."

Whereupon your own Gloss saith: *Hic est argumentum, quod papa non habet utrunque gladium*: "Here is a good argument, that the *pope* hath not both swords:" that is to say, that the *pope* is not both *priest* and *king*.

St. Bernard saith thus unto pope Eugenius: *Planum est, (quod) apostolis interdicitur dominatus*. [suppl. I] *ergo tu tibi usurpare aude, aut dominans apostolatam, aut apostolicus dominatum. Plane ab alterutro prohiberis. Si utrunque similiter [al. simul] habere vis, perdes utrunque. Alioqui ne te putes exceptum illorum numero, de quibus conqueritur Dominus, dicens, Ipsi regnaverunt, et non ex me*: "It is plain, that *temporal dominion* is forbidden the apostles. Now, therefore, thou, being *pope*, dare to usurp either the *apostleship*, being a *prince*, or the *princehood*, being the *successor of the apostles*. Doubtless from the one of them thou art forbidden. If thou wilt indifferently have both, thou shalt lose both. Otherwise think not, thou canst be excepted from the number of them of whom the Lord complaineth, *They have made themselves kings, and not by me.*"

<sup>80</sup> [Leg. "Nicolaus I." ed. Richter.]

Concerning the place of St. Peter, one of your company saith, it nothing furthereth the *pope's kingdom*. Thus he saith: *Sacerdotium dicitur regale, a regno, non hujus mundi, sed cœli*: "St. Peter calleth us a *kingly priesthood*, of the *kingdom of heaven*, not of the *kingdom of this world*." Yet is this the self-same *kingdom* that the *pope* craveth, and that by the authority of St. Peter.

Joh. de Paris.  
cap. 18. [cap.  
19. p. 133.]

Notwithstanding, one of your Louvanian company hath sent us home lately other news from Louvain. His words be these: *Vos estis regale sacerdotium*: "You are a *kingly priesthood*, as who should say, the *priesthood* before was not *kingly*, for that then *kings* ruled over *priests*: but now is the *priesthood* *kingly*, for that to it be subject even *kings* themselves." Thus unless your *priests* may rule *kings*, and *princes*, and all the world at their pleasure, ye think they have no *kingly priesthood*.

Dorm. fol. 40.

In the council holden at Macra in France, it is written thus: *Solus Dominus noster Jesus Christus vere fieri potuit et rex et sacerdos. Post incarnationem vero, et resurrectionem, et ascensionem ejus in cœlum, nec rex pontificis dignitatem, nec pontifex regiam potestatem sibi usurpare præsumpsit*: "Only our Lord Jesus Christ might truly be both *Priest* and *King*. But sithence his incarnation, and resurrection, and ascension into heaven, neither hath the *king* presumed to take upon him the dignity or office of a *bishop*, nor hath the *bishop* presumed to usurp the power and majesty of a *prince*."

Conc. Macr.  
[c. 1. xvii.  
538.]

Citatur ab Il-  
lyric. inter  
Testes Veri-  
tatis, p. 121.  
[art. 110.]

To be short, M. Harding, we say not, as you so often and so untruly have reported of us, that the *king* may in any wise execute the *bishop's* office: but thus we say, and, because it is true, therefore we say it: the *king* may lawfully correct and chastise the negligence and falsehood of the *bishop*: and that, in so doing, he doth only his own office, and not the *bishop's*.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 6.

Joshua also, though he were none other than a *civil magistrate*, yet as soon as he was chosen by

Josh. i.

God<sup>80</sup>, and set as a ruler over the people, he received commandments, specially touching *religion* and the *service of God*.

M. HARDING.

There is no doubt but Joshua received commission and commandment to worship God, but none to rule priests in spiritual matters. Yea, rather he was commanded to go forth, and come in at the voice and word of Eleazarus the high priest, he and all the children of Israel. Do not these men prove their matters handsomely?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Joshua was commanded to go in and out, and to be directed by the voice of Eleazarus the *high priest*. "Therefore" (ye say) "in spiritual causes the priests may not be controuled by the prince." Ye deliver out your arguments, M. Harding, before they be ready. These pieces would have been better tied together.

Though the *prince* be commanded to hear the *priest*, yet if the *priest* be negligent, or deceive the people, he may by his ordinary authority controul the *priest*.

Exod. xxxii.  
4. 21.

When Aaron the high priest had consented to the making and worshipping of the golden calf, Moses, being then the *temporal prince*, rebuked him sharply unto his face: and, in so doing, did not the *bishop's* office, but only his own. As touching Joshua, whom ye would fain have restrained from all ecclesiastical causes, he caused the people to be circumcised: he caused altars for their bloody sacrifices to be erected: he caused the *priests* to make their sacrifices: he caused the *Deuteronomy* to be written in stones: he caused both the blessings and the curses of God to be pronounced: he spake openly to the people, and frayed them from *idolatry*. All these were cases, not of civil policy, but of religion. St. Augustine saith: *In hoc reges Deo serviunt, sicut eis divinitus præcipitur, in quantum sunt reges, si in suo regno bona jubeant, mala prohibeant; non solum quæ pertinent ad humanam*

Aug. contra  
Cresconium,  
lib. 3. cap. 51.  
[ix. 464.]

<sup>80</sup> [Apol. Lat. "inauguraretur."]

*societatem, verum etiam quæ ad divinam religionem:*  
 “Herein *kings* serve God, as it is commanded them from above, in that they be kings, if within their kingdom they command good things, and forbid evil; *not only in things pertaining to human fellowship, or civil order, but also in things pertaining to God’s religion.*” Ye may see, therefore, M. Harding, how handsomely soever we prove our matters, that of your part hitherto they are but unhand-  
 somely and coarsely answered.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 7.*

King David, when the whole *religion of God* was altogether brought out of frame by wicked king Saul, brought home again the *ark of God*, that is to say, he restored *religion* again, and was not only amongst them himself, as a counsellor and furtherer of the work, but he appointed also *hymns* and *psalms*, put in order the companies, and was the only doer in setting forth that whole solemn triumph<sup>81</sup>, and in effect ruled the *priests*. Chron. xlii.

M. HARDING.

As David restored all things to good order after the evil king Saul, so did queen Mary redress disorders before committed. But as queen Mary did it by the mean of priests, so king David in priestly matters called for Sadoch and Abiathar. Indeed, David passed other princes herein, because he had the <sup>a</sup> gift of prophesy, whereby he wrote psalms, which to this day we sing. But all this maketh nothing to prove him judge of spiritual matters. He did not usurp the authority to sacrifice, to discern the leper, and to do the like things of priestly charge.

An ill comparison, for that the one set up, the other plucked down.  
 A simple shift, God wot. For other kings that did the like were no prophets.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“King David” (ye say) “restored religion by mean of the priests.” Nay verily, M. Harding: for by mean of

<sup>81</sup> [Apol. Lat. “. . . et pompam instituit, et quodammodo præfuit sacerdotibus.” There is nothing to correspond to the words “was the only doer.”]

the *priests* the religion utterly was decayed. Therefore ye spoil that most *noble prince* of his worthy praises, and give them to others that never deserved them. The holy *tabernacle* was broken and lost: the *ark of God* was kept, not in the temple<sup>81</sup>, but in a private man's house: the people had no common place to resort unto, to hear *God's will*: they had each man his own private *chapel* in their *hills* and *groves*. And all this was done by the slothfulness and negligence of the bishops.

David therefore called the *bishops* and *priests* together: he shewed them, in what sort the *religion of God* was defaced: he willed them to bring the *ark* into *Sion*: he was present himself: he appointed and ordered the whole triumph: he assigned, which of the *Levites*, and in what order they should serve before the *ark*: he allotted Aaron's *children*, which were the *priests*, to walk each man in his several office.

So likewise it is written of king Solomon touching the same: "King Solomon, according to the decree and order of his father David, appointed the offices of the *priests* in their several ministeries, and the *Levites* each man in his order, that they should praise God, and minister before the *priests*. For so David the man of God had commanded." Likewise it is written of king Jehosaphat: "He appointed and ordered the *Levites* and *priests*."

Thus, then, did these godly *princes*: and thus doing, they usurped not the *bishop's* office, but only did that they lawfully might do, and appertained wholly unto themselves.

Where ye say, "*David was a prophet, and not only a king*," as though he had done these things by the virtue of his *prophesy*, and not by the right of his princely power, this poor shift is very simple: for, notwithstanding king David were a *prophet*, yet king Jehosaphat, and other *princes* that did the like, were no *prophets*: neither do we read of any other *prophet* that ever attempted to do the like: nor did David these things as a *prophet*, but as a *king*.

<sup>81</sup> [That is, the tabernacle.]



THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis.* 8.

King Solomon built unto the Lord *the temple* which his father David had but purposed in his mind to do: and after the finishing thereof, he made a godly oration to the people, concerning *religion* and the *service of God*: he afterward<sup>82</sup> displaced Abiathar the *priest*<sup>83</sup>, and set Sadok in his place.

<sup>a</sup> Chron. vi.  
<sup>i</sup> Kings viii.

[<sup>i</sup> Kings ii.  
26. 27. 35.]

## M. HARDING.

Solomon's building of the temple, and praying therein, proveth no supremacy over the priests in spiritual things. His putting of Abiathar out of his dignity and room, <sup>a</sup>was like to that queen Mary did to Cranmer: whom she might have removed for treason, as Solomon laid the like to Abiathar: yet she chose rather to burn him for heresy. But this proveth <sup>b</sup>only an outward execution of justice, without any prejudice to the substance of our question: which is, whether a temporal prince may determine the causes of religion, or no.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth.  
For what superior bishop's authority used Solomon in the deposition of Abiathar?  
<sup>b</sup> Untruth, manifest.  
Read the answer.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The deposing of Abiathar, ye say, was only the execution of outward justice; like to that queen Mary did to doctor Cranmer, the *archbishop of Canterbury*. Wherein ye shew yourself to be much overseen. For these comparisons are in no wise like. Solomon, by his princely authority, lawfully deposed the high priest Abiathar: but queen Mary deposed not, nor could she by your *canons* lawfully depose the *archbishop of Canterbury*: nor do you think it in any case lawful, that a *bishop* should be deposed by a *prince*. "For deposition" (ye say) "is a spiritual punishment, and only belongeth unto a *bishop*." And your *law* saith: *Ejus est destituere, cujus est instituere*: "He may depose a priest, that hath authority to place a priest." Therefore these two princes' doings were not like. But touching the high priest Abiathar, king Solomon summoned him to appear before him: king Solomon sat in judgment, and heard the accusations wherewith he was

<sup>82</sup> [Abiathar was deposed, immediately after Solomon's accession, some years before the dedication of the temple. There is no account given of a formal trial.]

<sup>83</sup> [Apol. Lat. "episcopum."]

charged: king Solomon pronounced sentence against him: king Solomon deposed him: king Solomon appointed Sadok to succeed him. If all this be not sufficient, over and besides these things, king Solomon placed the *ark of God*: king Solomon sanctified and hallowed the temple: king Solomon offered up burnt sacrifice: king Solomon directed and ordered the *priests* in their several offices: king Solomon blessed the whole people: and as it is written, "The *priests* and *Levites* left nothing undone, of all that was commanded them by the king." If these cases be not *spiritual*, tell us then, what cases may be allowed for *spiritual*? Thus the godly king Solomon thought it lawful for him to deal, not only in matters of temporal government, but also in *ecclesiastical* or *spiritual cases of religion*. Therefore, M. Harding, it is but a toy that ye tell us of the *execution of outward justice*.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. v. vi. vii. viii.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. viii. 15.

Concerning that most grave, and godly, and learned father, the *archbishop of Canterbury*, with whom ye did whatsoever your pleasure was, God grant his blood be never required at your hands.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. *Divis. 9.*

After this, when the *temple of God* was in shameful wise polluted, through the naughtiness and negligence of the *priests*, king Ezechias commanded the same to be cleansed from the rubble and filth, the *priests*<sup>83</sup> to light up candles, to burn incense, and to do their divine service according to the old and allowed order: the same king also commanded the *brasen serpent*, which then the people wickedly worshipped, to be taken down, and beaten to powder.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. xxix. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Kings xviii. 4.

M. HARDING.

.....How often shall I tell you, that this proveth no more, but that good kings do good deeds, maintaining true religion, and

<sup>83</sup> [Apol. Lat. "accendi lumina, "sacra fieri." The priests are not "suffitus adoleri, et veteri ritu named.]

pull down the false, as the constable of France burned the pulpits of the Huguenots in Paris? But these facts prove not that kings and constables be judges of religion, which is good, and which is evil; which true, which false. For therein they <sup>a</sup>follow the judgment and advice of priests and prophets, who be about them, as <sup>b</sup>Esaias was at hand with good king Ezechias, to direct his doings: and so was Elizeus with king Jehu.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth. For the priests did nothing, but against their wills. Read the answer. <sup>b</sup> This is far from the purpose. For Esaias and Elizeus neither were priests, nor had the execution of priestly offices.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“King Ezechias” (ye say) “and other kings followed the advice and judgment of the priests and prophets.” This tale, M. Harding, is not only unlikely, but also untrue. For ye know that Esaias and Elizeus, notwithstanding they were the *prophets of God*, yet were they neither *priests*, nor *bishops*, nor had any manner of ordinary ministration in the church. The *bishops* and *priests*, of whom ye speak, had disordered and wasted God’s whole religion. The *holy place of God* was full of filthiness: the gates of the *temple* were shut up, that no man might enter in: the people had turned away their faces from the *tabernacle of the Lord*: there was no incense: there was no sacrifice. All these things had happened through the negligence and wickedness of the *priests*. In the *old Latin text* it is written thus: *Sacerdotes et Levitæ, tandem sanctificati, obtulerunt holocausta*: “The *priests* and *Levites*, at the last, or with much ado, were sanctified, and offered up sacrifices.” Upon which place the *latter translation* saith thus: *Sacerdotes et Levitæ, pudore suffusi, sanctificaverunt se*: “The *priests* and *Levites*, even for very shame, sanctified themselves.” So ready were they to call upon, and to further the king, in his godly purpose. They held back what they could, and yielded to nothing, but with *much ado, and for very shame*. They did nothing but by the king’s commandment; and made him a reckoning of their doings.

<sup>2</sup>Chron. xxix. [leg. xxx. 15. Vulg.]

<sup>2</sup>Chron. xxx. 15. [Pagnin. Vers.]

Howbeit, perhaps ye will discharge this whole matter with one ordinary excuse, and tell us, that all these were but temporal cases.

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 10.

2 Chron. xvii.  
6.

King Jehosaphat overthrew and utterly made away the hill *altars* and *groves*, whereby he saw God's honour hindered, and the people holden back with private superstition from the ordinary *temple*, which was at Jerusalem: whereto they should by order have resorted yearly from every part of the *realm*. [Vol. iv. p. 79.]

M. HARDING.

Ye put us in mind to consider how that yourselves are those private hill altars, and dark groves. For ye be they that stop the people from the common temple of Christendom, the catholic church; out of which is no salvation: the head whereof sitteth in Peter's chair at Rome.....For setting order both in matters of commonweal, and others, Jehosaphat said thus, concerning religion: *Amarias sacerdos et pontifex vester, in iis qua ad Deum pertinent, præsidebit*: "Amarias the priest and high bishop, for such matters as pertain to God, he shall be head over you."

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

All this whole matter, touching as well king Jehosaphat, as also Amarias the *high priest*, is answered in that is past before.

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 11. Divis. 11.

[2 Chron.  
xxxv. 2.]  
2 Kings xii. 7.

2 Kings x. 25.

King Josias with great diligence put the *priests* and *bishops* in mind of their duties: king Johas bridled the riot and arrogance of the *priests*: Jehu put to death the wicked *prophets*. [Vol. iv. p. 79.]

M. HARDING.

a Ye might have found it 2 Kings cap. 12.  
b But he judged them, and condemned them for false prophets: this was no mere temporal office.

The putting of priests and bishops in mind of their duty, is not a supremacy in determining ecclesiastical causes. And whereas you say, that king Johas bridled the riot and arrogancy of the priests; if it were so, it was well done: but <sup>a</sup>I find not those words in the text. Concerning that king Jehu did, it is <sup>b</sup>mere temporal office to put false preachers and heretics to death. Neither can it belong to priests, unless they have also civil jurisdiction. Much less doth that act prove, that kings be supreme heads over the church, and ought to be judges in controversies and questions of religion.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Concerning the story of king Johas, I report me to that is written of him in the *book of Kings*. He sequestered <sup>2 Kings xii. 7.</sup> the *oblations* of the people, which the *priests* had bestowed lewdly and wantonly upon themselves, and by his own authority turned the same to the reparations of the *temple*. Of king Josias it is written thus: *Constituit Josias sacerdotes in officiis suis*: “King Josias appointed the *priests* <sup>[2 Chron. xxxv. 2.]</sup> to minister in their several offices.” And again: *Mundavit Judam et Hierusalem ab excelsis et lucis*: “King Josias <sup>2 Chron. xxxiv. 3.</sup> cleansed and rid Judah and Jerusalem from their hill *altars* and their *groves*.”

But ye will say, He did all things by the discretion of the *priests* and *bishops*. This thing indeed is necessary, while the *priests* and *bishops* be learned and godly. But <sup>2 Kings xxii. 14.</sup> *king Josias* did far otherwise: for he sent the *bishop* himself unto *Olda*, the *prophetess*, to learn the discretion and judgment of a *woman*: and so was directed in matters of highest *religion* by a *woman*, and not by a *priest*.

These examples be so manifest, that one of your fellows of Louvain is fain thus to excuse the matter by over much antiquity: “If we would in these days” (saith he) “use <sup>Dorm. fol. 37.</sup> in all points the examples of the old law, there would follow an huge number of inconveniences.—It is no <sup>Dorm. fol. 39.</sup> good reason, to say that therefore our kings now-a-days must have the like authority.” Thus saith he: As though the *prince’s* right were now abated and altered, as the ceremonies of the law; and were otherwise now than it was before: or, as if the coming of *Christ* into the world, and the *preaching* of the *gospel*, had purposely been to repress and pull down the *seat of kings*.

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. Divis. 1.

And, to rehearse no mo examples out of the old law, let us rather consider sithence the *birth of Christ*, how the *church* hath been governed in the time of the *gospel*.

M. HARDING.

a Even so Jupiter, or Baal's bishop, was as well a bishop as the bishop of Rome.

b Neither can the pope meddle more with religion than Aunias or Caiaphas.  
c Untruth. For if the bishop had offended, he was subject to the Prince, as well within the church, as without.

If we consider the office of a king in itself, it is <sup>a</sup> one everywhere, not only among Christian princes, but also among heathen. <sup>a</sup> The definition of a king, which agreeth to Julius Cæsar, or to Alexander the Great, as they were monarchs and princes, is one with the definition of a king which agreeth to Henry the Eighth, or to Charles the Fifth. <sup>b</sup> So that no more could king Henry, as king, meddle with religion, than Alexander, or Julius Cæsar.....<sup>c</sup> His place is chief among the lay, even when they are in the church at the service of God; and <sup>c</sup> without the church, in all temporal things and causes, he is over the priests themselves.

And because all these examples are taken out of the Old Testament, I will give thee a true resolution out of the same book, what authority priests had, and what authority kings had. Moses gave this rule, concerning the same matter. "If" (saith <sup>Deut. xvii. 8, 9.</sup> he) "thou perceivest an hard and doubtful judgment to be with thee between blood and blood, cause and cause, leaper and leaper, and seest the words of the judges within thy gates to vary, arise, and go up to the place which thy Lord God shall choose, and thou shalt come to the priests of the stock of Levi, and to the judge that shall be for the time, and thou shalt demand of them, who shall shew the truth of judgment to thee ....."

But neither the priest, by this place, may meddle with that jurisdiction which belongeth to the temporal judge, neither the judge with that which was spiritual, and belonging only to the priest. For of such causes, Azarias, the priest and bishop, said to king Ozias, "It is not thy office, Ozias, to burn incense unto <sup>2 Chron. xxvi. 18.</sup> our Lord. It is the office of the priests:" that is to say, of the sons of Aaron, who are consecrated to do such ministries. But this the king might do even in matters of religion: <sup>d</sup> when the high priest had given sentence, he might see the execution thereof to be done. But <sup>e</sup> otherwise, whatsoever king or temporal judge might not do in his own person, <sup>e</sup> much less might he judge whether another did well therein, or no. And this much concerning the Old Testament.

d The prince is executioner to the priest.  
e Untruth, evident. Read the Answer.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The office of a *king*, ye say, was no more in king Henry the Eighth, or in Charles the Fifth, than it was in the heathen *princes*, Julius Cæsar, or Alexander the Great. And, therefore, ye say, a *Christian prince's* office standeth only in *matters temporal*: and for that cause ye often call him, a *mere lay, temporal prince*: as if he were in authority not much better than an *heathen magistrate*.

Even so, M. Harding, is your *pope* no more a *bishop*, or

perhaps, much less a *bishop*, than Annas and Caiaphas : neither is your *priest* more a *priest*, than the *priest* of *Dagon*, or *Baal*. The difference standeth not in office, but only in truth. Yet, nevertheless, ye know that heathen *princes* had evermore a *sovereign authority*, not only over their *priests* and *bishops*, but also over all *cases of religion*.

Aristotle saith : Βασιλεὺς τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος : Aristot. Politicor. lib. 3.  
 “The king, that is lord and ruler of things that pertain [cap. 14.] unto the gods.”

And, therefore, Socrates, in his story, saith : *Imperatores una complexi sumus*, &c. : “We have also herein comprised the *emperors’ lives*, for that, sithence the *emperors* were first christened, the affairs of the *church* have hanged of them, and the greatest *councils* both have been, and are kept by their advice <sup>84</sup>.

Socrat. lib. 5.  
In Proemio :  
[ii. 263, 264.]  
τὰ τῆς Ἐκ-  
κλησίας  
πράγματα  
ἤρτητο ἐξ  
αὐτῶν, . .  
τῇ αὐτῶν  
γνώμῃ.

Ye say : “The prince, in doubtful cases, was commanded to take counsel of the *highest priest*.” This is true. But will ye conclude hereof, that the *highest priest* may say and do what he listeth, without controulment? What if the *high priest* would answer thus, as he answered sometime indeed : “This Christ is a *Samaritan*, a deceiver of the people, and hath a devil?” What if he tear his own robes for anger, and cry out, “*He blasphemeth : he is worthy to die*?” Yet must the *emperor* needs give ear unto him, and believe him, without exception? Certainly, in the *old law*, if the *bishop* either had been negligent in his office, or of malice or ignorance had answered *untruth*, he was evermore under the general controulment of the *prince*.

“Within the church” (ye say) “the prince is inferior to the priest, notwithstanding, without the church, he is, in temporal cases, above the priest.” Thus, ye fetch your matter round, within, without, and round about, with all the circumstances : as if princes were as changeable as yourself, and would be other without than they are within.

<sup>84</sup> [Socrates : . . Τὰ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πράγματα ἤρτητο ἐξ αὐτῶν, καὶ αἱ μέγιστα σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασι τε καὶ γίνονται.]

<sup>85</sup> Indeed, in that the priest doth his office, in that he either openeth *God's will*, or declareth his threats, or rebuketh sin, or excommunicateth, and cutteth off a dead member from the body, so far forth the prince, be he never so mighty, is inferior unto him. But in this respect the prince is inferior, not only to the *pope*, or *bishop*, but also to any other simple *priest*: and the *pope* himself, in this respect, is inferior to his confessor, be he never so poor a *priest*. So the emperor Constantinus was wont to say to the godly *bishops*: "Be you *bishops* within the church, and I will be *bishop* without." But if the *bishop* had been faulty, either in negligence, or in falsehood, whether he had been within the church, or abroad, he was always to be controuled by the *prince*.

9. qu. 3.  
Nemo. In  
Glossa.

Ab Eus. De  
vita Const.  
Orat. 4. [cap.  
24. tom. 1.  
638.]

Ye say: "When the high priest had given sentence, the prince might see the execution thereof to be done." And thus ye make the *emperor* the *pope's man*, to put his sentence in execution. So pope Bonifacius VIII. telleth you: *Materialis gladius exercendus est manu regum et militum, sed ad nutum et patientiam sacerdotis*: "The temporal sword must be drawn by the hand of kings and soldiers: but at the beck and sufferance of the priest."

[Extrav.  
com.] de Ma-  
joritate et O-  
bedientia,  
Unam sanc-  
tam. [p. 189.]

But, I beseech you, at whose beck did king Solomon depose Abiathar, the *high priest*? At whose beck did Josias, and other godly princes, of whom we have said before, redress the *religion of God*, which the priests so shamefully had decayed? At whose beck did they rebuke the careless negligence of the *priests*? Verily, one of your own doctors saith: *In veteri lege, sacerdotes qui reges inungebant, indubitanter regibus subdebantur*: "In the old law, the bishops that anointed the kings, out of doubt were subject unto the kings."

Johan. de  
Parisiis, cap.  
18. [cap. 19.  
p. 134.]

And St. Augustine saith: *Quando imperatores veritatem tenent, et ipsa veritate contra errorem jubent, quisquis illud contempserit, ipse sibi judicium acquirit. Nam et inter homines pœnas luit, et apud Deum frontem non habebit, qui*

August.  
Epist. 166.  
ad Donati-  
stas. [ll.  
299.]

<sup>85</sup> [This passage is quoted by Hooker, Eccl. Pol. vol. iii. 446. He reads, "high priest."]



*hoc facere noluit, quod ei per cor regis ipsa veritas jussit:*  
 “When the emperor holdeth the truth, and by force of the same truth giveth out laws and proclamations against error, whosoever despiseth the same, procureth judgment against himself. For he shall be punished before men, and before God he shall have no face, that refused to do that thing, that the *truth itself, through the heart of the prince, hath commanded him.*”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. *Divis. 2.*

The *Christian emperors*, in the old time, appointed the *councils of the bishops*. Constantine called the *council at Nice*: Theodosius the First called the *council at Constantinople*: Theodosius the Second called the *council at Ephesus*: Martian called the *council at Chalcedon*.

M. HARDING.

The calling or summoning of councils may be done <sup>a</sup> either by way of authority, which the caller himself hath; or by way of authority, which he taketh of another. If Constantine, the two Theodosians, and Martian, called the four first general councils by their authority only, then were they no general councils; neither could their decrees bind the whole world. For, although they were great emperors, yet was not the whole Christian world under them. And, therefore, those Christian bishops, who lived in Persia, in Ethiopia, in Scotland, in Scythia, or in any other land not subject to the emperor, were neither bound to come, nor bound to obey the laws made by them, who were not their superiors. But if it be far from reason, that a general council should not bind all bishops, and all Christians, it is also far from reason, to say that emperors called general councils by their own only authority. Indeed, they called them by the assent of the bishop of Rome, <sup>b</sup> who, being the general shepherd of Christ's flock, and, therefore, also, of all bishops, might command <sup>c</sup> all his sheep to come together, except they were reasonably to be excused: and they were bound to hear his voice, and to obey his decree. So that although ye proved the emperors to have summoned and called the four first councils, yet were ye not able to prove they did it <sup>d</sup> without the assent of the bishops of Rome, which, for the time, sate in Peter's chair. And by the force of that assent the deed must take effect. And this much generally.

Now to prove unto you, that <sup>e</sup> St. Sylvester assented to the

<sup>a</sup> A discreet distinction. As if the emperor received his authority from the pope.

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, manifest, as it shall appear.

<sup>c</sup> All the bishops throughout the whole world are the pope's sheep.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth. For the emperor may summon councils whether the pope will or no.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth. For Sylvester was dead long before the summoning of the council.

calling of the first council at Nice<sup>86</sup>, it is to be considered, that he only hath authority to ratify, who hath authority to command, and to give assent and strength from the beginning. For none other difference is between commanding, assenting, authorizing, and ratifying, but that assenting is common to them all; commanding is a thing that goeth before the fact: authorizing is the making of a thing good by present agreeing to it, whiles it is done; ratifying, is the allowing of it when it is done. If then I shew that the pope did ratify the calling of the general councils, and authorize them; I shew much more that he assented to the calling of them. The authorizing is proved, by reason he sent his legates to every of them. As <sup>f</sup> St. Sylvester<sup>86</sup> sent Hosius Cordubensis, of the province of Spain<sup>87</sup>, unto Nice, with Victor<sup>88</sup> and Vincentius, priests of the city of Rome. Of which the last two, being themselves no bishops, yet for that they were legates of the chief bishop, did, in <sup>g</sup> the first place,<sup>89</sup> put unto the decrees of that council their consent and names, writing after this sort: *Pro venerabili viro papa et episcopo nostro Sylvestro subscripsimus*: "We have subscribed for the reverend man, our pope, and bishop Sylvester." And at the very <sup>h</sup> same time that the general council was kept at Nice, St. Sylvester called another council in Rome, at the which two hundred seventy and five bishops were assembled. And it is expressly written in the same council: *Sylvester collegit universam synodum episcoporum cum consilio Augusti vel matris ejus*: "Sylvester gathered together the whole synod of the bishops, with the counsel of the <sup>i</sup> emperor, or <sup>i</sup> his mother." Why his counsel was needful, it appeareth there. Because the emperor bare the charges of their diet and carriage. So that his counsel was necessary, not chiefly for religion, but rather for supportation of the charges of so great a journey. For then neither was the bishop of Rome, nor other bishops, endued with so large possessions, as they were afterward.

Now to return to the council of Nice. The emperor was indeed the cause of their coming together, as well for that himself persuaded that mean of concord, as also for that liberally he

<sup>86</sup> [With respect to Bp. Jewel's mistake, here repeated in several successive notes in his margin, as to the time of Sylvester's death, see supra vol. v. 426. note <sup>39</sup>; vol. vi. p. 106, note <sup>85</sup>, and infra p. 381, note <sup>93</sup>.]

<sup>87</sup> [Bp. Jewel, in his marginal note, denies that Hosius was Sylvester's legate, and with reason: see Richard. Anal. Concill., who says that Gelasius Cyzicenus (end of cent. v.) asserts that he was the pope's representative, but that Tillemont, in his 4th note on the coun-

cil of Nice, discredits the story.]

<sup>88</sup> [The delegate, whom, on the authority probably of the spurious epistle of Athan. (iii. 665.) or of the forged epistle of Hosius (see Richard. Anal. Concill. i. 353.), Harding calls Victor, was Vitus.]

<sup>89</sup> [The order of subscription varies according to different accounts: Hosius is generally first, sometimes Alexander; Vitus and Vincentius sometimes second; sometimes fourth; sometimes thirty-ninth. See Seldeni Annott. in Eutychiei Aegyptii Fragm. p. 130.]

<sup>f</sup> Untruth, vain and unadvised. For neither was Hosius Sylvester's legate, nor was Sylvester then alive. <sup>g</sup> Untruth, impudent. For they had the fourth place in the council, and subscribed after Eustathius. <sup>h</sup> Untruth, unless a dead man may summon councils. <sup>i</sup> By the counsel of the emperor, or of his mother, wisely; he wotteth not whether. And yet the emperor's mother was dead before. Sozom. lib. 2. cap. 2. et 3. [ii. p. 46.]

defrayed the charges. Yet called he not the bishops of his own head. And that these men might have seen in the Ecclesiastical History, where Ruffinus writeth: *Tum ille ex sacerdotum sententia apud urbem Niceam episcopale concilium convocat*: "Then the emperor calleth together a council of bishops according to the determination of the priests." He did it according as it seemed good to the bishops. <sup>k</sup>And shall we think the bishop of Rome was none of them that consented to the calling? Yes, verily, he was the chiefest of all. How can it otherwise seem? For when all the decrees were made, *Placuit ut hæc omnia mitterentur ad episcopum urbis Romæ Sylvestrum*: "It was thought good, that all those acts and decrees should be sent to <sup>k</sup>Sylvester, bishop of the city of Rome." If he were the last that had the view and confirming of all things, there is no doubt but he had a voice and great authority in calling the council.

What other is that, which Socrates, in his Ecclesiastical History, witnesseth, saying: *Cum utique regula ecclesiastica jubeat non oportere <sup>l</sup>præter sententiam Romani pontificis <sup>l</sup>concilia celebrari*: "Whereas the ecclesiastical rule commandeth, <sup>l</sup>that no councils ought to be kept besides the determinate consent of the bishop of Rome:" "We know" (saith Athanasius and the bishops of Egypt, assembled in council at Alexandria,) "that in the great council of Nice of 318 bishops, it was with one accord by all confirmed there, that without the determination of the bishop of Rome, neither councils should be kept, nor bishops condemned." I omit here, as a thing well known, how Constantine the emperor refused, in express words, to be judge over bishops, saying, that God had given them power to judge of him; much less did he arrogate to himself only and chiefly authority to summon councils, or to judge bishoply affairs. "As for me," (saith Valentinian the emperor,) <sup>m</sup>"inasmuch as I am but one of the people, it is not lawful to search such matters;" (he speaketh of the heretics' doctrines;) "but let the priests, to whom this charge belongeth, be gathered together within themselves, where they will," &c.

Concerning the second council, which was the first of those that were kept at Constantinople, it may be, that Theodosius called it, as Constantine called the first at Nice. But what authority Damasus bare in the same, it appeareth partly by that he had his <sup>n</sup>legates there, partly also by that Photius, patriarch of Constantinople, writeth in his epistle to Michael, prince of Bulgaria. Where, having declared the coming together of the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, he saith thus: *Quibus haud multo post et Damasus episcopus Romæ eadem confirmans atque idem sentiens accessit*: "To which" (patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem) "not long after, Damasus, the bishop of Rome, joined himself, confirming <sup>o</sup>and determining the same matter." This much saith Photius of the second council, the confirmation whereof he doth attribute not to Theodosius the emperor, but to Damasus the pope.

<sup>k</sup> Full clerly proved. For Ruffinus saith, "The emperor herein followed the advice of Alexander the bishop of Alexandria," &c.; but of the pope there is no mention.

<sup>l</sup> Untruth fondly forged. For Sylvester was dead long before.

<sup>m</sup> Untruth, standing in plain corruption of the words. See the answer.

<sup>n</sup> So had sundry other bishops.

<sup>o</sup> Other bishops likewise gave their consents, and confirmed &c. Yet had they no authority to summon councils.

Lib. 10. c. 1. Mark, "ex sacerdotum sententia."

In summ. Nice. Concl.

Hist. Trip. lib. 4. cap. 9. [leg. 19.]

† Epistola Ægypt. Pontificum. [Mansi, iil. 404.]

Ruffin. lib. 10. c. 2.

Hist. Trip. lib. 7. c. 12.

Photius in Lib. de Conciliis.

But what did Theodosius then? (will some man say.) Did he nothing? Yes, verily, he did very much, as in the said epistle Photius recordeth: "Then did great Theodosius" (saith he) "indeed worthy of great praise rule the empire, who was himself also a defender and a maintainer of godliness." Behold what the emperor's part was, not to sit in judgment of matters of religion, and to determine which was the true faith, but to defend it and maintain it. And that thou mayest see, reader, plainly, what Theodosius thought of religion, whom these defenders would make a judge in causes of religion, I advise thee to read the ninth book of the Tripartite History, where appear many great arguments of his own faith, which he publisheth to the world from Thessalonica, in a public law, to be such as Peter had taught the Romans, and as Damasus, who succeeded Peter, taught at that day, requiring all his subjects to believe the same. He required not them to follow his own private faith, but Peter's faith, and the pope's faith. And whereas there were two bishops of Alexandria at that time, the one, whose name was Peter, holding with the bishop of Rome, the other, named Lucius, not so<sup>89</sup>; Theodosius commanded his subjects to believe as Peter did, who followed the first Peter and Damasus the bishop of Rome.

Ruffin. lib. 11.  
c. 3.

Touching the third general council, it was kept indeed under Theodosius the younger, at Ephesus. But he was not supreme head there. Yea, rather, who knoweth not, that Cyrillus being himself patriarch of Alexandria, yet was president at Ephesus, bearing the stead and person of pope Celestine? If Cyrill was in stead of the bishop of Rome there president, who may doubt, but that he was supreme head of the church, in whose name the president sat? Doth the president of the queen's majesty's council use to sit at her council in the name of any other inferior person? If Theodosius were supreme and chief, why sat not Cyrill in his name as president? But seeing that Photius writeth, and Nicephorus also, that Cyrill, archbishop of Alexandria, sat in the stead of Celestine, pope of Rome, over that council kept at Ephesus, undoubtedly it cannot be denied, but that Celestine was supreme head, as well of the church as of the general council.

Lib. 14. c. 34.  
[il. 512.]

It is not therefore only to be considered, that Theodosius sent abroad his messengers to summon the fathers to the general council, but also it is to be considered, by whose authority it was done. If in our time it had pleased the emperor Ferdinand, of famous memory, to have sent his messengers to the kings and princes of Spain, France, England, Hungary, Bemeland, Pole, and to the estates and dukes of Italy and Germany, to summon them to the council, which the pope thought good to indict at Trent; I think, verily, the pope would have thanked the emperor for it, and himself should have saved so much charges as men of experience know such an enterprise to require. But now, sith the pope hath of his own sufficient to bear the charges of such

p Untruth, manifest. For Theodosius the emperor expressly determined, what should be holden for Christian faith.

q Untruth, guilefully inclosed. For Theodosius willed his subjects to follow as well the faith of sundry other bishops as the pope's.

r A fond folly. For the bishop of Rome had evermore the first place in councils: yet was he not therefore the head of the church.

s No doubt, by the authority of the pope. And so was the emperor only the pope's man.

<sup>89</sup> [That is, Lucius was an Arian and a persecutor.]

affairs, he asketh not any more of the emperor such expenses, as in old time to that necessary purpose by the emperors were allowed.

Last of all, Martian (say you) called the fourth general council at Chalcedon. We answer: he called it not in such sort as ye mean, to wit, as supreme head and ruler thereof, but as one able to send messengers for the bishops about the world, and to sustain the charges, also willing to see peace and concord in the church of God. Who list to read the epistles of pope Leo to Pulcheria the empress, to Martian himself, to Theodosius, to Flavianus, archbishop of Constantinople, to the synod first assembled at Ephesus, afterward for certain causes at Chalcedon; in the same epistles he may see both the cause of the council, and what conference was had thereof with the said Leo, bishop of Rome, who sent first to Ephesus, Julianus, a bishop, Renatus, a priest, and Hilarius, a deacon, and afterward to Chalcedon, Paschasinus and Lucentius, bishops, and Bonifacius, a priest, to represent his person. In one of the said epistles, written to the second synod at Ephesus, Leo saith thus: *Religiosissima clementissimi principis fides*, &c.: "The most religious faith of our most clement prince knowing it to pertain chiefly to his renown, if within the catholic church no branch of error spring, hath deferred this reverence to God's ordinances, as to use the authority of the see apostolic, to achieve the effect of a holy purpose, as though he were desirous by the most blessed Peter himself, that to be declared, which in his confession was praised." By which words it is plain, that in matters of religion the emperor proceeded not upon his own head, but <sup>u</sup>was directed by the see of Peter. What shall I say more?

If the emperor first christened the pope, let the emperor be superior in things to Godward. But if the pope christened the emperor, (as <sup>x</sup>Sylvester did Constantine,) let the spiritual father, in that degree of rule, be above the spiritual child.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

No man could utter so many *untruths* together, with such affiance, without some cunning. First, M. Harding, ye bear us in hand, that the *emperors* of the world, in those days, summoned *councils*, not by their own authority, but by the authority and warrant of the *pope*. As if the *pope's* authority, at that time, had been many degrees above the *emperor*. Notwithstanding, pope Pius II., as you know, saith thus: *Ante Nicenam synodum unusquisque sibi vixit: et parvus respectus ad Romanam ecclesiam habebatur*: "Before the council of Nice, each bishop lived severally to himself: and little regard was there then had to the

<sup>t</sup> Untruth. For the council was summoned to Chalcedon, quite contrary to the pope's will. Read the answer.

<sup>u</sup> Untruth, most manifest. Read the answer.

<sup>x</sup> Untruth. For he was christened by Eusebius, the bishop of Nicomedia, long after that Sylvester was dead.

<sup>y</sup> Eneas Sylvius in epist. 288. [p. 802. d.]

church of Rome." Pope Innocentius complaineth, that he had not authority sufficient to force Pelagius, being but one man, to come before him: much less had he authority sufficient to command and call the whole world. Pope Leo both was an humble suitor himself unto the *emperor* Mar-tianus, that it would please his *majesty* to command a *council*, and also intreated other *bishops* to promote the cause. Thus he writeth: *Humiliter ac sapienter exposcite, ut petitioni nostræ, qua plenariam indici synodum postulamus* [i. *postulavimus*], *clementissimus imperator dignetur annuere*: "Make suit with discreet and humble prayer, that our most *gracious emperor* would vouchsafe to grant our request, in that we have desired a *general council*." It is not likely, that pope Leo would thus have written, if his own authority had been sufficient.

Leo ad Cle-  
rum et ple-  
bem Con-  
stant. epist.  
23. [l. 521.]

Theod. lib. 5.  
c. 9. [iii. 204.]  
διὰ τῶν τοῦ  
θεοφιλεστά-  
του βασι-  
λέως γραμ-  
μάτων.

Eusebius,  
lib. 10. c. 5.  
[l. 484.]

Conc. Chal-  
ced. act. 1.  
pag. 748.  
[Mansl. vi.  
613.]

Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 16. [al.  
17. ll. 34.]

Nay, it is the more unlikely, that the *emperor* should herein at any time use the authority of the *pope*: for that the *pope* himself was never able to summon *bishops*, as hereafter it shall appear, but only by the authority of the *emperor*. Pope Damasus commanded the *bishops* of the *East* to come to *Rome*: howbeit, not in his own name, for that had been no warrant, but by the *emperor's* special letters. Eusebius saith thus: Ἀντιγράφον βασιλικῆς ἐπι-στολῆς, δι' ἧς σύνοδον ἐπισκόπων ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς γενέσθαι κελεύει: *Exemplar regiarum literarum, quibus jubet Romæ episcoporum concilium celebrari*: "This is a copy of the *emperor's* writ, whereby he commanded a council to be kept in *Rome*." As for the *pope*, notwithstanding all his *universal power*, he was commanded by the *emperor's* summon, to be present at *councils*, as well as others.

In the *council* of *Chalcedon* it is written thus: *Eodem tenore a piissimis et Christianissimis imperatoribus, sanctissimus noster papa, Romanæ ecclesiæ præpositus, Leo, vocatus est*: "By order of the same *writ*, our most holy *pope* *Leo*, ruler of the *church* of *Rome*, was called to the council by the most godly and most Christian *emperors*."

Sozomenus saith: *Constantinus scripsit ad omnes præsides ecclesiarum, ut ad diem adessent: ad episcopos apostolicarum sedium: ad Macarium Hierosolymitanum:*

*ad Julium Romanum, &c.*: “The emperor Constantinus sent out his letters unto all the rulers of the churches, that they should meet all at Nice upon a day: unto the *bishops of the apostolic sees*: unto Macarius the *bishop of Jerusalem*: and unto Julius the *bishop of Rome, &c.* But Julius excused his absence because of his age<sup>90</sup>.” Otherwise, of obedience and duty towards the emperor, he was as much bound to have made his appearance there as the rest of his brethren.

Ye say, “If the emperor should have summoned the council by his own authority, then the bishops of Persia and Scotland, which countries were not then under the obedience of the Roman empire, would not have appeared upon the summon, and so it had been no general council.” This cavil wanteth both truth and savour. For proof whereof, I will bring forth yourself, M. Harding, to reprove yourself. Ye should not so soon have forgotten your own decree, specially conceived and published in this selfsame book. Thus you say: these be your own words: “A council is not accounted general, because bishops of all countries under heaven be assembled, but because many be assembled, and all be lawfully called.” Otherwise, your late *chapter of Trident*, with your worthy number of forty prelates<sup>91</sup>, whereof certain were only *May bishops*<sup>92</sup>, otherwise by you called *Nullatenses*, could never have been a *general council*.

Nicolaus Cusanus saith: *Authoritas concilii non ita dependet a congregante, ut, nisi a papa congregetur, non sit concilium: quia tunc omnia octo universalia concilia non fuissent firma: quoniam per imperatores convocata leguntur: et Romanus pontifex ad instar aliorum patriarcharum, divales sacras jussiones, de veniendo, aut mittendo ad concilium, recepit* [leg. *recepisse*]: “The authority of a council dependeth not of him by whom it was summoned, that,

<sup>90</sup> [Sozomenus. From the words of Sozomenus it is only to be inferred, that Constantine wrote to these bishops. See note <sup>94</sup>, p. 381. infra. The quotation in the margin is from Theodoret, who does not name Julius.]

<sup>91</sup> [This number is correct only in reference to the earlier sessions of the council under Paul III. Supra vol. vi. p. 219. note <sup>70</sup>.]

<sup>92</sup> [Pates and Waucop: ib. note 71.]

Theod. lib. 1.  
c. 7. [il. 25.]  
διὰ γῆρας  
ἀπελείθη  
βαθύ.

M. Harding,  
fol. 329. a.

Nicol. Cusan.  
de Concord.  
Cathol. lib. 2.  
cap. 25. [p.  
756.]

unless it be summoned by the pope, it can be no council. For so we should avoid all the first eight general councils. For we read, they were summoned by emperors, and not by popes. And the pope received the emperor's majesty's commandment to come or send to councils, as other patriarchs did."

Certainly, it cannot appear, that there was any *bishop* either of Scotland or of England, then called *Britain*, at any of the first four *councils*, either at Nice, or at Ephesus, or at Constantinople, or at Chalcedon. Yet are these *councils* nevertheless called *general*.

Touching the rest, the *emperor* was then the only *monarch* of the world: and, as Chrysostom calleth him, *Summitas et caput omnium super terram hominum*: "The top and head of all men in the world." No doubt, whosoever would then have refused the *emperor's* *summon*, much more would he have refused the *summon* of the *pope*.

To qualify the matter, ye say, the *emperor* did these things, although not by the *pope's* *warrant*, yet at the least by the *pope's* *consent*, and never otherwise. Here, likewise, is another *untruth*. For the *emperor* commanded *councils*, both when he would and whither he would, whether the *pope* would or no, many times without any manner of regard had to his pleasure. Pope Leo wrote thus unto the emperor Theodosius: *Omnes nostræ ecclesiæ, omnes mansuetudini vestræ cum gemitibus et lachrymis supplicant sacerdotes ut.....generalem synodum jubetis intra Italiam celebrari*: "All our churches and all our priests most humbly beseech your majesty with sobs and tears, that ye will command a general council to be holden within Italy." In like sort he moved the *clergy* of *Constantinople* to be suitors unto his *majesty* for the same: yet nevertheless the *emperor* continued still in his purpose: and contrary to the pope's humble petition, kept the *council*, not in *Italy*, but at *Chalcedon*, where also, as it is said before, pope Leo himself was summoned to appear by the *emperor's* *commandment*, with other bishops.

Of such authority was the *pope's* *consent* in *summoning* of *councils*. He humbly craved it upon his knees, with sighs and tears, and could not get it. And, therefore,

Chrys. ad  
Pop. Antioch.  
hom. 2. [ii.  
23.]

Leo ad Theo-  
dosium, ep.  
24. [i. 508.]



Nicolaus Cusanus saith: *Habetur ex præscriptis una conclusio ..... , scilicet in conciliis Romanum pontificem in con-* Nicol. Cusan. de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 12. [p. 725.]  
*claudis statutis generalibus non habere eam potestatem, quam quidam adulatores illi contribuunt:* “Hereof we have one conclusion, that in general councils, and in making of laws general, the bishop of Rome hath no such power as *certain flatterers* would allow him.” Take heed, therefore, M. Harding, lest, for your great pains in a desperate cause, ye be taken for one of the *pope’s flatterers*.

Hereof Æneas Sylvius, which afterward was pope Pius II., saith thus: *Ex hisce autoritatibus mirum in modum se putant armatos, qui concilia negant fieri posse sine consensu papæ. Quorum sententia, si, ut ipsi volunt, inviolata persistet, ruinam secum ecclesiæ trahet. Quid enim remedii erit, si criminosus papa perturbet ecclesiam: si animas perdat: si pervertat malo exemplo populos: si denique contraria fidei prædicet, hæreticisque dogmatibus imbuat subditos? Sinemusne cum ipso cuncta ruere? At ego, dum veteres lego historias, dum Actus perspicio Apostolorum, hunc equidem morem non incenio, ut soli papæ concilia convocaverint: nec post, tempore Constantini Magni, et aliorum Augustorum, ad congreganda concilia quæsitus est magnopere Romani consensus papæ?* “By these authorities they think themselves armed, that say, ‘No council may be kept without the consent of the pope.’ Whose judgment, if it should stand, as they would have it, would draw with it the decay and ruin of the church. For what remedy were there then, if the pope himself were vicious, destroyed souls, overthrew the people with evil example, taught doctrine contrary to the faith, and filled his subjects full of heresies? Should we suffer all to go to the devil? Verily, when I read the old stories, and consider the Acts of the Apostles, I find no such order in those days, that only the pope should summon councils. And afterward, in the time of Constantine the Great, and of other emperors, when councils should be called, there was no great account made of the pope’s consent.” Cardinal Cusanus saith: *Negligente aut contradicente papa, imperator..... potest præceptive synodos indicere, ad providendum fluctuanti ecclesiæ:* “If the Cusan. de Concord. Cathol. lib. 3. cap. 15 [p. 797.]

*pope* be negligent, or if he say nay, the *emperor*, to stay the wavering state of the church, may *command councils by his own authority*." Thus the emperor Sigismund called a *council* at *Constance*: notwithstanding, it stood *pope John* much upon, never to yield his consent unto it. For in the same *council* he was deprived, and of a *pope* was made a *cardinal*.

Ye say, "The *pope* had authority to confirm councils: *ergo*, much more he had authority to call councils." And here ye tell us a very solemn tale, what is commanding, what is assenting, what is authorizing, what is ratifying: as if it had been somewhat to the purpose. But if your reason hold, then must *general councils* have many callers. For, as I shall hereafter sufficiently prove, not only the *pope*, or the other principal *patriarchs*, but also all other *bishops* that were present, yea, *emperors*, *kings*, *lieutenants*, and *counsellors*, had authority to *confirm councils*.

Sozom. lib.  
6. cap. 23.  
[ii. 246.]

Sozomenus saith: *Nec Romanus, nec Vincentinus, nec alii confirmarunt*: "This council was confirmed, neither by the bishop of Rome, nor by the bishop of Vincentia, nor by the rest of the bishops<sup>92</sup>." Whereby it appeareth, that, in confirmation of *councils*, all other *bishops* whatsoever had as good right and authority as the *bishop* of *Rome*. And the emperor Martianus saith: *Sacrosancto nostræ serenitatis edicto venerandam synodum confirmamus*: "We confirm the reverend council by the holy edict of our majesty." Thus you see, that not only all *bishops*, but also *emperors* and *lay princes*, had authority to confirm councils. Now, therefore, M. Harding, if it be true that you say, that whosoever hath authority to *confirm councils*, much more hath authority to *call councils*, then must it needs follow, that not only *kings* and *emperors*, but also all *bishops* through the world, have authority to *call councils*.

Ye say, "Pope Sylvester sent that famous learned

Conc. Chal.  
act. 3. p. 804.  
[vii. 480. A.]

<sup>92</sup> [Sozomenus, lib. 6. cap. 23. . . . μήτε τοῦ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἐπισκόπου, μήτε τῶν ἄλλων συνθεμένων αὐτοῖς.]  
In the Greek the name of the bishop of Vincentia does not occur.

father Hosius, the bishop of Corduba, to the council of Nice, to represent his person." This may well pass among the rest of your truths. For neither was Hosius there in the *pope's* behalf, but in his own: nor was pope Sylvester then alive, or able to send him, during the whole time of the *Nicene council*, notwithstanding any thing that your fabular Peter Crabbe hath said to the contrary <sup>93</sup>. As for Hosius, the bishop of Corduba, of what authority and estimation he was in all *ecclesiastical assemblies*, it may appear by these words of Athanasius: *In qua synodo dux ille, et antesignanus non fuit? Quæ ecclesia istius præ-sidentie non pulcherrima monumenta retinet?* "In what council hath not Hosius been chief and president? What church is without some notable remembrance of his government?" Certainly, M. Harding, it seemeth he was a great deal too good to be sent so far in a dead man's errand.

Athanas. Apol.  
2. [de fuga:  
tom. i. 322.]

Notwithstanding, Julius <sup>94</sup>, being then *bishop of Rome*, for that he was unable to travel because of his age, sent thither two *priests*, Vitus and Vincentius, to supply his room. Thus he did not of pride, the better by his absence to maintain a state, but only for that he was forced of

Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 16. [al.  
17. li. 34.]

<sup>93</sup> [See note <sup>85</sup> supra vol. vi. 106: as also note <sup>39</sup> vol. v. 426. Bishop Jewel has repeated this statement several times with great earnestness, and it is evident that, relying principally upon one authority, he himself firmly believed, (as many other writers have done,) that pope Sylvester was dead at the meeting of the council of Nice. Yet it is certain, that this pope lived for several years afterwards, and that Julius, who was the next pope but one, did not succeed till eleven years after the council of Nice. All other original authorities are clear upon this point: the sole real ground for the bishop's opinion being Sozomenus, who expressly asserts in the passage printed below, (lib. 1. c. 17.) that it was pope Julius who sent Vito and Vincentius. (See the notes in Read. Vales. ed. of Sozomenus.)

Another ground was his belief that St. Athanasius alluded to the council of *Nice* in the passage cited below from the Apol. 2. contra Arianos, (tom. i. 168.) whereas, indeed, the council there intended is that of *Sardica*, (A. D. 347.) held during the pontificate of Julius. So that, in fact, one mistake is built upon another.]

<sup>94</sup> [Sozomenus, lib. 1. cap. 16. [al. 17.] ἐκοινώνουν δὲ τούτου τοῦ συλλόγου, τῶν μὲν Ἀποστολικῶν θρόνων, Μακάριος ὁ Ἱεροσολύμων, καὶ Εὐστάθιος ἤδη τὴν Ἀντιοχείας τῆς πρὸς τῷ Ὀρόντῃ ἐκκλησίαν ἐπιτραπείς, καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Ἀλέξανδρείας τῆς πρὸς τὴν Μαρείαν λίμνην. Ἰούλιος δὲ ὁ Ῥωμαίων ἐπίσκοπος, διὰ γῆρας ἀπελιμπάνετο. Παρῆσαν δὲ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ Βίτων καὶ Βικέντιος, πρεσβύτεροι τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκκλησίας.]

necessity so to do. For if he had been able to travel so far, he had been forced to go thither himself. Therefore pope Agatho afterward thus excused his absence unto the emperors: *Christianissimi domini filii, secundum piissimam jussionem mansuetudinis vestræ, pro obedientia quam debui- mus, præsentis confamilios nostros misimus*: "My most Christian lords and children, according to the most godly commandment of your majesties, and according to the obedience that we owe of duty, we have sent these present our fellow servants."

Concil. Constant. act. 4. et Heracl. et Tiberium Imp. p. 288. [Mansi xi. 235, 236.]

Other *bishops*, in like cases of age or infirmity, did the like. For example, Lucifer, the *bishop* of *Sardinia*, sent Herennius and Agapetus: and Paulinus sent Maximus and Calemerus to the *council* of *Nice*<sup>94</sup>, to be in their steads.

Athan. ad Antioch. tom. 2. [tom. 1. pt. 2. 776.]

Ye say, "Vitus and Vincentius, for that they were the *pope's legates*, had therefore the first place in *subscription* among the *bishops*." Here is another great *untruth*. For Theodoretus saith: "The first and chief of all that company, both in place and in speech, was" (not Vitus or Vincentius, the *pope's legates*, but) "Eustathius, the *patriarch of Antioch*"<sup>95</sup>.

Theodor. lib. 1. cap. 7. [iii. 26.]

Touching these two the *pope's legates*, Sozomenus placeth them only in the fourth room. Athanasius saith: *Subscripserunt, Hosius ab Hispania, Julius Romanus per Archidamum et Philoxenum presbyteros*: "They subscribed their names to the *council*, Hosius that came out of Spain, and Julius the *bishop of Rome*, by Archidamus, and Philoxenus, priests," that were his legates<sup>96</sup>. By

Sozomen. lib. 1. cap. 16. [nt. 17. tom. ii. 34, 35.]  
Athan. Apol. 2. [contr. Arian. 1. 168.]

<sup>94</sup> [Here is another singular mistake. It was not to *Nice* that these delegates were sent, but to a synod held at *Alexandria*, (A. D. 362.) confirmatory of the *Nicene council*. See Mansi iii. 353.]

<sup>95</sup> [Theodoret only states, that Eustathius first addressed the emperor.]

<sup>96</sup> [From the manner in which this passage is introduced it would seem to have been intended to apply to the council of *Nice*, and it has been said above in note <sup>98</sup>,

that bishop Jewel really quoted it as such; in confirmation of which it may be stated, that the same passage of St. Athanasius is evidently referred to supra vol. v. p. 426, where the question of Sylvester's death is also considered. The council, however, of which St. Athanasius speaks, as the one to which Julius sent Archidamus and Philoxenus, (who did subscribe after Hosius,) was the council of *Sardica*, held A. D. 347, in the 11th year of Julius' pontificate.]

which words he alloweth the *bishop of Rome's legates* the second place in subscription, but not the first. And thus ye see, Hosius the bishop of Corduba subscribeth before Julius the bishop of Rome.

In the *council of Africa*, Philippus and Asellius, the *pope's legates*, had the *last place* in subscription after all others. In the *council of Chalcedon*<sup>97</sup>, Philippus, one of the *pope's legates*, had an hundred and seven and fifty others to subscribe before him.

Conc. Afric.  
cap. 100. [lv.  
511. A.]  
Conc. Chalced.  
Act. 1.  
Sanct. [vi.  
875. a.]

These fathers, I trow, would not have been so unmanerly in their dealing, if they had taken the *pope* for the *head* of the *whole universal church*, to have placed his *legate* behind so many. Further, ye say, "At the very same time that the general council was kept at Nice, St. Sylvester called another council in Rome." This, I trow, M. Harding, is another *untruth*, unless ye have power to raise up dead men to keep *councils*. For Sylvester was dead long before.

Sozomenus saith, Vitus and Vincentius were sent to Nice, not by pope Sylvester, who then was dead, but by pope Julius, that was the second after him. The like may easily appear by Athanasius, Theodoretus, Nicephorus, and others. Beda also, in his *Chronicles*, telleth you, that the *council of Nice* was holden, not in the time of pope Sylvester, who then was dead, but in the time of pope Julius<sup>98</sup>.

Sozom. lib. 1.  
cap. 16. [al.  
17. ii. 34, 35.]  
Athanas.  
Apologia 2.  
Theod. lib.  
1. cap. 7.  
[iii. 25.]  
Niceph. lib.  
8. cap. 14.  
[i. 560.]  
Beda in  
Chronicis.

Therefore, M. Harding, you must needs devise two *councils of Nice* about one time: two *Sylvester popes*: two *writers* of this one story, the one true, the other false. Otherwise, this frail stuff will never hold. Ye are over easy to credit fables.

The *council* that ye imagine was holden in *Rome* by

<sup>97</sup> [Rather in that of Ephesus, as reported at Chalcedon.]

<sup>98</sup> [Theodoret merely says that the *bishop of Rome* was absent, and sent two presbyters; Nicephorus, the same; in Beda, neither Julius nor Sylvester are named; but the date of Sylvester's death being assumed to be

prior to the council of Nice, upon the authority of Sozomenus, Bp. Jewel conceives all these authorities to mean Julius by "the bishop of Rome." It may be added, that Photius, in his letter to Michael, prince of Bulgaria, says that both Sylvester and Julius sent legates to Nice. Ed. Justell. p. 114.]

Conc. Rom.  
cap. 5. [ii.  
625.] cap. 3.  
[p. 623.]  
cap. 20. [p.  
631.]

pope Sylvester is nothing else but a great heap of childish vanities. The holy discreet learned fathers say there: *Nemo presbyterorum chrisma conficiat: quoniam Christus a chrismate vocatur: presul summus non judicabitur a quocquam. Quoniam scriptum est: non est discipulus supra magistrum. Neque ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque ab omni populo iudex judicabitur:* “No priest may make or hallow the *chrism*: for *Christ* of *chrism* hath his name: the *highest prelate*” (that is, the *pope*) “may be judged of no man: for it is written, *The scholar is not above his master. The judge*” (that is, the *pope*) “shall not be judged, neither by the emperor, nor by all the clergy, nor by kings and princes, nor by the whole people.” Such, and other like good stuff have you in your *council of Rome*.

Euseb. lib.  
10. cap. 5.  
[i. 484.]

Notwithstanding, of what credit soever this *council* were, yet, M. Harding, it utterly overthroweth your whole purpose. For if ever there were any such *council* summoned in Rome, it was summoned, not by Sylvester, the *dead pope*, but by the authority of the *emperor* that then was alive. So Eusebius writeth of the *council of Rome*, holden in the time of pope Meltiades, as it is said before: *Exemplar regiaram literarum, &c.* “Here is a copy of the *emperor’s writ*, whereby he hath commanded a *council of bishops* to be kept at Rome.”

Theod. lib.  
5. cap. 9.  
[iii. 204.]

Likewise the *bishops* assembled in the *council of Constantinople*, wrote unto the *bishops* in the *council of Rome*: *Cum indixissetis, &c.* “After ye had called a *council* to *Rome*, ye warned us also to come thither, as the members of your own body, by the most godly *emperor’s writ*.”

By these it appeareth, if there were any such *council* called to *Rome*, it was called by the *emperor*, and not by the *pope*.

Ye say, “The emperor in such affairs was advised evermore by the bishops.” This is not unlikely, and therefore easily may be granted. Notwithstanding, for ought that ye can find, he was more advised oftentimes by some other *bishops*, than by the *pope*, as it shall appear. Eusebius,

touching the emperor Constantinus, writeth thus: *Quasi communis quidam episcopus a Deo constitutus, ministrorum Dei synodus convocavit*: “As if he had been one common bishop appointed by God, he appointed councils of bishops to assemble together<sup>98</sup>.” Ruffinus saith: “The emperor was advised hereto by Alexander, the bishop of Alexandria, and by other bishops and priests of Egypt.” Here is no mention of the pope. In the like cases of ecclesiastical affairs, Athanasius was an earnest suitor unto the emperor Constantius: Dioscorus unto Theodosius, and so others unto other.

Euseb. De vita Constantini, Oratione 1. [cap. 44. tom. 1. 524.]

Ruff. lib. 1. [al. lib. x.] cap. 1.

But of the *pope's omnipotent consent*, without which, ye tell us, no emperor may summon a council, there is no man that maketh mention.

Ye say, “There ought no council to be kept without the determinate consent of the bishop of Rome.” This also is another of your *untruths*, standing in the manifest corruption of the words of Socrates, as in my former Reply I have declared more at large. The words of Socrates be these: *Non licet scribere ecclesiastica decreta præter sententiam episcopi Romani*: “It is provided, that ecclesiastical laws be not made without the consent of the bishop of Rome:” for that the bishop of Rome was one of the four great patriarchs, whose assents in all general councils were thought necessary. But Socrates meaneth such ecclesiastical laws as pertain to the whole church of God. For this is a rule agreeable to reason, *That toucheth all, must be allowed by all*.

Art. 4. dist. 29. [leg. 26. Supra ii. 260.] Soc. lib. 2. cap. 17. [ii. 96.] Μη δειν παρὰ γνώμην τοῦ ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης κανονίζειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας. Cassiod. lib. 4. cap. 16. Regula juris. Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus debet approbari.

Now, whereas ye have exchanged the *allowing of canons*, into the *summoning or calling of councils*, it may please you to remember, that *allowing of canons* was common to all the members of the council, and specially to the four principal patriarchs, as it is said before: but the authority of *calling councils* belonged only to the emperor.

<sup>98</sup> [Eusebius de vita Constant.: ἐξάιρετον δὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ νέμων φροντίδα διαφερομένων τινῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους κατὰ διαφόρους χώρας, οἷά τις κοινὸς ἐπίσκοπος ἐκ Θεοῦ καθεσταμέ-

νος συνόδους τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ λειτουργῶν συνεκρότει. ἐν μέσῃ δὲ τῇ τούτων διατριβῇ, οὐκ ἀπαξίων παρεῖναι τε καὶ συνιζάνειν, κοινῶν τῶν ἐπισκοπούμενων ἐγένετο, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης τοῦ Θεοῦ βραβεύων τοῖς πάσι.]

[† Athan. iii.  
676.]

That ye allege of Athanasius is a vain and shameless forgery, as I have elsewhere declared more at large. Such *religion*, such *doctors*. Such folly is worthy no other answer.

Soz. lib. 6.  
cap. 7. [ii.  
227.]

“Valentinian, the emperor,” (ye say) “accounted himself as one of the people: and therefore said, It was not lawful for him to examine matters of religion.” Thus he said, either of humility, or else for want of time. His foreign enemies, his wars, and his civil cares, had filled his head with other thoughts. Nicephorus imagineth him thus to say: *Mihi negotiis occupato, et reipublicæ curis distento, res hujusmodi inquirere non est facile*: “For me, being thus occupied with business and public cares, it is not easy to inquire of such matters.” Otherwise, that *ecclesiastical causes* be within the *prince’s* charge, I doubt not but hereafter it shall well appear. King Odoacer said unto pope Symmachus, and unto the *clergy of Rome*, as it is alleged once before: “*Miramur quicquam tentatum fuisse sine nobis: nam vivente nostro presbytero, sine nobis nihil tentari oportuit*: “We marvel that any thing was attempted without us: for without us nothing should have been done so long as *our priest*” (he meaneth the *pope*) “was alive<sup>99</sup>.”

Nicephor.  
lib. ii. cap.  
3. [ii. 113.]

Concil. Ro-  
man. 3. cap.  
2. [viii. 267.  
u.]

After this ye fill the house full with *patriarchs* of Constantinople, *patriarchs* of Alexandria, *patriarchs* of Jerusalem, *princes* of Bulgaria, and with other like great and stately persons. The conclusion hereof is this, That pope Damasus gave his consent to the *council of Constantinople*. All this, M. Harding, ye might soon have obtained with more favour and less ado. Howbeit, ye may not hereof well reason thus, The *pope* consented unto the *council*: *ergo*, The *pope* had authority to call the *council*: lest children wonder at your logic.

In the mean while, ye say, the emperor Theodosius ruled the *empire*: whereby ye give us to understand, that he had no charge over the *church*. And thus ye continue still to enrich yourself, and to heap your reader with *untruths*.

<sup>99</sup> [Supra vol. vi. p. 299. note 44.]



Certainly, the *bishops* in the *council of Constantinople* wrote thus in humble wise unto the same emperor Theodosius: *Obsecramus clementiam tuam, ut quemadmodum literis honorasti ecclesiam, quibus nos convocasti, ita finalem conclusionem nostrorum decretorum corrobore sententia tua et sigillo*: “We beseech your majesty, that as ye have honoured the *church* by your letters, wherewith ye have called us together, so it may please you to *confirm the final conclusion* of our decrees with your *sentence*, and with your *seal*.”

Post Conc.  
Ephesinum  
primum.  
[Crabb. tom.  
1. p. 548. col.  
2. Mansi. iii.  
557.]

Further, as it appeareth by your own allegation, the same emperor Theodosius took upon him to bound and to limit the *catholic faith*, and that even in the body of his *civil laws*: which thing neither could he have done without judgment, nor would he have done without authority. But if ye mean, that by this *determination* of the emperor Theodosius, that *faith* only should be taken for *catholic*, that was then professed by pope Damasus, and should afterward be professed by others succeeding in Peter's *chair*, then have ye secretly conveyed us in another *untruth*. The place itself will soon reprove you. The emperor's words be these: *Cunctos populos.....in tali volumus religione versari, quam divinum Petrum apostolum tradidisse Romanis, religio usque nunc ab eo insinuata declarat: quamque pontificem Damasum sequi claret, et Petrum Alexandriae episcopum, virum apostolicæ sanctitatis*: “We will all men to walk in that *religion*, which holy Peter, the *apostle*, delivered to the Romans, as the faith first enkindled by him, and still continued until this day, doth declare: which *religion* also it is plain that pope Damasus followeth, and Peter, the *bishop of Alexandria*, a man of apostolic holiness.” Here, the emperor Theodosius commandeth his subjects to follow, as well the faith of Peter, the *bishop of Alexandria*, as of Damasus, the *bishop of Rome*.

The emperor  
limiteth the  
catholic  
faith.

Cod. Theod-  
osian. [tom.  
vi.] lib. 16.  
Tit. de Fide  
Catholica.  
Cunctos Po-  
pulos.

And yet in the next title following he openeth his own meaning in this wise by other examples more at large: *Episcopis tradi omnes ecclesias mox jubemus,.....quos constabit uti [leg. sociatos esse] communionem Nectarii episcopi*

Cod. Theod-  
os. [tom.  
vi.] lib. 16.  
tit. 1. [Epi-  
scopis tradi.]

of his place, but for the worthiness of his person, was appointed *president* in the *council of Sardica*. And Athanasius speaketh of him in this wise with great admiration: *Cujus non fuit ille concilii princeps!* "In what council hath not Hosius been the *president*, or *chief!*"

Ye say: "Pope Sylvester christened the emperor Constantinus, and therefore was his spiritual father." This may pass among other your truths. For your *popes*, by their omnipotent power, may minister sacraments being dead. It is known, that as long as Sylvester was alive<sup>2</sup>, Constantinus was never christened. And yet, notwithstanding all this were true, M. Harding, yet your cause thereby were little furthered; unless perhaps ye will reason thus: Pope Sylvester christened the *emperor*: *ergo*, the *pope* hath authority to *call councils*. Howbeit, unless this argument be better digested, your very sophisters of Louvain will hardly allow it. But, indeed, that whole tale, touching the christening of the emperor Constantine, is nothing else but a peevish fable. Constantius, the *emperor's own son*, utterly denieth, that Sylvester ever baptized Constantinus, his *father*. Eusebius saith, Constantinus was christened, not in the flourishing state of his age, but only a little before he died: not in *Rome*, but at *Nicomedia*, in the kingdom of Epirus: not in a corner, but in the presence of many *bishops*: and, as St. Hierom saith, not by *pope* Sylvester, that then was dead, but by Eusebius, the *bishop of Nicomedia*. For proof whereof, St. Ambrose saith: *Constantino in ultimis constituto, gratia baptismatis omnia peccata dimisit*: "The grace of baptism forgave Constantine all his sins, even at the ending of his life<sup>3</sup>." Therefore, M. Harding, we must needs say, that either your tale is untrue, which is not strange; or else Constantine was twice baptized, which is very unlikely.

Cardinal Pole, seeing the matter to pass so clear, telleth

Athanas. Apologia 2. [i. 322.] et E-pist. ad solitariam vitam agentes. [i. 369.] et inter Acta Liberii, c. 6. [Crabb. i. p. 348.]

Euseb. de Vita Constant. Orat. 4. c. 44. [i. 661.]

Socrat. [lib. 1. c. 39. ii. p. 75.] Anno ætat. suæ 65. συγκαλέσας τοὺς ἐπισκόπους. [Euseb. i. 661.]

Hieron. in Chron.

Ambros. de Obitu Theodosii. [ii. 1209.]

Cardinal. Poin de Baptismo Constantin. p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> [This is probably correct. Sylvester died A. D. 335. Constantine was christened about A. D. 337.]

<sup>3</sup> [S. Ambros. de Obitu. Theod.

The Bened. Edd. say it is strange that any one can defend the apocryphal story of Constantine's having been baptized by Sylvester.]

us roundly, in one word, that Eusebius and Constantius were *Arian heretics*, and, therefore, refuseth the whole story written by Eusebius, touching the christening of Constantine. But, somewhat to soothe you in your tale, let a fable stand for truth, and let us grant you an impossibility, that Constantine was baptized by pope Sylvester, being dead: yet will you needs gather hereof, that, therefore, the *emperor* is subject to the *pope*? or, that the *pope* hath authority to call *councils*? What will you then say, when the *emperor* is baptized by some other *priest*, or *bishop*, or by a *midwife*? Shall every of these therefore require to have, and to do the like? Or must we believe, that such a *priest*, *bishop*, or *midwife*, shall have authority to call *councils*? Indeed, this were a good short way to get *supremacy*. But it might have pleased you to remember, that the *cardinal* of Ostia useth always of office to *consecrate* the *pope*. Yet, I trow, ye will not therefore place him above the *pope*. Elizæus anointed king Jehu: yet was he not therefore above the *king*. Your own doctor saith: *Quod hoc argumentum non concludat, patet: quia in veteri lege sacerdotes qui reges inungebant, indubitanter regibus subdebantur*: “It appeareth, that this *argument* is nothing worth, and concludeth nothing. For in the *old law*, the *priests* that anointed the *kings* were undoubtedly subject to the *kings*.”

Johan. de Parisiis, cap. 19. [p. 134.]

To conclude, what right *emperors* had in *summoning* of *councils*, by these few authorities and examples following, it may soon appear. Eusebius saith: *Constantinus synodum œcumenicam collegit, et episcopos, ut undique accelerarent, honorificis literis convocavit*: (not the *pope*, but) “Constantine the *emperor* gathered a *general council*, and by honourable writs called the *bishops* of all countries to repair thither<sup>4</sup>.” Theodoretus saith: “A great and a holy *council* was gathered to Nicæa, by the *grace of God*, and” (not by the *pope*, but) “by the *godly emperor* Constantinus<sup>5</sup>.”

Euseb. de Vita Constant. Orat. 3. [l. 579.]

Theod. lib. 1. c. 9. [iii. 31.]

<sup>4</sup> [Eusebius: Εἰθ' ὡσπερ ἐπιστρατεύων αὐτῷ Θεοῦ φάλαγγα, σύν-οδον οἰκουμηνικὴν συνεκρότει· σπεύδειν ἀπανταχόθεν τοὺς ἐπισκόπους γράμμασι τιμητικοῖς προκαλούμενος.

οὐκ ἦν θ' ἀπλοῦν τὸ ἐπιταγμα.]

<sup>5</sup> [Theodoret. Epist. Synodica: Ἐπειδὴ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος καὶ τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου βασιλέως κ. τ. λ. ἡ ἅγια σύνοδος κ. τ. λ.]

Soz. lib. 7.  
cap. 9. [il.  
289.]

*Constantinopolitanæ ecclesiæ, et Timothei, &c.*: “ We command that forthwith the *churches* be restored to all *bishops*, of whom it shall appear, that they communicate with Nestorius, the *bishop of Constantinople*, or with Timotheus, or such as shall have fellowship or agreement in faith with the *bishops of Alexandria in Egypt*: and with Pelagius, the *bishop of Laodicea*: and with Diodorus, the *bishop of Tarsus in Asia*: and with Amphilochius, the *bishop of Iconium*: and with Optimus, the *bishop of Antioch*: and with Helladius, the *bishop of Cæsarea*: and with Otreius, the *bishop of Melite*: and with Gregorius, the *bishop of Nyssa*: and with Terennius, the *bishop of Scythia*: and with Marmarius, the *bishop of Martianopolis*.” Every of these several *bishops*, M. Harding, by the *emperor’s* judgment, in trial of the *catholic faith*, had as great authority and weight, as had Damasus, the *bishop of Rome*.

Dist. 22. Re-  
novantes.

But pope Cælestinus, ye say, desired Cyrillus the *bishop of Alexandria* to represent his person, and to supply his room in the *council of Ephesus*, that is to say, to have the *first place* in the *council*. For the *first place* in all ecclesiastical assemblies was allotted to the *bishop of Rome*; the *second* to the *bishop of Constantinople*; the *third* to the *bishop of Alexandria*; the *fourth* to the *bishop of Antioch*; the *fifth* to the *bishop of Jerusalem*.

This packing of places, therefore, between Cælestinus and Cyrillus, was a mystery purposely canvassed, to keep the *bishop of Constantinople*, whom the *pope* evermore envied, out of countenance. For by this policy the *bishop of Alexandria*, that should have had the *third place*, was handsomely shifted into the *first*: and the *bishop of Constantinople*, which, in the *bishop of Rome’s* absence, should have had the *first place*, was removed down to the *second*.

Howbeit, what availeth all this, M. Harding, to further your purpose, and to prove that councils were summoned by the *pope*? Verily, it appeareth not hitherto, that either Cælestinus, or Cyrillus, or any other *bishop*, had any such power or authority to summon *councils*. This is it, that ye should have proved. As for the *first* or *second place* in *councils*, we moved no question.

Again ye seem to say, "The pope of right was evermore president in all councils." This, if ye know it, is another *untruth*; if ye know it not, it is an error. For it is plain, that in the first *council of Nice* pope Julius was not *president*, but Eustathius, the *bishop of Antioch*. The *pope's legates*, as it is said before, were placed beneath in the fourth room. In the fifth *council of Constantinople*, Menna<sup>1</sup>, the *bishop* of the same city, was *president*, and not the *pope*. In the second *Ephesine council*, Dioscorus, the *bishop of Alexandria*, was *president*. In the second *council of Carthage*, it seemeth Gennedius [*al.* Genethlius] was the *president*.

Nicolaus Cusanus, after he had well debated this matter, saith thus: *In conciliis fuit semper præsidentialis Romani pontificis autoritas, sine qua universale concilium non fuisset, dummodo saltem interesse voluisset, aut [l. et] potuisset*: "The *bishop of Rome* had always authority to be *president* in *councils*, otherwise the *council* had not been general: so that the *bishop of Rome* either would, or could be present at the *council*." For otherwise he was not *president*. Therefore, of your part, M. Harding, it was a great *untruth* to say, *The pope of right was evermore president in all councils*. Again, Cusanus saith: *Imperatore in persona existente, reperio eum semper præsedissee. In sexta synodo [suppl. tertius] Constantinus (imperator) præsedit in medio cum decem de majoribus patritiis, et ad levam ejus vicarii senioris Romæ, &c.* "When the *emperor* was present in person, I find that he was always *president*. In the sixth *council of Constantinople*, Constantinus, the *emperor*, was *president*, and sat in the midst with ten of his greatest lords: and at his left hand sat the *popes legates*," &c. This, M. Harding, is very far from your reckoning.

This dignity then passed not by inheritance, or by succession, as the *pope* now would seem to claim it; but either by choice of the *council*, or by favour of the *prince*. Thus Hosius, the *bishop of Corduba* in *Spain*, not by right

<sup>1</sup> [It appears, that both Evagrius and Nicephorus confounded which sat A. D. 547, with that of 536, in which Menna presided; see Mansi, tom. viii. 877, and ix. 123.]

Theod. lib. 1. c. 7. [iii. 25, 26.]

Evagr. lib. 4. cap. 38. [iii. p. 419.]

Niceph. lib. 17. cap. 27. [ii. 774.]

Conc. Chalced. act. 1. Diosc. ex Actis. [vi. 649. D.]

Conc. Carthagin. 2. [iii. 691.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Nicol. Cusanus de Concord. Cathol. lib. 2. cap. 2. [p. 712.]

Sozom. lib. 1. c. 16. [ii. 34.] Sozomenus saith: (not the *pope*, but) “The *emperor* Constantine wrote unto all the rulers of the churches, that they should be at Nice by a day: to the *bishops* of the *apostolic sees*: to Macarius, the *bishop of Jerusalem*, and to Julius, the *bishop of Rome*.” In which words this also may be noted, that the *pope* then was under the *emperor’s* summon, no less than others.

Council. Constantinop. 1. [iii. 557.] In the *council of Constantinople* the *bishops* wrote thus unto the *emperor*: *Ex mandato tuæ pietatis Constantinopolim convenimus*: “We are come to Constantinople” (not by the *pope’s* authority, but) “by your *majesty’s* *commission*.” Athanasius saith: *Ab imperatore præfectisque literæ sequentes in omnem partem missæ sunt, eos qui illuc ituri essent, convocantes*: “These *letters* or *writs* following were sent out into all places” (not from the *pope*, but) “from the *emperor* and his *lieutenants*, summoning them that should come unto the *council*.” St. Chrysostom saith:

Chrys. Epist. 1. ad Innocent. [iii. 518.] “We went in, and humbly besought” (not the *pope*, but) “the most *Christian prince*, to call a *council*.” St. Ambrose, speaking of himself, and of other *bishops*, being then at the *council of Aquileia*, saith thus: *Nos convenimus Aquileiam juxta præceptum imperatoris*: “We are met together at Aquileia, by the commandment of the *emperor*,” (and not of the *pope*.)

Hieron. in Epitaphio Paulæ [iv. pt. 2. p. 671.] St. Hierom saith: *Orientis atque occidentis episcopos, ob quasdam ecclesiasticas [i. ecclesiarum] dissensiones, Romam imperiales literæ contraxerunt*: “To stay certain ecclesiastical dissensions,” (not any the *pope’s* letters of commandment, but) “the *emperor’s* *writs* caused the *bishops*, as well of the East as of the West, to draw to Rome.”

Of *pope Leo* we have said before. Being *pope*, and, as M. Harding imagineth, able to summon the world with a beck, thus he writeth to the *emperor* Theodosius: *Dignetur pietas vestra supplicationi nostræ annuere, ut intra Italiam haberi jubeatis episcopale concilium*: “We beseech your *godly majesty* to grant unto our humble request, that it may please you to command a *council* of *bishops* to be holden within Italy.”

Sozom. lib. 4. c. 22. Sozomenus saith: “The *Arians* besought” (not the *pope*,

Leo Epist. 9. ad Theodosium Imperatorem. [i. 476.]

The pope humbly desires the emperor to summon a council.

but) “the *emperor* Constantius, to command a *council* to be holden at Antioch.” The same *Arians* afterward besought” (not the *pope*, but) “the same *emperor* Constantius to summon another *council* at Milan.” Again Sozomenus saith: “The *catholic bishops* sent Hypatianus, their ambassador, to entreat” (not the *pope*, but) “the *emperor*, that, to redress certain errors, they might have leave to meet together.” Pope Liberius saith: “A *council* is holden at Milan” (not by my authority, but) “by the *commandment of the prince*.” Pope Leo saith: “The *great council of Chalcedon* was summoned” (not by himself, but) “by the travail of Martianus the *emperor*.” The *emperor* Constantius commanded two several *councils* to be kept at one time, the one at Seleucia in Isauria, in the *East*, the other at Ariminum in Italy, in the *West*. Socrates saith: “Sithence the *emperors* were first christened, the state of the church hath hanged of them, and the greatest *councils* have been, and be kept by their advice.”

Inter Acta  
Liberii.

Leo ad Anatolium. [l. 599.]

Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 37. [at. 37. 39. tom. ii. 135.]

Socrat. lib. 5. In proœmio. [il. 263. 264.]

Thus many *ancient councils* we are able to shew you summoned by *emperors*. Now shew you, M. Harding, either that the *emperor* did all these things by the authority of the *pope*, or that the *emperor* was only the *pope's* *summoner*, to call to *council* such and so many as it should like his holiness to command, or that the *pope* did ever summon any one *ancient general council* by his own only right, without further commission from the *emperor*; then will we say, ye have said something. As for all that ye have now said, in good sooth it is less than nothing.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. *Divis.* 3.

And when Ruffine, the *heretic*, had alleged for his authority a *council*, which, as he thought, should make for him, St. Hierom, his adversary, to confute him, “Tell us, (quod he,) “*what emperor commanded that council to be called?*” The same St. Hierom again, in his *epitaph* upon Paula, maketh mention of the *emperor's letters*, which gave commandment

[Apol. contr. Rufinum, lib. 2. tom. iv. pt. 2. p. 415.]  
[Hieron. in Epitaph. Paulæ iv. pt. 2. 672.]

to call the *bishops of Italy and Græcia to Rome, to a council*<sup>6</sup>.

M. HARDING.

a Untruth, proceeding of ignorance, as it may soon appear.

b Read the former answer.

Besides that ye <sup>a</sup> do strangely to call Ruffine an heretic, we say that St. Hierom might well demand what emperor summoned that council, which was never summoned. Again, we confess, that some emperors have summoned both Latin and Greek bishops. <sup>b</sup> But ye prove not, that any did it as supreme head, and as judge in matters of religion, but by the consent of the bishops of Rome, as I have declared before.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Hier. in Ap. cont. Ruffin. [tom. iv. pt. 2. p. 353.] [ib. 355.]

In eadem Apologia.

Were you not a stranger in your own books, M. Harding, ye would not think it so strange a matter to hear Ruffinus called an *heretic*. St. Hierom doubted not so to call him. Thus he saith: *Dum mihi inconstantiae crimen impingit, se hæreticum, &c. Ita vertit Origenem,.....ut qui in Trinitate catholicum legeret, in aliis hæreticum non cave-ret*: “While Ruffinus chargeth me with inconstancy, he proveth himself to be an heretic, &c. Ruffinus hath so translated Origen into Latin, that whoso findeth him catholic touching the *Trinity*, should never suspect him in any thing else to be an *heretic*.” Again he saith unto him: *Solos hæreticos non recipimus, quos vos solos recipitis*: “Only *heretics* we receive not into our houses: and yet them only you receive.”

Anas. ad Epi. scop. Hierosol. Apud Hieron. tom. 4. [Mansi iii. 944. e.]

Anastasius, the *bishop of Rome*, hath thus published his judgment of the same Ruffinus: *Omni suspicione seposita, Ruffinum scito, quod propria mente Origenis dicta in Latinum transtulit, ac probavit. Nec dissimilis ab eo est, qui alienis vitii præstat assensum. Illud tamen scire te cupio, ita haberi a nostris partibus alienum, ut quid agat, ubi sit, nec scire cupiamus*: “All suspicion set apart, know thou that Ruffinus hath translated Origen” (the *heretic's*) “words into Latin, according to his own liking, and well alloweth the same. And whosoever giveth his consent unto another

<sup>6</sup> [There is nothing in the Latin to correspond to the words “to a council.”]



man's fault, is not unlike unto him. Notwithstanding, thus much I would have thee to know, that Ruffinus is so far from our fellowship, or profession of *faith*, that we desire not to know, neither what he doth, nor where he is."

Vincentius saith, that St. Hierom charged Ruffinus with the *Pelagian heresy*. Erasmus saith: *Ruffinus non fuit alienus ab Origenistarum hæresi*: "Ruffinus was not clear from the Origenians' heresy." Again, speaking of the same *heretics*, he saith: *Hujus rei dux et signifer Aquileiæ Ruffinus fuit*. Again: *Notat, nescio quem: ipsum, opinor, Ruffinum, qui in eam hæresim inductus est a magistro quopiam, &c.* Again: *Monet, ut explosa factione Origenistarum, eos etiam ejiciat, qui clam et oblique essent Origenistæ, Ruffinum, et illius amicos*: "The captain and standard-bearer of this *heresy* was *Ruffinus of Aquileia*," &c. Again: "St. Hierom here noteth somebody, I know not whom, but I think Ruffinus himself, that was brought into this *heresy* by some teacher," &c. Again: "He warneth his friend, that having renounced the *Origenian heretics*, he would likewise renounce them that privily and in secret were *Origenian heretics*, meaning Ruffinus and his friends."

Likewise again he saith: *Ruffinus gravissima suspicione premebatur, quod esset Origenista. Sub hoc enim titulo Arianorum hæresis conata est repullulascere*: "Ruffinus was grievously suspected to be an *Origenian heretic*. For under that name the *Arian heresy* began to revive." Thus, ye see, M. Harding, it was not so great an heresy to say that Ruffinus was an *heretic*.

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 12. Divis. 4.

Continually, for the space of five hundred years, the *emperor* alone appointed the *ecclesiastical assemblies*, and called the *councils* of the *bishops* together.

We now, therefore, marvel the more at the unreasonable dealing of the *bishop of Rome*, who, know-

Vinc. in Speculo. lib. 17. cap. 99.

[Erasm. in Epist. Hier. ad Princip. i. 123.]

Erasm. in Vita Hieron. [P. B. B. 3.]

Erasm. in Epist. Hier. ad Princip. [Hier. Opp. ed. Erasm. i. 124.] In Sch.

Erasm. in Argum. Epist. Theoph. ad Hieron. [Hier. Opp. ed. Erasm. ii. 315.]

Erasm. in Argum. Epist. Theoph. ad Hieron. [Hier. Opp. ed. Erasm. ii. 315.]

Erasm. de Lib. Origen. [viii. 367.]

ing what was the *emperor's* right, when the *church* was well ordered, knowing also that it is now a common right to all princes, for so much as kings are now fully possessed in the several parts of the whole *empire*, doth so without consideration assign that office alone to himself, and taketh it sufficient, in summoning a *general council*, to make that man, that is *prince* of the whole world, none otherwise partaker thereof, than he would make his own servant.

M. HARDING.

.....Where you say, The emperor alone celebrated, kept, or held councils, for so is your Latin, <sup>a</sup> it is too impudently faced, without any face, without proof, without truth. They were celebrated or holden <sup>b</sup> by the pope's legates, the patriarchs and bishops, and not by emperors. Albeit, emperors might sit in them, <sup>c</sup> but not as judges. And they have ever been called *episcopalia concilia*, not <sup>d</sup> *imperatoria*; "councils of bishops, not of emperors." And divers councils, not accounted general, were kept by bishops before any emperor was christened: as those which were kept by St. Peter in Jerusalem, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles: in the time of Victor the pope, in Pales- Acts xv. tina, and other places, concerning the keeping of Easter: at Rome, about the time of pope Fabian, against the Novatian heresy: at Antioch, against Paulus Samosatenus, and many others. All which councils were kept, not only without the presence of the emperor's person, but <sup>e</sup> also without his power or authority. And yet if he were head of the church, it could not have been done without him.

If you say, he was not then christened, I answer, that Christianity is no part of his imperial power. It is a spiritual power, whereby he is made the son of God. He may thereby be ruled by a Christian bishop. But, verily, he hath no power given to him, whereby he may rule bishops. <sup>f</sup> Baptism maketh a man the child of the church. But <sup>f</sup> it is imposition of hands, in consecrating a Christian priest to be a bishop, that giveth him rule over others, and not the sacrament of baptism. Therefore emperors were not the holders or keepers of councils the first five hundred years. Yea, three hundred were fully expired before the emperor professed openly the Christian faith. So much the less may you marvel, that now the bishop of Rome calleth and keepeth councils chiefly by his own authority. For he suc-

a This is M. Harding's modesty. Read the answer next going before this, saving one.

b Untruth, plain and evident. For many times the pope's legates were underlings, and inferiors unto others.

c Untruth. For the emperor's ambassadors sitting in council, were called *illustrissimi iudices*.

d No more were they called *concilia papalia*.

e So were the most part of the same councils kept without either the presence, or the power, or authority of the pope.

f O folly of follies! As if the emperor's power were either increased or impaired by his baptism.

ceedeth Peter, not Nero<sup>g</sup>. He took his authority of Christ immediately, not of the people of Rome. Be the emperor Christian or not Christian, the bishop of Rome, by <sup>h</sup> nature of his bishop's office, is not only always a Christian man, but also a chief priest.

Where you say, the bishop of Rome, in summoning the late council, did besides good consideration, in that he made a man, that is prince of the whole world, no otherwise partaker thereof, than he would make his own servant; you forget yourself foully, and seem to reckon little what you speak, so you utter your malice. For who is that, whom you call prince of the whole world? What contradiction is this? Said you not in the same sentence before, that kings are now fully possessed in the several parts of the whole empire? How then call you Ferdinand i prince of the whole world? Well, this is but one of the common ornaments of your rhetoric. Sir, the emperor Ferdinand, of famous memory, was not so abused of Pius the Fourth, that blessed man, bishop of Rome in these our days. Ye rather are they, who abuse the emperor's majesty. For ye depose him clean from his seat: ye find fault that ever Leo the Third made an emperor in the west. Ye complain openly, that the imperial majesty had not continued still at Constantinople; belike to the intent the Turk might now have had it, who is known to suffer in his dominions all faiths and religions: for which cause it may seem ye favour him. As for pope Pius that now is, he deferred the old privilege of honour unto the emperor Ferdinand, without the old burden. For whereas in old times <sup>k</sup> councils were holden by authority of the pope, <sup>k</sup> as Socrates witnesseth, yet the emperor bare the charge of calling the bishops together. But now the pope himself bare a great part of that burden, and communicated his purpose fully with the emperor... ..

<sup>g</sup> A substantial good reason. But what if St. Ambrose say, he succeedeth Judas?

<sup>h</sup> The pope a Christian man by nature of office.

<sup>i</sup> It is written in your own Gloss, *Jura communia dicunt, quod imperator est dominus mundi.*

<sup>k</sup> Untruths, two together: for neither was it so, nor does Socrates record it so.

*Lib. 8. cap. 2.*

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Whether it were the *emperor alone* that appointed *ecclesiastical councils*, it may appear by that we have already said. *The pope alone* I assure you it was not. Nay, the *emperor*, as it is said and proved before, oftentimes held such assemblies, when and where himself listed, whether the *pope* would or no. The *pope's* duty was only to appear amongst other bishops when he was called.

I grant such *councils* had their name of *bishops*, and were called *concilia episcopalia*, for that matters there were specially ordered by the discretion and judgment of the *bishops*. But will you therefore conclude, that the same *councils* pertained nothing to the *prince*? Certainly

the emperor *Constantinus* commanded all the *bishops* to appear before him, and to yield him a reckoning of their determinations in the *council*. This was the tenour of his writ: *Quotquot synodum Tyri habitam complexistis, sine mora ad pietatis nostræ castra properetis: ac re ipsa, quam sincere ac recte judicaveritis, ostendatis: idque coram me, quem sincerum esse Dei ministrum ne vos quidem ipsi negabitis: "As many of you as have kept the council at Tyrus, repair to our camp without delay, and shew me in deed how sincerely and rightly ye have proceeded: and that even before me, whom you yourselves cannot deny to be the sincere servant of God."*

Sozom. lib. 2.  
c. 28. [ii. 85.]  
Socrat. lib. 1.  
c. 33. [ii. 69.]

Tripart. Hist.  
lib. 2. cap. 2.

Athanasius was the greatest travailer in the *council of Nice* against the *Arians*: yet was then no *bishop*, but only a *deacon*. Your own *ceremoniary of Rome* telleth you, that *abbots* have right and authority to determine and subscribe in *council*, as well as *bishops*: and yet were they never called the *councils* of *abbots*, but only of *bishops*. Therefore, M. Harding, this guess is over simple, and serveth you not. But hereof we have sufficiently said before.

"Christianity" (ye say) "is no part of the imperial power." Ye might likewise have said, *Christianity is no part of the papal power*. Verily, it cannot well appear, that Peter and Paul had ever any such *Christianity*. The emperor's right is neither increased nor abated by his *baptism*. Whether he be faithful or unfaithful, he is the minister of God, and beareth the sword to punish sin.

Ye say: "The pope succeedeth Peter, and not Nero: therefore, he calleth and keepeth councils chiefly by his own authority." Of such proper *arguments*, M. Harding, we marvel not much, though ye make no store. Howbeit, some men have thought ye do St. Peter great wrong, appointing him such children to be his *heirs*. For many of them in all their dealings have resembled Nero more than Peter. St. Bernard saith thus unto pope Eugenius: *In his successisti, non Petro, sed Constantino*: "In these things ye have succeeded, not Peter the apostle, but the emperor Constantine." Pope Adrian the Fourth was wont to say,

Bern. de Consider. lib. 4.  
[cap. 3. vol. 1.  
P. 437. F.]

*Succedimus, non Petro in docendo, sed Romulo in parri-* Citatur ab  
*cidio*: “We succeed not Peter in teaching, but Romulus Ilyric. inter  
 in killing our brethren.” Testes veri-  
 [art. 210.]

Erasmus saith: *Pontifices nunc sunt vicarii [vicem occu-* Erasm. in  
*pant] Julii Cæsaris, Alexandri Magni, Cræsi, Xerxis: (non Adagio. Si-*  
*Christi,) non Petri*: “The popes now are the vicars of ieni Aicibia-  
 Julius Cæsar, of Alexander the Great, of Cræsus, and of dis. [Opp. ii.  
 Xerxes: not of Christ, nor of Peter.” It is written in a 689.]

sermon, bearing the name of St. Ambrose: *Qui debuerint* Ambros. Ci-  
*esse vicarii apostolorum, facti sunt socii Judæ [et præambuli tatur ab Il-*  
*Antichristi]*: “They that should have been the apostles Ilyric. inter  
 vicars, are now become Judas’ fellows.” Test. p. 142.  
 [art. 125.]

Robertus Gallus, that lived wellnear three hundred years past, imagineth Christ thus to say of the pope: *Quis posuit idolum hoc in* Rob. Gal.  
*sede mea, ut imperaret gregi meo?* “Who set this idol in cap. 5.  
 my room, and made him ruler over my flock?” And being so vile in his own house, how can he be glorious in the house of God?

“Yet” (you say) “the pope is always, not only a Christian man, but also a chief priest,” (not by faith, but) “by the nature of his office.” Even so your Gloss telleth you:

*Papa sanctitatem recipit a cathedra*: “The pope receiveth his holiness of his chair;” that is to say, of the nature of his office. Dist. 19. Sic  
 omnes. In  
 Glossa.

Cardinal Cusanus saith: *Veritas adhæret cathedrae, &c. Veritas per Christum cathedrae alligata est,.....* Nicol. Cusan.  
 ad Bohem.  
 epist. 2.  
 [836.]

*non personis. Ait enim, super cathedram Mosi sederunt scribæ et Pharisei*: “The truth cleaveth fast to the pope’s chair, &c. Christ hath nailed his truth to the pope’s chair, and not to his person. For he saith, ‘The scribes and Pharisees are placed in Moses’ chair.’” Another saith:

*Tametsi papa non sit bonus, tamen semper præsumitur esse bonus..... In papa si desint bona acquisita per meritum,* Dist. 40. Non  
 nos. In Glos-  
 sa.

*sufficiunt quæ a loci prædecessore præstantur*: “Notwithstanding the pope be not good, yet he is ever presumed to be good. If the pope lack good virtues of his own, the virtues of Peter his predecessor are sufficient.” Part hereof  
 hath been  
 touched be-  
 fore.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ M. Harding. “You bear your reader in hand, that *Nicolaus Cusanus* wrote a book intituled, *De*

*Auctoritate Ecclesiæ et Concilii, supra et contra Scripturam*<sup>7</sup>. Now, M. Jewel, if you be able to shew us any book of Cusanus so intituled, either in print, or in authentic written hand, I will say, that you will prove yourself a truer man than ever I took you to be, &c.” *The answer.* This matter, M. Harding, you have blazed out with such eloquence as is most meet for a man of your sobriety. Indeed, at what time I wrote mine answer, I had not that book of Cusanus, nor could not get it by any means, but was fain therein to use the report and credit of Matthias Flacius Illyricus, whom I think you will not deny to be a man of good reading. His words hereof are these: *Nicolai Cusani sententia de auctoritate ecclesiæ et concilii, supra et contra scripturas.* Hereupon you cry out in the mildness of your spirit: “A shameless man—a false harlot—an impudent liar—grown to such impudency—a slanderer—a bragger—a boaster of great reading,” &c. O, M. Harding, it were much fitter for a wise man to be sober, than thus to fare. But you pass along boldly and constantly, as your manner is.

M. Harding,  
412. B.

M. Harding. “Well, say you, perchance you will say, though the title be altered, yet the words out of the same epistle be truly recited, wherein consisteth the chief effect and principal purpose. If you so say, you will be proved no less a liar, and false reporter herein, than you have been in the rest. And, for example herein, I will bring even the very first place that you have alleged out of him. You tell us, pag. 55, that thus he saith: *Sequuntur scripturæ ecclesiam, et non e converso*: ‘The scriptures of God follow the church: but contrariwise, the church followeth not the scriptures.’ You have here clipped the author’s sentence, and quite altered the sense. His words are these: *Ecclesia igitur, sicut recipit scripturam, ita et interpretatur: sequuntur scripturæ ecclesiam, quæ prior est, et propter quam scripturæ, et non e converso*: “The church, as it receiveth the scripture, so doth it expound the same.

<sup>7</sup> [These words were printed in The margin of 1570 has the correct the margin of the ed. of 1567. reference to Cusan. ad Bohemos.]

The scriptures, therefore, do follow the church, which is the former, and for the which the scripture is ordained, and not contrariwise." Cusanus' words, in their right form, do both stand well, and have a good meaning. But your false changing of them causeth them to import an intolerable derogation of the scriptures, without any colour of truth. For as it is most true, that the church was before the scriptures, that is to say, the written word of God, and that the scriptures were ordained and appointed for the church; so it is very false, that the scriptures do follow the church, and the church not the scriptures. For why hath the church received the scriptures, but to follow them, and to put them in execution, both in our inward belief, and in our outward actions? Do you not blush, M. Jewel, thus wilfully to pervert that (with your false juggling, and conveying away of those words, *Quæ prior est, et propter quam scripturæ*), which before had a good right sense? You thought, belike, you should never hear hereof again, nor be called to any reckoning; or else ye would have had more regard to your good name and honesty, &c. You thought you would pass Illyricus an ace in falsehood, although he be his craft's master therein."

*The answer.* A fierce orator you are, and a favourable interpreter, M. Harding. Cardinal Cusanus must needs be defended, and stayed upright, in respect of his dignity; and whatsoever he hath written, it must have a right good catholic meaning. But poor M. Jewel must blush, and be ashamed of his juggling. But, I pray you, M. Harding, are not these Cusanus your doctor's own words? Doth he not say plainly, *Sequuntur scripturæ ecclesiam, et non e converso?* "The scriptures follow the church; but, contrariwise, the church followeth not the scriptures." You say, there be other words between, *Quæ prior est, et propter quam scripturæ*: that is to say, "The church was before the scriptures, and the scriptures are to serve the church." Is this the matter, M. Harding, that must make M. Jewel to change his colour? Or are these words sufficient to put Cusanus from his meaning? First he saith, "*The scriptures follow the church.*" Doth he afterward by

these words recant the same, and tell us, that the *church followeth the scriptures*?

You will say, Cusanus saith not, *the scriptures follow the church in authority, but only in time*: for he saith, “*The church was before the scriptures.*” So might he have said, *Moses* was before *Christ*: or, the *law* was before the *gospel*: or, the *synagogue* was before the *church*. But what had this been to his purpose? Awake a little, M. Harding, and remember yourself. Was this the question, that lay between cardinal Cusanus and the Bohemians, Whether the *church* or the *scriptures* were former in time? Or, if it were not the question, would he speak so much, and so vainly, as you oftentimes do, besides his purpose? Leave, leave this trifling, M. Harding: it will not help you. Learn rather to understand your doctor’s meaning by himself.

The matter, as you know, was this: The Bohemians required the *holy communion in both kinds*, and therein alleged the warrant of the *scriptures*. For Christ, said they, ordained and ministered the *communion* in both kinds. Cusanus defended the abuse and disorder of the *communion in one kind only*, and therein alleged the warrant of the *church of Rome*. Hereof this issue grew between them, whether they ought in cases of *religion* to follow the *church of Rome*, or rather the *scriptures*. To this Cusanus saith, “*The church of Rome* is above the *scriptures.*” This he layeth as a foundation of the whole. And, therefore, of the *scriptures* he speaketh full meanly, and very coldly, or rather disdainfully, as it shall appear, and alloweth all power and authority to the *church of Rome*. These things considered, I beseech you, to what purpose had it been for Cusanus to say, the *church* was before the *scriptures*? For the question was not, whether the *church* or the *scripture* were the elder, but, whether of these two, in trial of the truth, we ought rather to follow.

Now concerning the authority of the *church*, Cusanus saith thus: *Veritas adhæret cathedræ Petri:.....Universa catholica ecclesia ad Petri cathedram conglobata, a Christo*



*nunquam recedet:.....Hæc est una, quæ tenet et possidet omnem sponsi sui Domini potestatem:—Veritas cathedræ* [p. 836.]  
*per Christum alligata est, non personis: extra Romanam sanctam catholicam ecclesiam non est salus:—Quam firma est ædificatio ecclesiæ! Quia nemo decipi potest, etiam per malum præsentem.—Si dixeris, Domine obedivi tibi in præposito, hoc tibi sufficiet ad salutem: etiamsi præpositus de oneribus humeris tuis impositis, præceptis, et solutionibus rationem sit Deo redditurus. Tu enim per obedientiam, quam facis præposito, quem ecclesia tolerat, decipi nequis, etiamsi præceperit alia quam debuit. Quare sententia pastoris ligat te pro tua salute, propter bonum obedientiæ, etiamsi injusta fuerit. Nam ad te non attinet cognoscere, quod sententia sit injusta, nec conceditur tibi, ut non obedias, si tibi injusta videatur. Nulla enim esset obedientia, si in tuo arbitrio esset de sententia pastoris judicare.....Præsumit enim ecclesia de illa sententia: cui si tu obedieris, magna erit merces tua. Obedientia igitur irrationalis est consummata obedientia, et perfectissima: scilicet, quando obeditur sine inquisitione rationis, sicut jumentum obedit Domino suo, &c.: “The truth cleaveth fast to Peter’s chair: the whole universal catholic church, rolled up to Peter’s chair, shall never depart from Christ: this church” (of Rome) “is that only church that holdeth and possesseth all the power of the Lord, her spouse: Christ hath tied his truth to the chair, not to the persons of the bishops: without the holy catholic church of Rome there is no salvation: how strong is the building of the church! for no man can be deceived, no, not by an evil bishop: if thou say unto God, ‘O Lord, I have obeyed thee in my bishop,’ this shall suffice thee unto salvation: notwithstanding, the bishop, of his part, shall yield an account unto God for the burdens that he hath laid upon thy shoulders, for his commandments, and for thy payments. For thou canst not be deceived by thy obedience that thou yieldest to thy bishop, whom the church suffereth, although he command thee other things than he ought to do. Therefore, the bishop’s sentence, although it be unjust, bindeth thee for thy salvation, because of the goodness of obedience. For it behoveth not thee to know*

Cusan. Exci-  
tationum, lib.  
2. Non dice-  
ret. [p. 378.]  
Excitat. lib. 6.  
Ubi Ecclesia.  
[p. 547.]

No man can  
be deceived.

Unto salva-  
tion.

that his sentence is unjust: nor is it lawful for thee to disobey it, although thou take it to be unjust. For it were no obedience at all, if it were in thy power to judge of the sentence of thy bishop. For the church presumeth his sentence to be good: which sentence if thou obey, thy reward shall be great. Obedience, therefore, without reason, is a full and most perfect obedience: that is, when thou obeyest without requiring of reason, as a horse is obedient to his master." With such colours Cusanus adorneth and blazeth the majesty of the *church of Rome*, and such obedience and bondage he requireth to be yielded unto the same. *So must we be obedient unto the pope, as a horse is obedient unto his master.*

Obedience  
without rea-  
son:

As a horse  
is obedient to  
his master.

Now let us consider, in what regard he hath the *scriptures of God*, so shall we see, how far he placeth the one in authority before the other. Thus, therefore, he saith to the Bohemians: *Dicitis præcepto Christi obediendum esse primo loco, deinde ecclesiæ: et si aliud præceperit ecclesiæ, quam Christus, non ecclesiæ, sed Christo obediendum esse. Certe in hoc est omnium præsumptionum initium, quando judicant particulares suum sensum in divinis præceptis conformiorem, quam universæ ecclesiæ.*—(Intellige,) *scripturas esse ad tempus adaptatas et varie intellectas, ita ut uno tempore secundum currentem universalem ritum exponantur: mutato ritu, iterum sententia mutetur.*—*Non mirum, si praxis ecclesiæ uno tempore interpretetur scripturam uno modo, et alio tempore alio modo. Nam intellectus currit cum praxi. Intellectus enim qui cum praxi concurrat, est spiritus vivificans.*

Nic. Cusan. ad Bohemos epist. 2. Pag. 832.

Pag. 833.

Ep. 7. p. 857.

Ep. 2. p. 833.


Pag. 834.

Ep. 3. p. 838.

—*Fatum est ergo argumentum, velle universalem ecclesiæ ritum ex scripturis prædecessorum arguere. Legitur enim, apostolos non tradidisse fidem per scripturas, &c.*—*Hæc est omnium sane intelligentium sententia, qui scripturarum auctoritatem, aut intellectum in ecclesiæ auctoritate [l. approbatione] fundant, quæ unam accipit, et alteram abjicit: et non e converso, ecclesiæ firmamentum in scripturarum auctoritate locant.....Dicitis forsitan, Quomodo mutabuntur præcepta Christi auctoritate ecclesiæ, ut tunc sint obligatoria, quando ecclesiæ placuerit? Dico, nulla esse Christi præcepta, nisi quæ per ecclesiam pro talibus accepta sint.*—*Mutato judicio*

*ecclesiæ, mutatum est et Dei judicium*: “You say, we must first obey Christ’s commandment, and afterward the church. First, Christ. And if the church command us to do otherwise than Christ commandeth, we must then obey Christ, and not the church. Verily, herein standeth the beginning of all presumption, when particular men think their own judgment to be more agreeable to God’s commandments than the judgment of the universal church. Understand thou, that the *scriptures are appointed to serve the time, and have divers understandings: so that at one time they may be expounded after the universal, common, and ordinary custom*: and that, the same custom being changed, the meaning of the scriptures may likewise be changed. Presumption. Scriptures serve times. Scriptures changed. No marvel, though the practice of the church at one time do expound the scriptures after one sort, and at another time after another sort, for the understanding of the scriptures runneth with the practice of the church. Scriptures follow practice. For the understanding that runneth with the practice is the quickening spirit. It is a foolish enterprise, to go about to reprove the universal order of the church by the scriptures of our ancestors. A foolish enterprise. For we read, that the apostles delivered not the faith by the scriptures. Faith not by scriptures. This is the judgment of all that be wise, that *build and found the authority and understanding of the scriptures in the authority of the church*, which receiveth one scripture, and refuseth another: but, contrariwise, they build not the stay of the church in the authority of the scriptures. Perhaps you will say, How shall Christ’s commandments be changed by the authority of the church, that they shall bind us, when the church shall think it good? I tell thee, *There is nothing to be taken for Christ’s commandment, unless it be so allowed of the church. When the church hath once changed her judgment, God’s judgment is likewise changed.* Church not founded in the scriptures. Christ’s commandment without the church, is no commandment.”

Hereby, M. Harding, may you know cardinal Cusanus’ judgment, touching the *scriptures of Almighty God*. “*The scriptures,*” saith he, “*follow the practice of the church,*” not only in time, as you say, but also in authority and in credit. As for your *commentaries*, they are too simple,

and over partial, and a great way beside the text. Now judge you, indifferently, M. Harding, whether Cusanus say not, as I have alleged him: *Sequuntur scripturæ ecclesiam, et non e converso*: “The scriptures follow the church, but, contrariwise, the church followeth not the scriptures.” To conclude, hereby may you judge of the title of these *epistles*, wherewith you find yourself so much encumbered: *De autoritate ecclesiæ, supra et contra scripturas*. Certainly it is manifest by his plain words, that he placeth the authority of the *church*, not only above, but also against the authority of the *scriptures*. 

There were never so many *heretics* in any one *see*, as have been in the *see of Rome*, as I have already sufficiently and fully proved. And yet ye say, “*The pope cannot err.*” There were never so notorious examples, or, as Platina calleth them, Monsters of filthy life: “yet” (ye say) “they are all holy fathers, and hold their Christianity by nature of office.” Howbeit, your doctor, Alphonsus, saith: *Quamvis credere teneamur ex fide, verum Petri successorem esse supremum pastorem totius ecclesiæ, non tamen tenemur eadem fide credere, Leonem, aut Clementem esse verum Petri successorem*: “Although we be bound to believe, that the true successor of Peter is the highest pastor of all the church, yet are we not bound with like faith to believe, that pope Leo and pope Clement are the true successors of Peter.” John the Baptist said rightly unto the Pharisees that likewise made vaunts of their *succession*: “Never say Abraham is your father. For God is able even of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham.” Chrysostom saith: *Non locus sanctificat hominem, sed homo locum*:—*Nec cathedra facit sacerdotem, sed sacerdos cathedram*: “The place sanctifieth not the man, but the man sanctifieth the place. Neither doth the chair make the priest, but the priest maketh the chair.”

Nazianzene saith: *Non locorum est gratia, sed Spiritus*: “The grace of God goeth not by place, but by the Holy Ghost.”

Chrysostom saith: *Omnis Christianus qui suscipit ver-*

Platina in  
Benedict. iv.

Alphonsus  
advers. hæ-  
res. lib. 1.  
cap. 9. [p.  
55.]

Matt. iii. 9.

Chrys. in  
Opere im-  
perf. hom.  
43. [vi. app.  
183.]

Dist. 41.  
Mult.

Greg. Na-  
zianzen. in  
sanctum  
Lavacrum.  
[1. 711.]

*bum Petri, fit thronus Petri, et Petrus sedet in eo*: “Every Christian man that receiveth the word of Peter, is made Peter’s chair, and St. Peter resteth in him.”

Chrysost. in Mat. hom. 33. [In Oper. imperf. vi. app. 143. A.]

But here have you found out a foul contradiction in our words. “Who is he” (say you) “whom ye call the prince of the world?” Not the pope, M. Harding, lest ye should happily [haply] be deceived: notwithstanding your fellows have so often told us, *Papa totius orbis obtinet principatum*: “The pope hath the princehood of all the world.”

In Sexto lib. 3. Titul. 16. cap. Unico. [in glossa o.]

The *emperor’s majesty* we find oftentimes entitled by this name: but your *pope’s holiness* so entitled we find never: unless it be some certain late decrees and glosses of his own. Albeit, you of late have much abated the emperor’s honour, and have made him only the *pope’s man*. For thus ye say: *Imperator (Occidentis) est procurator, sive defensor Romanæ ecclesiæ*: “The emperor (of the West) is the proctor or steward of the church of Rome.”

Dist. 98. [l. 96.] 81 Imperator: in Glossa.

Yet Chrysostom saith: “*Imperator est summitas et caput omnium super terram hominum*; “The emperor is the top and head of all men upon the earth.” In the council of Chalcedon, the emperor is called, *Dominus universi mundi*: “The lord of the whole world<sup>8</sup>.”

Chrysost. ad Pop. Antioch. homil. 2. [ii. 23.] Concil. Chal. Act. 1. In nomine. [vi. 584.]

Perhaps ye will say, *The state of the empire is now impoverished*: and, therefore, the emperor hath lost his title. Yet your own doctors and glossers could have told you, *Jura communia dicunt, quod imperator est dominus mundi*: notwithstanding the decay of the empire, “The common laws say, that the emperor is the lord of the world.” Robert Holcot, speaking of the emperor of Germany, saith thus: “*Hic est rex regum, cui omnes subditæ sunt nationes et populi, &c.*: “The emperor is the king of kings, unto whom all nations and countries be in subjection.”

Extra [l. Extrav. comm.] de Majorit. et Obedient. Unam sanctam: in Glossa. [p. 194.] Holcot in Saplen. Lect. 199. [l. 200. p. 660.]

The Romans of late years wrote thus unto the emperor Conradus: *Excellentissimo et præclarissimo urbis et orbis totius domino, &c.*: “Unto the most excellent and most

Otho Frisingensis. [de gestis Frieder. 1. lib. 1. cap. 28.]

<sup>8</sup> [The same title is given to the emperors by Paschasius, the pope’s legate, himself. Mansi vii. p. 425.]

noble emperor, the lord both of the city of Rome, and also of all the whole world." Therefore, M. Harding, to move this vain quarrel without some cause, it was great folly.

"Councils" (ye say) "in old times were holden by authority of the pope." For proof whereof ye allege Socrates, in the eighth book, and the second chapter: but word or sentence ye allege none. Howbeit, it was a great oversight to allege the *eighth book* of Socrates, whereas Socrates himself never wrote but *seven*, and so far to overleap your author. Notwithstanding, this small error may well be dissembled amongst so many. Howbeit, touching the thing itself, ye may as easily find in the *eighth book* of Socrates, that never was written, as elsewhere. For, indeed, amongst all that ever he wrote, this thing certainly, that you allege, he wrote never.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 12. Divis. 5.*

And although the modesty and mildness of the emperor Ferdinando be so great, that he can bear this wrong, because peradventure he understandeth not well the pope's packing, yet ought not the pope of his holiness to offer him that wrong, nor to claim another man's right as his own. [Vol. iv. p. 80.]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 13. Divis. 1.*

But hereto some will reply, The *emperor*, indeed, called *councils* at that time ye speak of, because the *bishop of Rome* was not yet grown so great as he is now, but yet the *emperor* did not then sit together with the *bishops in council*, nor bear any stroke with his authority in their consultations. I answer, Nay, that it is not so. For, as witnesseth Theodoret, the emperor Constantine sat not only together with them in the *council of Nice*, but gave also advice to the *bishops*, how it was best to try out the matter by the *apostles' and prophets' writings*, as appeareth [Vol. iv. p. 80.]

by these his own words: "*In disputation*" (saith he) <sup>[Theodoret. lib. 1. c. 7. tom. iii. 26.]</sup> "*of matters of divinity, we have set before us to follow the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. For the evangelists' and the apostles' works, and the prophets' sayings, shew us sufficiently, what opinion we ought to have of the will of God.*"

## M. HARDING.

For the sitting of emperors in councils, you treat a common place not necessary. No man ever denied, but emperors may sit in them: we acknowledge two sorts of sitting: one for the assessors, another for the judge. <sup>a</sup>No emperor ever sat as a judge in council. But many, both emperors in person, and their lieutenants for them, have sitten, as being ready to assist and defend that, which the bishops had judged and decreed.

.....What manner a seat great Constantine had in the first council at Nice, Eusebius in his Life, and Theodoritus doth declare. After that all the bishops were set in their seats, to the number of 318, in came the emperor last with a small company.

<sup>b</sup>A low little chair being set for him in the midst, he would not sit down before the bishops had reverently signified so much unto him; and, as Theodoritus writeth, not before he had desired the bishops to permit him so to do. Now think you, that the supreme head of the church should have <sup>c</sup>come in last, and have sitten <sup>d</sup>beneath his subjects, and have staid to sit until they had as it were given him leave?

Neither consulted he with the bishops, but required them to consult of the matters they came for, as Theodorite witnesseth. Neither spake he there so generally as you report, nor framed his tale in that sort, as you fain, <sup>e</sup>universally of the will of God, <sup>e</sup>but of the Godhead, saying, that the books of the Gospels, and of the apostles, and the oracles of the prophets, do plainly teach us what we ought to think of the Godhead, *περὶ τοῦ Θείου*. For the controversy, about which the Arians made so much ado, was touching the equality of Godhead in Christ, and his consubstantiality with God the Father. And by those words and other, which there he uttered, he took not upon him to define or judge, but only to exhort them to agree together in one faith. For among those bishops certain there were that favoured the heresy of Arius. Such examples you bring for defence of your part, as make much against you. Not that you delight in making a rod for yourself, but because you have no better: and somewhat must you needs say, lest the stage you play your part on should stand still.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, Cusanus saith: *Invenio imperatores in conciliis judicium fecisse*. Read the answer.

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, enclosed. For this low little chair was all of beaten gold, and was set in the highest place of the council.

<sup>c</sup> Vain folly. For the prince never cometh into the parliament house before the lords be set.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth. For Sozomenus saith: *Erat thronus ille maximus, et alius omnes superans*.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth, evident. For Cassiodorus expoundeth it thus: *Quid de divina lege sapere debeat, mus*.

In Vita Constant. lib. 3. [l. 582.]

Theod. lib. 1. cap. 7. [iii. 26.]

ἐπιτρέψαι  
τοῦτο τοὺς  
ἐπισκόπους  
αἰτήσας.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“Emperors” (ye say) “sat in councils, as assessors only, but not as judges.” That is to say, they sat by the bishops, and held their peace, and told the clock, and said nothing. Yet your doctors say: *Assessor episcopi non potest esse laicus*: “The assessor of a bishop may not be a layman.” But, touching the matter itself, Eusebius, that was always near about the emperor Constantine, and wrote his life, and was present at the council, saith thus: *Constantinus, quasi communis quidam episcopus a Deo constitutus, ministrorum Dei synodos convocavit: nec dedignatus est adesse, et considerare in medio illorum, consorsque fieri ipsorum, &c.*: “Constantine, as if he had been a common bishop appointed by God, called together councils of God’s ministers: and disdained not himself to sit in the midst amongst them, and to be partaker of their doings.” Again, Constantine himself saith thus: *Ego intereram concilio, tanquam unus ex vobis*: “I was present at the council amongst you, as one of you.” Again Eusebius saith: *Unus et unicus Deus instituit Constantinum ministrum suum, et doctorem pietatis omnibus terris*: “The one and only God hath appointed Constantine to be his minister, and the doctor of true godliness unto all nations.” And Theodoretus saith: *Laudatissimus rex apostolicas curas suscipiebat animo suo: at pontifices, non solum non ædificare ecclesiam, sed etiam illius fundamenta labefactare conabantur*: “The good emperor had apostolic cares in his heart: but the bishops did not only not build up the church of God, but also overthrew the foundations of the same.” M. Harding saith: “The bishops did all, and the emperor did nothing.” But Theodoretus saith: “The emperor built up that the bishops had thrown down.”

And again Eusebius saith: *Constantinus erat vocalissimus Dei præco, (et quasi servator ac medicus animarum)*: “Constantine, the emperor, was a most clear preacher of God, and, as it were, the saviour and physician of souls<sup>9</sup>.”

<sup>9</sup> [The references here in the confused manner. The words in edit. of 1609 are printed in a very parenthesis have not been found;

De Præscrip-  
tis Statut. §.  
Assessorem.  
Geminianus.

Euseb. in Vita  
Const. [Orat.  
1. cap. 44. 1.  
524.]

Orat. iii. cap.  
16. [1. 586.]  
αὐτὸς δὲ  
καθάπερ εἶς  
ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐ-  
τύχανον  
συμπαρόν.  
Euseb. eo-  
dem loco. [1.  
579.]

Theod. lib. 1.  
cap. 24. [al.  
cap. 25. iii.  
58.]

[Euseb. in  
Vita Const.  
Orat. i. cap.  
4. tom. i. 500.]



In this sort Nicephorus writeth unto the emperor Emmanuel<sup>10</sup> Palæologus: *Tu es dux professionis fidei nostræ*, &c.: “Your *majesty* is the captain of the profession of our faith: your *majesty* hath restored the catholic and universal church. Your *majesty* hath reformed the *temple of God* from merchants, and exchangers of the heavenly doctrine, and from heretics, by the word of *truth*.”

Ye say, “When the bishops were set, in came the emperor last, with a small company.” Whereof ye would have us to gather, that he came only as some inferior person, and not as a judge. Howbeit, Theodoretus saith: *Constantinus jussit episcopos ingredi*: “*Constantine commanded the bishops to go in*.”

And Eusebius saith: *Sedit tota synodus reverenter, ut par fuit, cum silentio expectans adventum principis*: “The whole council sat in reverent and comely order, quietly and in silence, looking for the prince’s coming.”

This is no good proof, M. Harding, that the *emperor* in the *council* was inferior to the *bishops*. Nay, the *bishops* were commanded to take their places, to sit in silence, and to wait for the emperor’s coming, as it becometh subjects to wait for their prince. Again he saith: *Signo, quo adventus imperatoris indicatus est, dato, omnibus exurgentibus, ipse deinde ingressus est medius, tanquam aliquis Dei cælestis angelus*: “When the watchword was given, that the emperor was come, the bishops stood up from their places, and his majesty passed along through the midst of them, as if he had been an angel of God.”

“But the emperor” (ye say) “sat upon a little low stool, and therein shewed himself inferior to the bishops.” Yea, M. Harding, but Eusebius saith, that the same *little low stool* was made of whole beaten gold: and therein, I trow, as low as ye place him, he was somewhat above the bishops.

but the words, οἶόν τινα μέγιστον φωστῆρα καὶ κήρυκα μεγαλοφώνω-  
τατον τῆς ἀπλανοῦς θεοσεβείας, oc-  
cur in Constantini Vita Orat. 1. cap. 4.]

<sup>10</sup> [The emperor to whom Nicephorus dedicated his history, was Andronicus Senior Palæologus.]

Niceph. in  
Præfatione  
ad Emmanu-  
elem.  
[l. p. 14.]

Theod. lib. 1.  
c. 7. [iii. 26.]  
εἰσελθεῖν τε

ἐπέτρεψε.  
Euseb. in  
Vita Const.  
Orat. 3. cap.  
10. [l. 582.]

Σὺν κόσμῳ  
τῷ πρόποντι  
ἢ πᾶσα κα-  
θῆστο σύνο-  
δος.

Πάντων δὲ  
ἐξαναστάν-  
των ἐπὶ συν-  
θήματι τῆν  
βασιλείως  
εἰσοδον εἰδή-  
λου.

Σμικροῦ τι-  
νος αὐτῷ κα-  
θίσματος ὕ-  
λης χρυσοῦ  
πεποιημέ-  
νου.

Ye say, "He sat alow, and in the midst of the bishops." And hereof ye conclude, he was their *inferior*. So Julius Cæsar, notwithstanding he were the *emperor of Rome*, yet when he came into the *college of poets*, he was well contented to be placed in the lowest room: and yet was he not therefore their inferior.

Euseb. de  
Vita Const.  
Orat. 3. cap.  
10. [l. 582.]

Προελθῶν  
ἐπὶ τὴν πρώ-  
την τῶν τα-  
γματῶν ἀρ-  
χῆν.

[Sozom. lib.  
1. c. 19. ii.  
37.]

Μέγιστος δὲ  
ἦν οὗτος,  
καὶ τοὺς ἄλ-  
λους ὑπερ-  
φέρων.

But touching the *emperor Constantine's* place in the *council*, Eusebius saith thus: *Accessit ad summum gradum ordinum*: "He went up to the highest rising of all the benches." Sozomenus saith: *Imperator peruenit ad caput concilii, et sedit in throno quodam, quem ipse sibi fecerat.*

.....*Erat autem thronus ille maximus, et alios omnes superans* <sup>11</sup>: "The emperor went up to the head or highest place of the council, and sat down in a throne of estate, that he had prepared for himself. But this throne was very great, and far passed all the rest." In the mean season, the *pope's legate* sat, as it is said before, neither in the first place, nor in the second, nor in the third, but in the fourth. Hereby it seemeth to appear plainly, that Constantinus, the *emperor*, had his place in the *council* above all the bishops.

Notwithstanding, sithence that time the *pope* hath determined, it must now be otherwise. His order is this, as it hath been alleged before: *Sedes imperatoris parabitur, &c.*: "The *emperor's seat* shall be prepared next unto the *pope's seat*, and shall have two steps joined unto the same: but neither so broad nor so long as be the *pope's*. It shall be apparelled with cloth of gold: but canopy over the head it shall have none.....Howbeit, this thing is specially to be marked, that the place, whereupon the *emperor* sitteth,

Ceremon. lib.  
2. sect. 14. c.  
2. [fol. 140.]

<sup>11</sup> [. . . ἐπὶ θρόνου τινὸς ἐκάθισεν ὡσπερ αὐτῷ κατεσκευάστο, καὶ ἡ σύνοδος καθήσθαι ἐκελεύσθη. Παρεσκευάστο γὰρ ἐκατέρωθεν βάρβαρα πολλὰ, παρεκτεινόμενα τοῖς τοίχοις τοῦ βασιλείου οἴκου. μέγιστος δὲ ἦν οὗτος, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερφέρων. The words which bishop Jewel supposed to allude to the throne, seem rather to describe the palace or church. This is probable, not

only from the context, but from the fact, that Eusebius, speaking of the same locality, and of the arrangements for the council, uses very similar expressions: Ἐν αὐτῷ δὲ τῷ μεσαιάτῳ οἶκῳ τῶν βασιλείων, ὃς δὲ καὶ ὑπερφέρειν ἐδόκει μεγέθει τοὺς πάντας βάρβαρον τ' ἐν τάξει πλείονων ἐφ' ἐκατέραις τοῦ οἴκου πλευραῖς διατεθέντων κ. τ. λ. De Vita Constantini, lib. iii. cap. 10.]

may be no higher than the place where the *pope* setteth his feet." Thus we see, the *emperor* is allowed to sit at the *pope's* *footstool*: but in any case to mount no higher.

Et advertendum quod locus ubi sedet Imperator, non sit altior loco, ubi tenet pedes Pontifex.

"The emperor" (ye say) "stood still," (no doubt, with cap in hand,) "and durst not sit down without leave:" and thereby testified himself to be inferior to the bishops. These cold conclusions, M. Harding, will hardly serve you. For Trajanus, being the *emperor of Rome*, was contented himself to stand afoot, and, for honour's sake, commanded the *consuls* to sit down: yet was he not therefore inferior in dignity to the *consuls*.

Helena, the *empress*, apparelled herself like a servant, and ministered unto the *holy virgins*, and gave them water to their hands, as if indeed she had been their servant: yet was she not therefore inferior unto the *virgins*.

Ruffin. lib. 1. cap. 7. [leg. cap. 8.]

The same *emperor* Constantine, at the time of the *ecclesiastical sermons*, stood upright, and would not sit, for the reverence that he bare to the *word of God*. Yet was he not inferior to the *preacher*. This was that good emperor's modesty and humility, M. Harding, but not his duty. It were wisdom for *princes* to take heed, they commit not overmuch to your hands: for whatsoever they once yield of mere courtesy, straightway ye claim it as your own.

Euseb. in Vita Const. Orat. 4. c. 33. [1. 644.]

Howbeit, touching the *emperor's* sitting in the *council*, it was far otherwise than you report it. Sozomenus saith: *Imperator resedit in throno, qui illi paratus fuerat: et synodus jussa est sedere*: "The emperor sat down in his *chair of estate* provided for him: and" (then) "the council was commanded to sit down." Hereby it appeareth, the *emperor* needed not the bishops' leave, but rather gave leave to the bishops.

Sozom. lib. 1. c. 18. [11. 37.] Καὶ ἡ συνόδος καθήσθαι ἐκελεύσθη.

No doubt, that godly and mild *prince*, being in that reverend assembly, bare himself with much reverence. And therefore Eusebius saith, he sat not down, before the "bishops had beckoned unto him." But he added withal: *Post imperatorem, idem fecerunt omnes*: (not before, but) "after that the emperor was set, they sat down all together." Now, M. Harding, if he that sat first in the *council* were the *head of the church*, as you seem to say, then may

Euseb. in Vita Const. Orat. 3. c. 10. [1. 582.] οὐ πρότερον, ἢ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐπινεύσαι, ἐκάθισαι. ταυτὸ δ' ἐπραττον πάντες μετὰ βασιλέα.

I reason thus: The *pope* or his *legate* in that *council* sat not first: *ergo*, the *pope*, then, was not *head of the church*.

Again, the *emperor* in that *council* sat first: *ergo*, by your own conclusion, the *emperor* was the *head of the church*. Certainly, the *pope* himself saith plainly, *the emperor Constantine was the president or ruler of the Nicene council*. His words be these: *Constantinus præsidens sanctæ synodo, quæ apud Nicaam congregata est*: “Constantinus, the *emperor*, being president of the holy council that was kept at Nice.” These be not our words, but the *pope’s*<sup>12</sup>, registered even in his own records. Therefore, I trust, ye will not refuse to give them credit.

But you say, “The emperor determined and defined nothing.” Yet the *emperor* himself, contrary to your saying, saith thus: *Ego suscepi, et perfecì res salutiferas, persuasus verbo tuo*: “O Lord, I took in hand, and brought to pass wholesome things, being persuaded by thy word.”

And again, writing hereof unto the *bishops* of sundry *churches*, he saith: *Ego vobiscum interfui, tanquam unus ex vobis. Non enim negaverim, conservum me vestrum esse: qua de re mihi maxime gratulor*: “I was present at the *council* with you, as one of you. For I cannot deny myself to be your *fellow-servant*, in which thing I most rejoice.”

Likewise again he saith: *Ego Nicæam contraxi magnum numerum episcoporum: cum quibus, cum essem unus ex vobis, et conservus vester vehementer esse cuperem, etiam ipse suscepi inquisitionem veritatis*: “I caused a great company of *bishops* to come to Nice: with whom together, I took in hand the examination of the truth, being myself one of you, and much desiring to be therein your fellow-servant.”

Likewise saith Eusebius: *Imperator, quasi luculentam facem accendens, ne quæ occultæ erroris reliquie superessent, oculo regio circumspexit*: “The emperor, as having

<sup>12</sup> [Bp. Jewel appears, from his marginal note, to have attributed these words to Gregory I.; but the older edd. of the Decretum assign them to Melchiodes: the

ed. of Richter shews, from internal evidence, that this cannot be correct; and traces the passage to the forged Decretals of Isidorus.]

12. Qu. 1. Futuram. Greg. [I. Melchiodes.]

Euseb. in Vita Const. Orat. 2. c. 54. [i. 563.]

Euseb. in Vita Const. Orat. 3. c. 16. [i. 586.]

Socrat. lib. 1. c. 9. [ii. 30.] Καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἐξέτασιν ἀνεδέξατο.

Euseb. in Vita Const. Orat. 3. c. 11. [iii. 583.] ὀμματι βασιλικῶ περιεσκόπει.

enkindled a great flame, looked well about with his princely eye, that no privy remnants of error should rest behind<sup>13</sup>.”

The bishops in the same *Nicene council*, being at variance amongst themselves, offered up their books of accusation, not unto the *pope* or to his *legates*, of whom they had then no great regard, but unto the *emperor*. Neither did the *emperor* put over their quarrels unto the *pope's judgment*, but unto the *judgment of God*. Again, the same emperor Constantine saith: “*If any (bishop) wickedly offend, by the hand of God's servant, that is to say, by my hand, he shall be punished*”<sup>14</sup>.”

To be short, cardinal Cusanus saith: *Sciendum est, quod in universalibus octo conciliis, ubi imperatores interfuerunt et non papa, semper invenio imperatores, et iudices suos cum senatu primatum habuisse et officium præsidentiae per interloquutiones, et ex consensu synodi, sine mandato, conclusiones, et iudicia fecisse. Et non reperitur instantia in octo conciliis, præterquam in tertia actione concilii Chalcedonensis*: “We must know, that in the eight general councils, where the *emperors* were present, and not the *pope*, I evermore find, that the *emperors* and their *judges*, with the *senate*, had the *government* and *office of presidence*, by hearing and conferring of matters: and that they made conclusions and judgments, with the consent of the *council*, and without any further *commission*. And there is no manner instance or exception to be found in the first eight *councils*, saving only in the third action of the *council of Chalcedon*”<sup>15</sup>.”

Here ye see plainly, by the authority of cardinal Cusanus, one of your own special doctors, that, in the eight first general councils, the *emperor* was president, and not the *pope*.

Whereas the *emperor* willed the *bishops* to conclude

<sup>13</sup> [In the chapter referred to, there are only the following words at all resembling those printed in the margin: ὁ δὲ φαιδροῖς ὄμμασι τοῖς πᾶσι γαληνὸν ἐμβλέψας κ. τ. λ.]

<sup>14</sup> [Supra vi. p. 322. note <sup>56</sup>. It is clear, from the story, that the

emperor did punish the bishops; but these words refer, apparently, not more to the clergy than to the laity.]

<sup>15</sup> [The words are not found in the chapter referred to; but the substance is mainly correct.]

Socrat. lib. 1. c. 8. [tom. ii. p. 20.]

Theodoret. lib. 1. c. 19. [iii. 51.]

Card. Cusan. de Conc. lib. 3. cap. 16.

their matters by the *apostolical* and *prophetical scriptures*, He speaketh not (say you) so generally as we report him, nor frameth his tale in that sort, as we feign, universally of the will of God, but of the Godhead. For τὸ θεῖον, in your fancy, signifieth only the *substance and nature of God*, and not *God's will, or his religion*. Here, M. Harding, it were some point of learning, to know what skilful *Greek reader* told you this tale, that τὸ θεῖον is nothing else but the *Godhead, or nature of God*. Verily, Cassiodorus in plain wise translateth it thus: *Evangelici et apostolici libri erudiunt nos, quid de sacra lege sapiamus*: “The books of the evangelists and apostles teach us, what we ought to think” (not only of the *substance and nature of God*, but also) “of the *holy law*.”

Tripert. Hist.  
lib. 2. cap. 5.  
[p. 315.]

Therefore, Theodoretus addeth further these words: *Accipiamus explicationes questionum nostrarum ex dictis Sancti Spiritus*: “Let us take the resolution of our questions out of the words of the *Holy Ghost*<sup>16</sup>.” And immediately before he saith: *De rebus divinis disputantes, præscriptam habemus doctrinam Sancti Spiritus*: “In our disputations” (not only of the *Godhead*, but also) “of *godly matters*, we have laid before us the doctrine of the *holy gospel*.” In like sense St. Hilary saith: *Non est relictus hominum eloquiis de Dei rebus alius, præterquam Dei sermo. Omnia reliqua, et arcta, et conclusa, et impedita sunt, et obscura*: “In matters touching God, there is no speech left unto men, but only the word of God. All other authorities be short, and narrow, and dark, and troublesome.” Believe them not henceforth, therefore, M. Harding, that tell you, that τὸ θεῖον signifieth only the *substance and nature of God's divinity*. For, as ye may easily see, your Gloss is vain, and fighteth directly against the text.

Theodoret.  
lib. 1. cap. 7.  
[iii. 26. 27.]

περὶ θεῶν  
πραγμάτων.

Hilar. de  
Trin. lib. 7.  
[p. 942.] De  
rebus Dei:  
περὶ τοῦ  
θεοῦ.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 13. Divis. 2.

Socrat. lib. 5.  
c. 10. [ii. 275.]

The emperor Theodosius (as saith Socrates) did <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 80.]</sup> not only sit amongst the bishops, but also ordered

<sup>16</sup> [Theodoretus: ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων.]

the whole arguing of the cause, and tare in pieces the *heretics' books*, and allowed for good the judgment of the *catholics*.

M. HARDING.

It is a wonder to see, how these men abuse the ecclesiastical histories. Whereas they talk a little before of the sitting of emperors in general councils, a man would think, that now also Theodosius had been said to have sitten among bishops <sup>a</sup>in some general council. But there is no such matter. Theodosius, the emperor, conferred with Nectarius, the bishop of Constantinople, how all Christian men might be brought to an unity in faith. And after that Nectarius had learned of Sisinnius, a great clerk, the best way to be, if all the heads of each heresy and sect might be induced to be judged by the old fathers and doctors of the church; the godly emperor, hearing this advice, caused both the heretics and catholics also to write each of them such things as each of them had to say for his belief. And after prayer made, reading over all the writings, <sup>b</sup>he rejected the Arians, the Macedonians, and the Eunomians, <sup>b</sup>embracing only their sentence, who agreed upon the consubstantiality of the Son of God. Here (say these defenders) Theodosius did not only sit among the bishops, but also ordered the whole arguing of the cause, tearing the papers of the heretics, and allowing the judgment of the catholics. To which objection, I make this answer. First, that Theodosius here took counsel of Nectarius, the bishop, and followeth it. Secondly, that he intended not to judge, whether opinion of all the sects were truer, <sup>c</sup>but only sought how to rid the church of controversies. Otherwise, he would not only have taken counsel of Nectarius, the catholic bishop, but also of the Arians, Macedonians, and Eunomians. For he is not a right judge that calleth one side only to him, and in judgment is ruled by it. If, then, it be plain, that the emperor only consulted with catholics, it is no less plain, <sup>d</sup>that he sat not judge upon the catholics. What did he then? Verily he intended to execute that judgment, which the bishops had pronounced at Nice, and therefore he conferred only with men of that side. And because he was instructed, that by disputation no good should come, he chose this way, to make all to write their opinions. Not that he minded now to learn his faith out of their writings, sith he had learned that long before, and professed the same in his baptism: but he sought a way, whereby to put all heretics to silence. Therefore, having read all the writings, and having made his prayer to God for grace, <sup>e</sup>to choose the better side, which also he made, not doubting of his faith, (for else he were an infidel, and unworthy to be a judge, even in the temporal matters among Christians,) but partly he declared, that all goodness is to be

<sup>a</sup> As if a private council were no council.

<sup>b</sup> Fond folly. As though the emperor could condemn the heretics, or allow the catholics, without judgment.

<sup>c</sup> A worthy reason. The emperor sought means to abandon heresies: *ergo*, he judged not, whether part was the truer.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth, contrary to the plain story.

<sup>e</sup> And how could he make choice without judgment?

James i. 5.

i Cor. vi.

f Thus, M. Harding maketh the emperor a dissembling hypocrite.

asked of God, partly he would the heretics to understand, that he went not to work with affection, but with the fear of God. Thus, having prayed and readen the writings, he executed the judgment of the Nicene council, and rejected those heretics.....:

g A fond cavil. It was a private council of sundry bishops, and the judgment thereof was specially directed by the emperor.

Now, to return to the words of the Apology, how say they, that the emperor not only sat among bishops, but also *causa disceptationis præfuit*, was chief ruler and moderator of the reasoning and debating of the matter? They cannot say thus, as of a council, whereof they talk. ¶ For there was no council indicted, not only by the pope, but neither by the emperor, nor by any other archbishop. ¶ It was a private calling together of certain heads of each sect, and not a solemn ordinary council. If there were no council of bishops, no sitting of bishops: if no sitting, no presidency at all. How then was Theodosius president, and judge of ecclesiastical causes?

h Thus the emperor is become the bishop's man.

If we shall report the thing as it was in truth done, only Theodosius used a politic way to put heretics to silence. Other judgment he took not upon him, as he that protested always, that spiritual causes and controversies of doctrine, could not better be decided, than by bishops. For which saying, St. Ambrose praised him. So that we are sure of Theodosius, that he never meant to intermeddle with ecclesiastical matters, <sup>b</sup> otherwise than to execute the bishops' decrees.

In Actis  
Concil.  
Aquilien.  
[iii. 602. a.]

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“Here” (ye say) “it is a wonder to see, how these men abuse the ecclesiastical stories. It was a private council” (ye say) “whereat Theodosius was present, and not a general.” As if this poor help were sufficient to salve the matter: or, as if a *private council* were no *council*: or, as if an *emperor* might sit as a judge in *private councils*, and not in *general*. I cannot blame you, M. Harding, for seeking such shifts. A simple stick may make a stay. The story, in brief, is this: Theodosius, the emperor, the better to bring his *churches* into *unity*, commanded an assembly of the bishops and best learned to appear before him, and each part to write a several confession of his *faith*, that he himself might judge between them, which *faith* were the best. Having received their writings, he willed public prayers to be made, and also both openly and privately prayed himself, that it might please God to assist him with his holy Spirit, and to make him able to judge justly.

Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 12. [li. 293.]

Socr. lib. 5. c. 10. [li. 275.]



Then he perused and considered each *confession* asunder by itself: allowed only the *catholics*, and condemned the *confessions* that were written by the Arians and Eunomians, and tare them in pieces. This is the true report of the story, M. Harding. Whatsoever ye have added hereunto, as your manner is, it is your own. Now, whether the emperor Theodosius took upon him to *hear* and *determine ecclesiastical causes of religion*, or no, I report me to your own indifferent judgment.

But ye will say: "The emperor presumed not to judge any thing of himself, but was wholly ruled by the bishops, as the executor of their wills." And hereof, ye say, "ye are well assured." Thus, by your handling, ye make the *prince* only your *bishop's* man, to strike blindly whomsoever your *bishop* shall command: to condemn, to deprive, to spoil, to kill his own subjects: not of any judgment, or knowledge, but only upon the doubtful credit, and at the pleasure of your *bishop*. So simple ye make this *godly emperor* in his dealing. He willed the congregation to pray: he prayed himself, that God would direct him with his *Spirit*, and give him wisdom to discern the truth: he conferred the *confessions*: he weighed each reason: he allowed one side for true and godly: all the rest he condemned for false and wicked. "And yet" (ye say) "ye are sure of Theodosius, that he intended not to judge, whether of all these sects were the truer." And so, by your discretion, he both allowed and condemned, without judgment, he knew not what.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis.* 1.

In the *council of Chalcedon*, a *civil magistrate* condemned for heretics, by the sentence of his own mouth, the *bishops*, Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Thalassius, and gave judgment, to put them down from their dignities in the *church*.

[Vol. iv. p.  
8r.]

## M. HARDING.

Where true and good matter wanteth, for defence of this cause, these men care not what they bring, so they make a shew of some learning, to deceive the unlearned. First, for condemnation of heretics, by sentence of a civil magistrate, they allege the name of the long council of Chalcedon, not shewing in what action, or part thereof, it may be found. True it is, that all these three are named in that council, Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Thalassius. <sup>a</sup> But that all three were condemned, we find not. Much less, that they were condemned by any civil magistrate, do we find. The condemnation of Dioscorus, archbishop of Alexandria, was pronounced by the legates of the pope of Rome, in form as followeth.

a Untruth, enclosed, standing in ignorance: for if M. Harding had read the council, he might have found it.

Paschasinus, having asked the consent of the fathers present in the council, to the condemnation of Dioscorus, after his faults rehearsed, with his two fellows, Lucentius, bishop of Tusculane, and Bonifacius, priest of the great church of Rome, said: "The most holy and blessed archbishop of the great and elder Rome, Leo, by us, and by this present holy synod, with the thrice most blessed, and worthy of all praise, Peter, the apostle, <sup>b</sup> who is the rock and <sup>b</sup> highest top of the catholic church, and who is the <sup>b</sup> foundation of the right faith, hath deprived Dioscorus, as well of the dignity of his bishopric, as also of his priestly ministry." Actio. 3. [vi. 1047.]

b This was spoken even like the pope's legate. For St. Paul saith: "Christ was the Rock," &c.

c This is the patience of M. Harding's spirit. When he shall read the council, and see his own error, he will be colder.

d Untruth, vain and childish. For then there belonged no such authority to the see of Rome.

e Untruth, shameless above measure: for they never asked pardon for sitting without the pope's authority.

f M. Harding is well assured, before he know.

g Manifest untruth. Read the Answer.

This was the sentence pronounced by the pope's legates, in the name of the bishop of Rome, under the authority of Peter. Which sentence the whole council allowed. This being true, how did the civil magistrate condemn Dioscorus? Was then the bishop of Lilybeum, or the pope, in whose name he gave sentence, a civil magistrate? <sup>e</sup> What is impudency, what is licentious lying, what is deceitful dealing, if this be not?

Of Juvenalis, archbishop of Jerusalem, and Thalassius, archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, this much I say: They might well have a rebuke for misusing themselves in the second council at Ephesus, where they sate like judges, <sup>d</sup> without authority of the see of Rome; (which, as Lucentius said, in the synod of Chalcedon, was never orderly done, neither was it lawful to be done;) they might, I say, take a rebuke for so presuming besides the pope's authority: but forasmuch as they <sup>e</sup> maintained not their fact, but, among other bishops of the East, cried out, *Omnes peccavimus: omnes veniam postulamus*: "We have all sinned: we all beseech pardon." Yea, forasmuch as Juvenalis rejected the fault upon Elpidius, who did not command Eusebius, the accuser of Eutyches, to come in, and Thalassius said, he was not cause thereof, it may well be, they were pardoned, although the honourable judges and senate said unto them: *In judicio fidei non est defensio*: "In a judgment of faith, this is no excuse." But in case they were deposed, <sup>f</sup> then are we sure <sup>g</sup> it was not done by the civil magistrate, otherwise than that they might allow and execute the sentence of deposition before given. Action. 1. Ex nova translat.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

If the *council* of *Chalcedon* seem over long, with better reading ye may make it shorter. That Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Thalassius, were all three condemned in that *council*, that (ye say) ye find not. Howbeit, if ye had sought it better, ye might soon have found it. One of your own *friends* of Louvain saith, that herein ye were too much overseen. The very words, truly recorded in the *council*, are these: *Videtur nobis, justum esse, eidem pœnæ Dioscorum reverendum episcopum Alexandria, et Juvenalem reverendum episcopum Hierosolymorum, et Thalassium reverendum episcopum Cæsariæ Cappadociæ,.....subjacere: et a sancto concilio, secundum regulas, ab episcopali dignitate fieri alienos*: “Unto us it seemeth right, that Dioscorus, the reverend bishop of Alexandria, and Juvenalis, the reverend bishop of Jerusalem, and Thalassius, the reverend bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, should be put to the same punishment, and by the holy *council*, according to the *canons*, should be removed from their *episcopal dignities*.” The which words ye might also have found fully reported in Evagrius<sup>17</sup>.

Copus Dialog. 1. p. 28.

Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. p. 831. [ed. Crabb. Mansi vi. 936.]

Evagr. lib. 2. cap. 4. [tom. iii. p. 288. et cap. 18. p. 314.]

Leo Epist. 40. ad Anatolium. 1. 556.]

Likewise also saith pope Leo, touching the same: *De nominibus Dioscori, Juvenalis, et Eustachii (vel potius, Thalassii) ad sacrum altare non recitandis, dilectionem tuam hoc decet custodire*: “Touching the names of Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Eustathius, (or, rather, Thalassius,) not to be rehearsed at the holy altar,” (which was the *communion table*), “ye must keep this order.”

But ye say, “Notwithstanding these bishops were condemned in the council, yet the civil or lay judges condemned them not. For they were there” (ye say) “only to see good order, and to keep peace.” This, M. Harding, is your own only idle guess, without any manner further authority, only grounded upon yourself. Certainly the words of the *council* be plain: *Gloriosissimi iudices et amplissimus senatus dixerunt*: “The most noble judges, and

Conc. Chalced. Actio. 1. [vi. 936.]

<sup>17</sup> [The passage occurs first, in lib. 2. c. 4. of Evagrius, (tom. iii. p. 288., Reading—Vales.), and is

referred to and quoted during the subsequent proceedings, at p. 314., and p. 323, in the selfsame words.]

Evagr. lib. 2. cap. 4. [tom. iii. p. 288.]

most worthy senate said." Likewise saith Evagrius: Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς ἐψηφίσαντο τάδε: "The lords of the emperor's council decreed these things<sup>18</sup>."

Conc. Chalced. Act. 1. p. 831. [vi. 936.]

Neither were the civil judges then so scrupulous, to think they might not deal in cases of religion, as it may well appear by their words. For thus they say: *Gloriosissimi iudices et amplissimus senatus dixerunt, De recta et catholica fide perfectius sequenti die, convenienti concilio, diligentiore examinationem fieri oportere, perspicimus*: "The most noble judges, and most worthy senate, said, 'We see, that, touching the right catholic faith, the next day, when the council shall meet, there must be had a more diligent examination.'"

And, when the matters were concluded and published, the bishops of the East brake out into favourable shouts, in this sort: *Iustum et rectum iudicium: Vita longa senatui: Multi anni imperatori*: "Just and right is this judgment: Long life unto the senate: Many years unto the emperor." For in all cases, as well ecclesiastical as temporal, the emperor was judge over all. Whatsoever the council had determined, without the emperor's consent it had no force. And, therefore, both the bishops, and other temporal judges in the council, used oftentimes to suspend, and to stay their decrees in this sort: *Videtur nobis iustum, si placuerit divinisimo et piissimo domino nostro*: "Unto us it seemeth right, if it shall also like our most virtuous and most godly lord" (the emperor). In the end they conclude thus: *Omnibus, quæ acta sunt, ad sacrum apicem referendis*: "So that all our doings be remitted to the emperor's majesty." All which words are borrowed, as the rest, out of the ecclesiastical story of Evagrius.

Evagr. lib. 2. cap. 4. [tom. iii. p. 288.]  
εἰ παρασταίη τῷ θειοτάτῳ ἡμῶν δεσπότῃ.

Ye say: "Juvenalis and Thalassius might well have a rebuke for sitting like judges in the second council of Ephesus, without authority of the pope." O, M. Harding, either ye are much deceived, and presume to speak before ye know, which were great folly; or else ye speak directly

<sup>18</sup> [It should be added, however, absence of the civil judges. See that the formal act of deposition appears ultimately to have been pronounced by the bishops, in the Evagrius, tom. iii. 314. with Valesius' note.]

against your knowledge and conscience, and willingly seek to deceive others, which were great wickedness. Verily, ye might easily have known, that these three *bishops* were condemned, not for intruding upon the *pope's authority*, as ye have imagined, but only for condemning other *godly bishops*, wickedly, and without cause. The words of the *council* are plain: *Gloriosissimi iudices dixerunt, Vos quidem primum docuistis, quia per vim et necessitatem in pura charta coacti estis subscribere ad damnationem sanctæ memoriæ Flaviani. Orientales, et qui cum ipsis erant, reverendissimi episcopi, clamaverunt, Omnes peccavimus, omnes veniam postulamus*: “The most noble judges said, Ye have here proved before us, that ye were driven by force and violence, in a blank paper, to subscribe your names to the condemnation of Flavianus, of godly memory. The bishops of the East, and other reverend bishops that were with them, cried out, *We have all offended, we all desire pardon*”<sup>19</sup>. This, indeed, was their fault, M. Harding: all that you imagine, of usurping the *pope's authority*, is but a fancy. For the *pope's huge and universal authority*, whereby now he claimeth the whole jurisdiction of all the world, at that time was not known.

The same *council of Chalcedon* maketh him *equal in authority and dignity* with the *bishop of Constantinople*. The words be these: *Sedi senioris Romæ, propter imperium civitatis illius, patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt. Et eadem intentione permoti centum quinquaginta Deo amantissimi episcopi, æqua sanctissimæ sedi novæ Romæ privilegia tribuerunt; rationabiliter judicantes, imperio et senatu urbem ornatam, æquis senioris regis Romæ privilegiis frui, et in ecclesiasticis, sicut illa, majestatem habere negotiis*: “Unto the see of the old Rome, in consideration of the empire of that city, our fathers have accordingly given privileges. And upon like consideration, the hundred and fifty godly bishops have given *equal and like privileges to the city of new Rome*;” (whereby is meant the *city of Constantinople*;) “for that they thought it reasonable, that the same *city of Constantinople*, being now adorned with *empire and senate*, should also have *privileges*

Conc. Chalcedon. act. 1. [vi. 936.]  
[Evagr. tom. iii. 313.]

Conc. Chalcedon. act. 16. Consulat. [vii. 428.]

<sup>19</sup> [The reference to Mansi applies only to a part of this quotation.]

*equal with Rome the elder, and have the same majesty and authority in ecclesiastical affairs, that Rome hath."*

Thus, ye see, your *pope* had not then a power peerless over all the world: but was made like, and even, and equal, in all respects, to one of his brethren. Therefore, if the *bishop of Rome* were the *head of the church*, then was the *bishop of Constantinople* likewise the *head of the church*. And if the *bishop of Rome's power were universal*, then was the *bishop of Constantinople's power universal*, as well as his. For the council alloweth as much *ecclesiastical authority* to the one *bishop*, as to the other.

Now, shortly to consider the whole substance of your talk: first, ye say, "These three bishops, Dioscorus, Juvenalis, and Thalassius, were never condemned in the council of Chalcedon." This, ye see, is *one untruth*. Secondly, ye say, "The civil magistrate never condemned them." This is *another untruth*. Thirdly, ye say, "Juvenalis and Thalassius were rebuked for sitting as judges in council, without the pope's authority." These are *two other untruths*. For neither had the *pope* any such *prerogative* at that time, nor was this the cause of their condemnation. And yet, as if ye would run us over with terror of words, ye cry out with a courage, "What is impudency, what is licentious lying, what is deceitful dealing, if this be not?"

Touching these fiery terms, M. Harding, I dare not answer you. But as for *plain lying*, without a difference, if ye know not what it is, look through your own *books*, and ye cannot fail of it. Verily, it is to publish *untruths* so largely and so liberally, as you have done, only upon affiance of the simplicity and ignorance of your reader, without regard or fear of God or man.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. Divis. 2.

[Concil. Constant. 3. tom. xi. 656.]

In the *third council at Constantinople*, Constantine<sup>18</sup>, [Vol. iv. p. 81.]  
*a civil magistrate*, did not only sit amongst the *bishops*, but did also subscribe with them. For, saith he,  
*We have both read and subscribed.*

<sup>18</sup> [This was the emperor Constantine V. Pogonatus.]

M. HARDING.

The subscribing is not the matter, but the judging. Constantine subscribed to the council, as now all Christian princes, being required, ought to subscribe to the Tridentine council. <sup>a</sup> But Constantine used not this style when he subscribed, *Definiens subscripsi*, "I have subscribed with giving definitive sentence." <sup>b</sup> For so to subscribe, it appertained only to bishops.

<sup>a</sup> A vain distinction.  
<sup>b</sup> Untruth, manifest. Read the answer.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis.* 3.

In the *second council*, called *Arausicanum*, the *princes' ambassadors*, being *noblemen* born, not only spake their mind touching *religion*, but set to their hands also, as well as the *bishops*. For thus it is written in the latter end of that *council*: "*Petrus, Marcellinus, Felix, and Liberius*<sup>19</sup>, *being most noble men, and famous lieutenants, and captains of France, and also peers of the realm, have given their consent, and set to their hands.*" Further: "*Syagrius, Opilio, Pantagathus, Deodatus, Cariatto, and Marcellus, men of very great honour, have subscribed.*"

[Conc. Arausican. 2. tom. viii. 719.]

M. HARDING.

What if all the laymen of the world had subscribed by the word of consenting or agreeing to the bishops' decrees, each one writing thus, as in that case the old manner was, *Consentiens subscripsi*? What other thing is proved thereby, than that they thought it necessary to allow that which bishops had determined? Which we wish ye would do.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis.* 4.

If it be so then, that *lieutenants, chief captains, and peers*, have had authority to subscribe in *council*, have not *emperors* and *kings* the like authority?

<sup>19</sup> [Sirmond. ap. Mansi declares these to be the four names of one man. The subscription is in these terms: "Petrus Marcellinus Felix

"Liberius V. C. et illustris Præfectus prætorii Galliarum atque patricius, consentiens subscripsi."]

[Vol. iv. p. 81.]

[Vol. iv. p. 81.]

M. HARDING.

Kings and queens not only might, but ought to subscribe, when they are required<sup>20</sup>.....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here, M. Harding, ye are driven to many shifts. Some of you say, that *princes' ambassadors* and *civil magistrates* had no right to *subscribe in council*, but only by license and sufferance of the *bishops*. Some others have found out a certain difference in *subscriptions*. "The bishop" (ye say) "subscribed in one form, and the civil magistrate in another." The *bishop thus: Definiens subscripsi*: "By giving my definitive sentence, I have subscribed;" the *lay magistrate thus: Consentiens subscripsi*; "Giving consent hereto, I have subscribed." Thus have you found out a knot in a rush, and devised a *diversity* without a *difference*. Certainly, in the old councils there appeareth only *one form of subscription*, and no mo. And afterward these two words, *definiens* and *consentiens*, wherein you imagine so great a difference, were used indifferently, as well of *bishops*, as of others, as each man was best affected. Sometime the *bishop* subscribed, *Consentiens*: sometime the *layman* subscribed, *Definiens*, without scruple. In the *council of Chalcedon* it is written thus: *Ego Dorotheus episcopus consensi et subscripsi*: "I, bishop Dorothee, have consented and subscribed," &c. Likewise it is written in the *council of Paris*: *Ego Probianus, episcopus Bituricensis, consensi et subscripsi*: "I, Probiane, the bishop of Bourges, have consented and subscribed." Marius Victorinus saith: *Nicene fidei multa episcoporum millia consenserunt*: "Many thousand *bishops* consented unto the *Nicene faith*."

On the other side, the *lay prince in council* hath had authority, not only to *consent* and agree unto others, but also to *define* and *determine*, and that in cases of *religion*, as by many evident examples it may appear. Evagrius

*Consentiens  
subscripsi.*

Conc. Chalc.  
act. i. p. 780.  
[Mansi vi.  
749.]

Conc. Paris.  
[Crabb, ii,  
145. Mansi ix.  
747.]

Marius Vic-  
torin. contra  
Arian. lib. 2.

*Definiens  
subscripsi.*

<sup>20</sup> [Harding adds, "Queen Elizabeth ought to do so."]



saith, as it is before alleged: Οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς συγκλήτου βουλῆς Evag. lib. 2. cap. 4. [ill. 288.] ἐψηφίσαντο τάδε: “They that were of the senate or the lords of the council, determined these things.” Sozomenus saith: *Imperator Constantinus jussit.....decem episcopos orientis, et totidem occidentis, quos synodus designasset, ad aulam suam venire, et sibi exponere decreta concilii, ut ipse quoque consideraret, an secundum scripturas inter se convenissent, et de rebus agendis, quæ optima viderentur, determinaret:* “The emperor Constantine commanded, that ten bishops of the east, and ten of the west, chosen by the council, should repair to his court, and open unto him the decrees of the council, that his majesty might consider whether they were agreed according to the scriptures; and that he might further” (not only consent, or agree, but also) “determine and conclude what were best to be done.” Æneas Sylvius, which afterward was pope Pius II., saith thus: *Visum est Spiritui Sancto, et nobis: unde apparet, alios quam episcopos in conciliis habuisse vocem decidentem:* “It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost, and to us: hereby it appeareth, that some others beside bishops had a voice definitive in councils.” And again he saith: *Nec ego cujuscvis episcopi mendacium, quamvis ditissimi, veritati præponam pauperis presbyteri. Nec dedignari debet episcopus, si aliquando ignarus et rudis sequacem non habeat multitudinem:* “Neither will I set more by any bishop’s lie, be he never so rich, than I would set by any priest’s truth, be he never so poor. Neither may the ignorant and unlearned bishop disdain, if he see the people unwilling to follow him.”

Gerson saith: *Judicium et conclusio fidei, licet authoritative spectent ad prælatos et doctores, spectare tamen possunt ad alios quam theologos, deliberatio sicut et cognitio, super his quæ fidem respiciunt. Ita ut ad laicos etiam hoc possit extendi; et plus aliquando, quam ad multos clericorum:* “Notwithstanding the judgment and conclusion of faith belong by authority unto bishops and doctors, yet, as well the deliberation hereof, as also the knowledge and judgment, concerning matters that touch the faith, may

Sozom. lib. 4. cap. 15. [ll. 153.] ὥστε καὶ αὐτὸν συνιδεῖν, εἰ κατὰ τὰς ἱεράς γραφὰς συνέβησαν ἀλλήλοις, καὶ περὶ τῶν πρακτέων ἔπη ἂν ἔριστα δοκῆ ἔπιτελέσαι.

Æneas Sylvius de gestis Concil. Basil. lib. 1. [p. 27. c.]

Eodem loco. [p. 27. b.]

Gerson, Quæ veritates sint credendæ. [i. 419. a.]

belong unto others too, besides the divines, or doctors, and professors of *divinity*. Yea, it may sometimes be extended even unto the *laymen*: and more sometimes unto them, than unto many *priests*."

The emperor Justinian, in *ecclesiastical causes*, oftentimes useth these words: *Definimus, mandamus, jubemus*, &c.: "We *determine*, we *conclude*, we *command*, we *bid*." Touching *bishops*, he writeth thus: *Definimus, ut nullus Deo amabilium episcoporum foris a sua ecclesia, plus quam per totum annum, abesse audeat*: "We *define*, or *determine*, that none of the *godly bishops* shall dare to be absent from his *church* more than by the space of one whole year." Here ye see the *temporal prince*, in an *ecclesiastical cause*, saith, *Definimus*. To be short, pope Nicolas himself saith, writing unto the emperor Michael: *Ubinam legis, imperatores antecessores vestros synodalibus contentionibus interfuisse? Nisi forte in quibusdam, ubi de fide tractatum est: quæ universalis est: quæ omnium communis est: quæ non solum ad clericos, verum etiam ad laicos, et ad omnes omnino pertinet Christianos*: "Where have you read, that your *predecessors*, being *emperors*, were ever present at our disputations in *councils*; unless happily [*haply*] it were in *certain cases*, whereas matter was moved touching the *faith*? For *faith is universal*, and *common to all*: and pertaineth not only unto *priests*, but also unto *laymen*; and generally and thoroughly to all *Christians*."

Nicol. Cusan.  
de Concord.  
lib. 3. c. 16.  
[p. 798.]

Nicolaus Cusanus saith: *In sexta synodo Basilius imperator patriarchalium sedium vicariis, et patriarchis in subscriptione se postposuit ex humilitate, tota synodo rogante, ut se præponeret*: "In the sixth council of Constantinople, the emperor Basilius subscribeth his name after the legates of the patriarchal sees, and after the *patriarchs*: but this he did of *humility*. For the whole *council* besought him to subscribe his name before all others." Thus ye see, M. Harding, by the *pope's* own judgment, that cases and disputations of the *faith* belong as well to the *temporal prince* as to the *pope*.

Authen. Coll.  
1. tit. 6. Quo-  
modo oport.  
Episc. [c. 2.]

Dist. 96. U-  
binam.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 14. *Divis. 5.*

Truly there had been no need to handle so plain a matter as this is, with so many words, and so at length, if we had not to do with those men, who, for a desire they have to strive, and to win the mastery, use, of course, to deny all things, be they never so clear, yea, the very same which they presently see, and behold with their own eyes.

M. HARDING.

The matter ye speak of is so clear, that, from the beginning of the world to this day, <sup>a</sup>no secular prince can be named, who, by the ordinary power of a prince, without the gift of prophecy, or special revelation, did laudably intermeddle with religion, as a judge and ruler of spiritual causes. The reason thereof is clear. Religion is an order of divine worshipping, belonging to God only; whereupon no man hath power, but he that is called thereto by God. He is called, in the judgment of men, who can shew his calling outwardly, as by consecration, and imposition of hands. Priests and bishops are called to be the dispensators of the mysteries of God. In that consecration, the keys of knowledge and discretion, the power of binding and loosing is given.

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, evident, as by sundry examples it shall appear.

<sup>b</sup>If a secular prince cannot shew the keys given to him, how dareth he adventure to break up, rather than to open, the clasped book of God, the door of the church, and the gates of the kingdom of heaven? Wherefore St. Ambrose said unto Valentinian, *Quando audivisti, imperator, in causa fidei, laicos de episcopo judicasse?* "When hast thou heard, emperor, laymen to have been judges of a bishop in the cause of faith?" And yet now these men think, that which St. Ambrose never heard of, not only to have been used continually, the first five hundred years after Christ's birth, but also to be as clear a matter, as if we beheld it with our eyes.

<sup>b</sup> O vain man! What pertain these keys to general councils? For by them every poor priest hath as good right in council as the pope.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"The temporal prince" (ye say) "hath not the keys of the kingdom of heaven: *ergo*, he may not judge in ecclesiastical causes, nor give *definitive sentence in general council.*" This is a very silly, poor argument, M. Harding, as hereafter it shall appear. But St. Ambrose saith unto the emperor Valentinian: "When did your majesty ever hear, that in a *cause of faith, laymen were judges over*

[Vol. iv. p. 81.]

Matt. xvi. & xviii.

Lib. 5. epist. 32. [ll. 860.]

*bishops?*” Here, M. Harding, by the way, St. Ambrose giveth you to understand, that, unless it be in a *cause of faith*, a *layman* may be *judge over a bishop*: which thing is contrary, not only to your former *doctrine*, but also to the whole course and practice of your *church of Rome*.

Howbeit, touching the meaning of these words, it becometh us to know, *first*, the cause wherefore St. Ambrose so shunned and fled the *emperor's* judgment: *next*, before what judges he desired to be tried.

First, the emperor Valentinian at that time was very young, as well in age, as also in faith: he was not yet *baptized*: he knew not the principles of *Christ's religion*: he was an *Arian heretic*, and believed not the *Godhead of Christ*, but bent all his study and power to maintain the *Arians*: he would have thrust out the *Christians*, and would have possessed the *heretics* in their *churches*: and to that end had raised his power, and filled Milan full of soldiers: he said, it was lawful for him to do what him listed. Briefly, his whole dealing was full of force and violence, such as hath been seen in some countries, not many years sithence.

In consideration hereof, St. Ambrose worthily refused him to be his *judge*: and therefore he said unto him: *Tolle legem, si vis esse certamen*: “Take away the rigour of your *law*, if ye will have the matter tried by disputation.” Again: *Noli te gravare, imperator, ut putes te in ea quæ divina sunt, imperiale aliquod jus habere: noli te extollere:.....esto Deo subjectus. Scriptum est, Quæ Dei Deo, quæ Cæsaris Cæsari*: “O my lord, trouble not yourself to think you have any princely power over those things that pertain to God. Vaunt not yourself: be subject unto God. It is written, ‘Give unto God that belongeth unto God: give unto Cæsar that belongeth unto Cæsar.’”

But as St. Ambrose saith, “*The emperor hath no power over God's causes*,” so may we likewise, and as truly, say, *The pope hath no power over God's causes*. St. Chrysostom saith: *Siquidem est in causa fidei, fuge illum, et evita: non solum si homo fuerit, verum etiam si angelus de cælo descenderit*: “If it be a *matter of faith*” (wherein he seeketh

Part 6. cap. 9.  
divis. 2. [supra vi. 309.]

Allegatur imperatori licere omnia.

Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 33. [ii. 857.] Mandatur denique, Trade Basilicam.

Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 32. ad Valentin. [ii. 860.] lib. 5. epist. 33.

Chrysost. ad Hebræ. hom. 34. [xii. 311.]

to abuse thee), “flee him, and shun him; not only if he be a man, but also if an *angel* should come down from heaven.” Thus it appeareth, St. Ambrose refused not the *emperor’s power*, and authority of judgment, in *cases ecclesiastical*, but only his wilful ignorance, and his *tyranny*, for that he knew his judgment was corrupted, and not indifferent.

And for that cause he saith: *Venisset, imperator, ad consistorium clementiæ tuæ, &c.*: “O, my lord, I would have made mine appearance at your consistory, to have uttered these things in your presence, if either the *bishops* or the people would have suffered me. For they told me, that *matters of faith* ought to be disputed in the *church, openly before the people.*” Again he saith: *Veniant sane, si qui sunt, in ecclesiam: audiant cum populo: non ut quisquam resideat iudex, sed ut unusquisque de suo affectu habeat examen, et eligat quem sequatur*: “Let them hardly come to the *church*: let them hearken together with the people: not that any man should sit as judge, but that every man may, after his own mind, examine the matter, and so choose whom he may follow.” Of such *tyranny* in *councils*, Athanasius likewise complaineth: *Quo jure contra nos synodum ullam constituere potuerunt? Aut qua fronte talem conventum synodum appellare audent, cui comes præsedit? Ubi spiculator apparebat? Ubi commentariensis, sive carcerarius, pro diaconis ecclesiæ, adventantes introducebat?..... Comes imperio utebatur: nos a militibus ducebamur*: “By what law could they keep a *council* against us? Or with what face could they call such an *assembly* by the name of a *council*? whereas the lord *lieutenant* was president, where the hangman was apparitor, where the *jailer* presented the suitors instead of the *deacons* of the church? The *lieutenant* did all things by authority and commandment: we were taken by the *soldiers*, and carried to prison<sup>21</sup>.”

<sup>21</sup> [S. Athanasius Apol. contr. Arianos. This is taken from the synodical epistle of Alexandria: πῶς οὖν οὗτοι συνιέναι καθ' ἡμῶν ἤθελον; πῶς δὲ σύνοδον ὀνομάζειν

τολμῶσιν, ἧς κόμης προκάθητο, καὶ παρῆν σπεκουλάτωρ· καὶ Κομμεντάριος ἡμᾶς εἰσήγεν ἀντὶ διακόνων τῆς ἐκκλησίας; . . . ἐκείνος ἐκέλευεν, ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ στρατιωτῶν ἡγόμεθα.]

Ambros. lib. 5. epist. 32. [ii. 863.]

Dicentes de Fide, in Ecclesia coram populo debere tractari.

In eadem epist. [ii. 861.]

Athan. Apol. 2. [contra Arian.] Poteram. [1. 130.]

Athanas. ad  
solitariam  
vitam agen-  
tes. Has Li-  
teras. [i. 365.]

Therefore he saith: *Fiat ecclesiastica synodus longe a palatio: ubi nec imperator præsto est, nec comes se ingerit, nec iudex minatur: et ubi solus timor Dei ad omnia sufficit, &c.*: “Let there be made an *ecclesiastical synod*, far from the *emperor’s* palace: where as neither the *emperor* is present, nor the *lieutenant* thrusteth in himself, nor the *judge* with his threats maketh men afraid: but where as the fear of God to all purposes is sufficient<sup>22</sup>.” For this cause St. Ambrose refused to be tried by the emperor Valentinian: that is to say, as then it was, by a *rash young man*; by a man *unbaptized*, and, therefore, no *Christian*; by a *tyrant*; and by an *Arian heretic*, that utterly denied the Godhead of Christ.

Athan. Apol.  
2. Cum mul-  
tas. [i. 196.  
197.]

Otherwise, Athanasius himself was well contented to commit his whole cause unto the *emperor*. For thus he saith: *Postulamus causam istam pietissimo imperatori reservari: apud quem licebit, et jura ecclesiæ, et nostra proponere. Plane enim confidimus, ejus pietatem, cognitis nostris rationibus, nequaquam nos condemnaturam esse*: “We require, that the *emperor’s* most godly and most *religious majesty* may have the hearing of the same matter: before whom we may open both our *church’s* right, and also our own. For we have good hope, that his *godliness*, understanding our reasons, will never condemn us<sup>23</sup>.”

August. contra  
epist.  
Parneniani,  
lib. 1. [cap. 9.  
ix. 20.]

Likewise St. Augustine saith unto the *Donatian heretics*: *An forte de religione fas non est, ut dicat imperator, vel quos miserit imperator? Cur ergo ad imperatorem vestri venire legati? Cur eum fecerunt causæ suæ iudicem?* “Is it not lawful for the emperor, or his deputy, to give *sentence* in a matter of *religion*? Wherefore, then, went your

<sup>22</sup> [S. Athanasius ad solitariam vitam agentes: from the speech of pope Liberius to an emissary of the emperor: καὶ γενέσθω λοιπὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὴ σύνοδος μακρὰν τοῦ Παλατίου, ἐν ἧ βασιλεὺς οὐ παρῆστω, οὐ κόμης παραγίνεται, οὐ δικαστῆς ἀπειλεῖ, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβος ἀρκεῖ, καὶ ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διάταξις.]

<sup>23</sup> [S. Athan. Apol. 2: an ex-

tract from an epistle of the Egyptian bishops assembled at Tyre, to Comes Flavius Dionysius: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῷ εὐσεβεστάτῳ καὶ θεοφιλεστάτῳ βασιλεῖ τηρηθῆναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀξιούμεν, παρ’ ᾧ δυνάμεθα καὶ τὰ δίκαια τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ἐαυτῶν παραθέσθαι. πιστεύομεν γὰρ ὅτι ἡ εὐσέβεια αὐτοῦ ἀκούσασα οὐ καταγνώσεται ἡμῶν.]

ambassadors to the emperor? Why made they him the judge of their cause?"

Thus, M. Harding, it appeareth, that you, in defrauding emperors and kings of their imperial and princely right, are fain to take part with the *Donatian heretics*.

As for us, we claim no other right in ecclesiastical causes, unto our *Christian princes* this day, than that may well appear hath been justly used both by Constantinus, the emperor, and also by other catholic and godly princes.

The emperor Theodosius wrote thus unto the council of Chalcedon: *Quoniam scimus, magnificentissimum Florentium patritium esse fidelem, et probatum in recta fide, volumus eum interesse audientie synodi, quoniam sermo de fide est*: "For that we know the most noble Florentius to be faithful and well approved in the right faith, therefore we will, that he be present at the hearing and debating of cases in the council, forasmuch as the *disputation is of the faith*."

For pope Nicolas himself saith, as it is alleged before: *Fides universalis est: fides omnium communis est: fides non solum ad clericos, verum etiam ad laicos, et ad omnes omnino pertinet Christianos*: "a Faith is universal: faith is common to all: faith pertaineth not only unto priests, but also unto laymen, and, generally, to all Christians."

As touching the pope, and his universality of power, in, and over all councils of bishops, we may rightly say, as Athanasius saith of Constantius, the Arian emperor: *Obtendit in speciem episcoporum iudicium: sed interim facit, quod ipsi libet..... Quid opus est hominibus titulo episcopis?* "He maketh a show of judgments or determinations of bishops: in the mean while he doth what he listeth himself. What are we the nearer for these men, that bear only the name of bishops?" Such commonly be the pope's prelates. Whatsoever learning they have besides, divinity is commonly the least part of their study. And, therefore, when they are assembled in council, they may well judge by authority, but not by learning.

Verily, Luitprandus saith: *Imperator, uti experientia didicimus, intelligit negotia Dei, et facit, et amat ea: et*

Liberatus, cap. 11. [p. 64.]

Dist. 96. Ubi nam.

a He speaketh of questions of faith moved in councils.

Athan. ad solitariam vitam agentes. [l. 375. 376.]

Luitprandus. Johan. 13. [Rer. gest. lib. 6. c. 6.]

*tuetur omnibus viribus et ecclesiasticas res, et civiles. Sed Johannes papa facit contra hæc omnia: "We see by experience, that the emperor understandeth God's causes, and favoureth, and performeth the same: and with all his power maintaineth both ecclesiastical and temporal matters. But pope John doth all the contrary<sup>24</sup>."*

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 14. Divis. 6.*

The emperor Justinian made a law to correct the behaviour of the *clergy*, and to cut short the insolent lewdness of the *priests*. And albeit he were a *Christian*, and a *catholic prince*, yet put he down from their *papal throne*, two *popes*, Sylverius and Vigilus, notwithstanding they were *Peter's successors*, and *Christ's vicars*. [Vol. iv. p. 81.]

M. HARDING.

Justinian's law, concerning good order to be kept among priests, morally, was good, and bound them by the force of reason. If he made any other law touching matters of religion, pope Joannes, then being, approved it, or at the least Justinian <sup>a</sup> asked approbation thereof, <sup>a</sup> as it may appear in his own epistle, wherein he confesseth in the fact itself, that his laws could not bind in supernatural causes belonging to faith, except the head of the universal church confirm them. Sylverius and Vigilus were deposed rather by Theodora, the empress, than by Justinian, the emperor. <sup>b</sup> Ye do wrong to impute that wicked tyranny unto him. <sup>b</sup> He is not to be burthened therewith, unless the man be countable for his wife's iniquities.....

a Untruth. For he did but confer with the pope touching his laws. Touching the asking of allowance, there appeareth nothing.  
b Untruth. For it was no tyranny, but just judgment. And Justinian gave Belisarius great thanks for so doing.

Howsoever it was, that extraordinary violence and tyranny cannot justly be alleged to the defence of your false assertion. Neither would yourself have mentioned the same, if ye could have found better matter. As hungry dogs eat dirty puddings, according to the proverb, clean enough for such unclean writers, so your foul matters be defended by foul facts.

<sup>24</sup> [Bishop Jewel has evidently quoted from memory. The words of Luitprandus are, "Imperator, quemadmodum re ipsa experti sumus, ea quæ Dei sunt sapit, operatur; diligit ecclesiastica: et sæcularia negotia armis tatur: moribus ornat: legibus emendat. Joannes papa his omnibus adversatur."]



## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

“Justinian” (ye say) “might well make some moral law to keep priests and bishops in good order.” Wherein, nevertheless, pope Paul III. condemneth you utterly. For thus he writeth, and reasoneth substantially against the emperor, Charles the Fifth: *Ecce ego super pastores meos*: Ezek. xxxiv. “Behold, saith Almighty God, I myself will oversee my shepherds:” *ergo*, saith pope Paulus, The emperor may not deal with the manners of *priests* and *bishops*. Thus it appeareth the *pope* and M. Harding cannot agree.

Paul. 3. in  
epist. ad Ca-  
rol. 5. [p.  
162.]

Howbeit, the *emperors* made *laws*, touching the *holy Trinity*: touching the *faith*: touching *baptism*: touching the *holy communion*: touching the *public prayers*: touching the *scriptures*: touching the keeping of *holy days*: touching *churches* and *chapels*: touching the *consecration of bishops*: touching *non-residences*: touching *perjury*, &c.

Addition.

*Addition.* ☞ Michael, an emperor of the East, contrary to the custom and order of the *church*, made a law that no *monk* should serve the *ministry* in any *cure*. The emperor Justinian giveth licence to a *bishop*, to release a *priest* from part of his *penance*, and to restore him to the *ministry*. *Emperors* had authority to appoint *patriarchal sees*, and that not by warrant from the *pope*, but as Balsamon saith: *Secundum potestatem illis desuper datam*; “According to that power, that is given to them from above.” By the *ecclesiastical laws*, no *bishop* may give orders without his own *diocese*. Yet Balsamon saith: *Characterem dare extra diocesim imperatorio jussu permisum est*: “A *bishop* being without his own *diocese* may give orders, so that the *emperor* so command him.” Here we see, the *emperor’s* commandment is above the *law* of the *church*. By the *apostles’ canons*, a *priest* may not wander from one *diocese* or *cure* to another. Yet Balsamon saith: *Nota, quod etiam imperatori concessum est, facere clericorum translationes*: “Mark thou, that the *emperor* hath a privilege to translate *priests* from one *cure* to another.” ☞

Balsam. [iu  
Photium] de  
Fide, titulo  
1. [cap. 3.]

Balsam. de  
peccatis  
episc. tit. 9.  
[cap. 38.]

Balsam. in  
Conc. Chal.  
cap. 12.

Balsam. in  
Canon.  
Apost. Can.  
14.

Balsam. in  
Canon.  
Apost. Can.  
16.

It were much for you, M. Harding, to say, as now ye

would seem to say, All these were moral laws, and pertained only to good order. "But the pope" (ye say) "allowed the emperor's ecclesiastical laws; otherwise, of the emperor's own authority, they had no force." The truth hereof, by the particulars, may soon appear.

Cod. [lib. 1. tit. 2.] de Sacrosanct. Eccl. : Omni innovazione.

By one of the *emperor's laws*, it is provided, That the *bishops of Constantinople* shall have *equal power and prerogative* with the *bishop of Rome*. This law the *pope* could never brook. And yet, that notwithstanding, Liberatus saith: "It holdeth still by the *emperor's authority*, whether the *pope* will or no." Again, it is provided in the same law, that the *churches* [ed. 1570, church] of *Illyricum*, in their doubtful cases, shall appeal to *Constantinople*, and not to *Rome*.

Liberat. cap. 13. [p. 94.] Imperatoris patrocinio. Cod. [lib. 1. tit. 2.] de Sacrosanct. Ecclesiis : Omni innovazione.

Theod. lib. 1. cap. 20. [iii. 51.] Ministri Dei, hoc est, mea manu coerebitur.

The emperor Constantine saith: "If the bishop move trouble" (by doctrine, or otherwise), "by my hand he shall be punished: for my hand is the hand of God's minister<sup>15</sup>."

Auth. tit. 123. [ap. Haloand. fol. 344. a.]

Justinian, the emperor, in his law, commandeth, That the priest, or bishop, in pronouncing the public prayers, and in the ministration of the sacraments, lift up his voice, and speak aloud, that the people may say, *Amen*, and be stirred to more devotion. Again he saith, as it is noted

Authen. coll. 1. Quomodo oporteat Episcopos. [tit. 6. cap. 1. gloss. s.]

in the Gloss upon the Authentics: *Papa temporalibus..... immiscere se non debet*: "The pope may not intermeddle with temporal causes."

Authen. col. 9. tit. 15. [leg. tit. 6. c. 3. Novell. 123.] de Sanctiss. Episcopis: Jubemus Beatissimos Archiepiscopos, Senioris Romæ, &c.

In the same laws, the same emperor Justinian saith: "We command the most holy archbishops and patriarchs, of Rome, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Antioch, [Theopolis,] and of Jerusalem." The same emperor Justinian commandeth, That all monks either be driven to study the scriptures, or else be forced to bodily labour. Carolus Magnus made a law, That nothing should be read openly in the church, saving only the canonical books of the holy scriptures. And that the faithful people should receive the holy communion every Sunday. I leave the rehearsal of infinite other like examples.

Auth. tit. 133. [Coll. 9. cap. 6.]

Ansfg. tit. 1. cap. 13. [leg. cap. 20. fol. 9.] Carol. Magn. lib. 6. cap. 162. [leg. cap. 167. fol. 159. b.]

Now, M. Harding, will you say, or may we believe,

<sup>25</sup> [See note <sup>56</sup>, p. 322. of this volume.]

that all these, and other like laws, were allowed by the pope? Verily, certain of them are made directly against the pope.

Indeed your glosser saith: *Ad quid intromittit se imperator de spiritualibus, vel ecclesiasticis, cum sciat ad se non pertinere?* "Wherefore doth the emperor thus busy himself with these spiritual or ecclesiastical matters, seeing he knoweth they are no part of his charge?" To so profound a question, after a long solemn study, he deviseth this answer: *Dic, quod autoritate papæ hoc facit:* "Say thou, that he doth it by the pope's authority." And then the whole matter is discharged, and all is well.

Notwithstanding, some likelihood hereof ye would seem to gather, even out of Justinian's own words. For thus he saith unto the pope, although far otherwise than you have forced him to say:.....*Omnia quæ ad ecclesiarum statum pertinent, festinavimus ad notitiam deferre vestræ sanctitatis.....Necessarium ducimus [al. duximus], ut ad notitiam vestræ sanctitatis pervenirent. Nec enim patimur, quicquam, quod ad ecclesiarum statum pertinet,.....ut non etiam vestræ innotescat sanctitati: quæ caput est omnium sanctarum ecclesiarum:* "Whatsoever things pertain to the state of the churches, we have speedily brought to the knowledge of your holiness. We thought it necessary that your holiness should have knowledge thereof. We suffer not any thing, that concerneth the state of the churches, but it be brought to the knowledge of your holiness, which is the head or chief of all the holy churches."

The emperor willeth the pope to take knowledge of his laws, for that he was the chief of the four principal patriarchs, and, in respect of his see, the greatest bishop of all the world: for which cause also he calleth him the head or chief of all churches. So Justinian saith: *Roma est caput orbis terrarum:* "Rome is the head of all the world." So St. Chrysostom saith: *Caput prophetarum Elias:* "Elias the head of the prophets." So saith Prudentius: *Sancta Bethlem caput est orbis.....:* "The holy town of Bethlehem is the head of the world."

Auth. col. 1. tit. 6. [cap. 1.] Quomodo oportet. Gloss. in verbum Sanctimus.

Cod. [lib. 1. tit. 1.] de Sum. Trin. et fid. cathol.: Interclaras. [leg. Reddentes.]

Cod. de veteri jure enucleando. [tom. iv. tit. 20. fol. 32. col. 1.] Chrysost. ad Roman. hom. 18. [ix. 636. B.] Prudent. in Enchiridio. [p. 6.]

Nazian. in  
ep. ad Basil.  
14. [at. 46. ii.  
p. 41.]

So Nazianzene calleth St. Basil, Τὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης ὀφθαλμόν, *Oculum orbis terrarum*: “The eye of all the earth.” So Justinian calleth the bishop of Constantinople, an *universal patriarch*: *Epiphanio universali patriarchæ*.

Auth. col. 1.  
[tit. 3.]

These, and other like words, pass oftentimes in favour as titles of honour. But they import not always that *universal government* or *infinite authority*, that the *pope* sithence hath imagined. But touching the *confirmation* and allowance of the *emperor's laws*, in these words of Justinian, ye find nothing: unless ye will say, *notitia* is Latin for *allowance*: or, *pervenire* is Latin to *confirm*.

Ut determinatus. [tom. v. fol. 7. col. 1.]

Cod. de Summa Trinit. et Fide cathol.: Inter claras. [tom. iv. fol. 4. col. 4. 5.]

The *emperor's* purpose was, as it plainly appeareth by his words, by these and all other means to bring the *see of Rome* into credit. For thus he saith: *Properamus, honorem, et auctoritatem crescere sedis vestræ . . . . . : omnes sacerdotes universi orientalis tractus, et subjicere, et unire sedi vestræ sanctitatis properavimus . . . . . Plus ita vestræ sedis crescet auctoritas*: “We labour to advance the honour and authority of your see: we labour to subdue and to join all the priests of the east part unto the *see of your holiness*. Thus shall the authority of your see the more increase.”

Greg. Hal-  
ander et Azo.

Notwithstanding, it is noted by the learned of your own side, that these *epistles* between the *emperor* and the *pope*, in the *oldest allowed books*, are not found: and therefore are suspected to savour of some Roman forgery. Hereby it is easy to understand, that until the time of the emperor Justinian, which was well near six hundred years after Christ, the bishops of the *east church* were not subject to the *bishop of Rome*, and that for so long time the *pope* was not yet known for the *head* of the *universal church of God*.

Hervæus [l. Johan. de Paris.] de potest. Papæ, cap. 17.

One of your own allowed doctors saith thus: *Dicere, quod princeps non potest facere leges, vel eis uti, quousque fuerint approbatæ per papam, falsum est*: “To say that the prince cannot either make or use his laws before the pope have allowed them, it is plainly false<sup>26</sup>.” Abbot Panor-

<sup>26</sup> [The marginal reference to take of Hervæus for Johan. Paris. which had been omitted in this passage, (with the usual mis- ris.)]

mitane, to qualify the matter, saith thus: *Lex principis præjudicialis ecclesiis, non extenditur ad ecclesias, nisi expressè approbetur per papam: sed, si favet ecclesiis, intelligitur approbata, nisi expresse reprobetur*: “The prince’s law, if it be prejudicial or hurtful to the church, is not extended unto the church, unless it be expressly allowed by the pope: but if it be profitable for the church, we must think it is allowed, unless it be expressly disallowed.”

But here, M. Harding, this one thing ye may note by the way, that notwithstanding you cannot find by any shift or colour, whereof ye lack no store, that the *pope hath authority to allow the emperor’s laws*, yet of the other side we are able readily to find, that the *emperor hath authority to allow the pope’s laws*. For so the emperor Justinian himself saith: *A præcedentibus nos imperatoribus, et a nobis ipsis recte dictum est, oportere sacras regulas pro legibus valere*: “It is well said, both by other emperors, our predecessors, and also by us, that the holy canons must be holden for laws.”

Likewise saith pope Honorius III.: *Imperator Justinianus decrevit, ut canones patrum vim legum habere oporteat*: “The emperor Justinian hath decreed, that the *canons of the fathers* shall have the force of laws.”

But what can be so plain as that Justinian hereof writeth himself? These be his words: *Nisi intra præscriptum tempus ad ecclesias suas redeant, deponantur, et alii in illorum locum surrogentur, idque autoritate et vi hujus præsentis legis*: “Unless bishops and priests repair again unto their churches by a day appointed, let them be deprived from their livings, and let others be placed in their rooms,” (not by the authority of the *pope*, but) “*by the force and authority of this present law*”<sup>27</sup>. So saith St. Augustine: *Reges in terris serviunt [al. serviant] Christo, faciendo leges pro Christo*: “Kings in the world serve Christ, in that

Extr. de Constit. [Eccles.] Sanc. Mariæ. Numer. 9. [Panor. tom. 1. pt. 1. fol. 31. col. 2.]

Auth. Coll. 1. [tit. 6. cap. 1. §. 8.] Quomodo oporteat.

Extra de Juramen. Calum. Inhaerentes. [lib. 2. tit. 7. cap. 1.]

Authen. de Eccles. diversis capitulis. [coll. 9. tit. 6. cap. 9.] κατὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς νόμον δύναμιν.

Aug. ep. 48. [li. 239.]

the edit. of 1609, is here restored from that of 1567. In that of 1570, where the mistake in the name was corrected, the chapter

was cited as cap. 18.]

<sup>27</sup> [See this passage in Greek, ap. Haloand. Novell. ed. Græc. fol. 343. a.]

they make laws for Christ." Likewise saith Justinian: *Legum autoritas et divinas et humanas res bene disponit*: "By the authority of the" (*emperor's*) "laws, both heavenly and worldly things are well ordered." And again:

Cod. de vet. jure enunclean. lib. 1. [tom. iv. fol. 31. col. 3.]

Auth. tit. [I. Novell.] 133. [col. 9. tit. 16. in Præf.] μηδὲν ἄβατον ἔστω εἰς ζητήσιω τῆ βασιλεῖα.

*Nullum genus rerum est, quod non sit penitus quærendum autoritate imperatoris*<sup>28</sup>. *Is enim recipit a Deo commu-*  
*nem gubernationem et principalitatem super omnes homines*:

"There is no kind of thing, but it may be thoroughly examined by the *authority of the emperor*. For he receiveth from God *a general government and principality* over all men:" that is, as well of the *clergy* as of the *laity*. So saith Paulus, the bishop of Apamea, unto the same emperor Justinian, upon the death of Agapetus, the bishop of Rome: *Transtulit ipsum Dominus, ut plenitudinem directionis vestræ custodiret serenitati*: "Our Lord hath taken the pope away, that he might reserve the whole fulness of order unto your *majesty*."

Concil. Constant. 5. act. 1. [viii. 983.]

Touching the *deprivation* of the two *popes*, Sylverius and Vigilius, ye say, "it was done only by Theodora the empress, and not by the emperor Justinian:" and therein, ye think, ye have taken us in some great advantage. Notwithstanding, in your own *Pontifical* it is written thus:

Concil. tom. 2. in Vita Vigili. [ed. Crabb. p. 3.]

*Belisarium interrogavit imperator, quomodo se haberet cum Romanis: vel quomodo in loco Sylverii statuisset Vigilium.*

*Tunc gratias ei egerunt imperator et Augusta*: "The emperor demanded of his captain Belisarius, how he had done with the Romans: and how he had deposed pope Sylverius, and placed Vigilius in his stead. Upon his answer, both the *emperor* and the *empress* gave him thanks." Now ye know, it is a *rule in law*: *Ratihabitio (retrotrahitur, et mandato comparatur*: "The *allowance* of a thing done, is as good as a *commission* for the doing."

ff. [novum. lib. 50. tit. 17. 19.] In regulis juris.

Some of your friends have said: *Totus mundus non potest deponere aut judicare papam*: "The whole world cannot depose or judge the pope." Yet Eutropius saith:

Petr. de Paul. De post. Papæ. art. 4.

*Si quando imperialis legatus mitteretur a principe, ut Ro-*

Eutropii Appendix, de Sylverio.

<sup>28</sup> [Add to the Greek quotation in the margin . . . κοινὴν πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐπιστασίαν ἐκ Θεοῦ παραλαβούση. Novellæ, Græce ed. Haloander, fol. 381. a.]

*manus pontifex proficisceretur Constantinopolim ad imperatorem, omni neglecta occasione, ibat, etiamsi pro certo sciret, se iturum in exilium:* “ If the emperor’s ambassador had commanded the *bishop of Rome* to appear at Constantinople before the emperor, he went straightway without excuse, yea, *although he certainly knew that he should be banished.*” Here I leave sundry examples of *emperors*, that by their authority have deposed not only other *bishops*, but also *popes*: as the example of Honorius, that deposed pope Bonifacius: of Theodoricus, that deposed pope Symmachus: of Otho, that deposed pope John XII.: of Henry, that deposed pope Benedictus IX.: and that, as it is recorded, not by wilful might or tyranny, but *imperiali, et canonica censura*: “ By his imperial, and by the canonical censures.” Yea, one of your own friends saith thus: *Populus commendabiliter, zelo fidei commotus, Constantinum papam, qui erat ecclesie in scandalum, privavit oculis, et deposuit:* “ The people of Rome, moved with the zeal of faith, took pope Constantine, and pulled out his eyes, and deposed him, for that he was slanderous unto the church: and they deserved great praise for the same.”

“ Howbeit” (ye say) “ these two popes, Sylverius and Vigilus, were good men, and godly fathers; and therefore the removing of them was violence and tyranny.” And hereto ye apply the unsavoury similitude of your *homely puddings*. Notwithstanding, what virtue or holiness was in either of these men, it may soon appear by the story. Pope Sylverius was chosen pope by corruption and simony, contrary to the will of the clergy: pope Vigilus accused him of treason, for that he would have betrayed the city of Rome to the Gotthians. As for pope Vigilus, your *Pontifical* saith: “ He was a false witness against his predecessor pope Sylverius: he sought undue means to remove him, and to place himself: he kept him in prison, and starved him for hunger: he gave a great sum of money to procure the popedom to himself: he killed his own notary: he killed a young man, being a widow’s son: and of these crimes he was accused before

Ennodius;  
Inter Decreta Bonif. 1.

Joh. de Paris.  
de potest.  
Reg. et Pap.  
c. 14. [p. 127.]  
23. [p. 143.]  
Idem, eodem  
loco.

Conc. tom. 2.  
In Sylverio.  
[ed. Crabb.  
pp. 1. 2.]  
Evag. lib. 1.  
[leg. lib. 4.]  
cap. 19. [tom.  
iii. 401.]

Pontific. in  
Vigilio. [ap.  
Crabb. p. 4.]

the emperor." Such virtue and such holiness the world found in them. Therefore the *godly emperor*, in removing of them, used neither extraordinary violence, as you say, nor injurious tyranny.

Joh. de Paris,  
c. 14. [p. 127.]

Your own fellows say: *Si papa sit incorrigibilis, nec cardinales possint per se amovere scandalum de ecclesia, tunc in subsidium juris, deberent supplicando invocare brachium sæculare. Et tunc imperator, requisitus a cardinalibus, deberet procedere contra papam*: "If the pope be uncorrigible, and the *cardinals* be not able of themselves to remove the offence from the *church*, then ought they, for aid of the law, by way of intreaty, to call upon the secular power. And then the emperor, being thus desired, ought to proceed orderly against the pope."

Fran. Zabara.  
De Schism.  
et Concilio.  
[In Synt. Tr.  
de Imp. fol.  
237. col. 2.A.]

Franciscus Zabarella saith, as he is alleged before: *Papa potest accusari (coram imperatore)<sup>29</sup> de quolibet crimine notorio: et imperator requirere potest a papa rationem fidei*: "The pope, in any notorious crime, may be accused before the emperor: and the emperor may require the pope to yield a reckoning of his *faith*."

#### THE APOLOGY, Chap. 15. *Divis.* 1.

Let us see then such men as have authority over the *bishops*, such men as receive from God commandments concerning *religion*, such as bring home again the *ark of God*, make *holy hymns*, oversee the *priests*, build the *temple*, make orations touching *divine service*, cleanse the *temples*, destroy the *hill altars*, burn the *idol groves*, teach the *priests* their duties, write them out *precepts* how they should live, kill the wicked *prophets*, displace the *high priests*, summon together *holy councils*, sit together with the *bishops*, instructing them what they ought to do, examine, condemn, and punish *heretics*, be

<sup>29</sup> [The words in parenthesis are not in the original; on this point, see Harding's remarks and Jewel's answer, supra vol. vi. 330.]



made acquainted with matter of *religion*; subscribe and give sentence to the determinations of *councils*: and do all these things, not by any other *man's commission*, but in their own name, and that both uprightly and godly: shall we say, It pertaineth not to such men to have to do with *religion*? Or shall we say, A *Christian magistrate*, which dealeth amongst others in these matters, doth either naughtily, or presumptuously, or wickedly? The most ancient and Christian *emperors* and *kings* that ever were, did occupy themselves in these matters, and yet were they never for this cause noted either of wickedness or of presumption. And what is he, that can find out either *princes* more *catholic*, or examples more notable?

## M. HARDING.

Now, then, kings and emperors, <sup>a</sup>who have their first authority by the positive law of nations, <sup>a</sup>not by supernatural grace from God, as priests have; who can have no more power than the people hath, <sup>a</sup>of whom they take their temporal jurisdiction;..... who have ever <sup>b</sup>been anointed and blessed by bishops, whosoever blesseth being greater than he that is blessed;.....shall we say, that such kings and emperors have authority to rule the church <sup>c</sup>whose sons they are? To be supreme heads over them whom they ought to kneel unto for absolution? To control their spiritual judges? whom, if they sin by human frailty, they <sup>d</sup>ought to cover with their cloaks, <sup>d</sup>as the great Constantine said; to degrade them of whom they must be baptized, anointed, crowned, and buried?.....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Now, M. Harding, ye huddle up hastily your poor arguments in heaps together. One or two of them only I mind to touch: the rest are not worth the stirring. First, ye say, "The pope's power is of God, the prince's power is only of man; the one supernatural, the other natural." In such sort your pope Nicolas adorneth and magnifieth his own chair. For thus he saith with a jolly courage: *Illud verbum quo constructum est cælum et terra, quo deni-*

<sup>a</sup> Untruths, three together, open and manifest. Read the answer.

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, confessed by M. Harding's own doctors.

<sup>c</sup> And is not the pope a son of the church? Then is he not the son of God.

<sup>d</sup> Untruth. For, that the prince ought so to do, Constantinus never said it.

Dist. 22. Omnes.

*que omnia facta sunt elementa, Romanam fundavit ecclesiam:*  
 “The word of God, whereby heaven and earth was made,  
 and whereby all the elements were fashioned, the same  
 word founded the *church of Rome*.” As if the *church of  
 Rome* and other *churches* were not all of one *foundation*.

Joh. de Parisiis, De potest. Reg. et Pap. cap. 25. [cap. 24. pp. 143—146.]

Another of your *pope's* retainers saith: *Papatus est summa virtus creata*: “The popedom is the highest virtue or power that ever God made:” that is to say, the popedom is above *angels, archangels, thrones, dominations*, and all the *powers*, in, under, or above the *heavens*. Another saith even as you say, and as I have partly said before: *Rex per hominem fit: sacerdos autem proxime nascitur ex Deo ipso:.....*

Stanislaus Orichovius in Chimaera. fol. 97.

*Quantum Deus præstat sacerdoti, tantum sacerdos præstat regi*: “The king is made by man: but the priest is immediately begotten of God. As much as God excelleth the priest, so much the priest excelleth the king.”

And, notwithstanding all this *supernatural power* be as well in the *simplest priest* as in the *pope*, yet another of your doctors saith: *Papa eligitur secundum jus divinum: alii vero episcopi secundum jus humanum*: “The pope is chosen by the *law of God*; but other bishops are chosen by the *law of man*”<sup>30</sup>. Thus ye think no colour too dear to paint out the *pope's* face, and to make it to shine fair and glorious.

Petr. de Palud. De potest. Curator. art. 6.

“But the prince's power” (ye say) “is temporal and natural, and only from beneath, and only of man, and, therefore, can be no greater than man may give him.” This is your *Louvanian divinity*, M. Harding: so highly ye esteem the *dignity and majesty* of the *prince*. But God

Prov. viii. 16.

himself saith: *Per me reges regnant*: “Kings rule by me,” (and not by *man*.) St. Paul saith: *Non est potestas, nisi a Deo*: “There is no *power* or *princehood*, but from *God*.”

Joh. xix. 11.

Likewise Christ himself said unto Pilate: “Thou couldst have no power over me, unless it were given thee” (not from *man*, but) “*from above*.” To like purpose the emperor Justinian saith: *maxima in omnibus sunt dona Dei*,

<sup>30</sup> [Petr. de Palude: “in papatu “dum jus divinum, in aliis autem “successio est ordinaria secun- “secundum jus humanum.”]

*et superna collata clementia, sacerdotium et imperium, &c.* Auth. Col. 1. [tit. 6.] Quo- modo oportet Episcopos: Muxima. [in Præf.]  
*Ex uno eodemque principio utraque procedentia humanam exornant vitam:* “Priesthood and princehood be in all things the greatest gifts of God, given unto us from the mercy above. These two flowing,” (not the one only from *man*, and the other from *God*, but) “both from one original, do adorn and beautify the life of man.” Upon which words it is noted in your Gloss: *Idem principium habent, et parum differunt:* Glossa: In verbum Utraque. “Priesthood and princehood have one original, and small difference.” He saith not, as you say, the odds between these two is so great, as is between *natural* and *supernatural*, between *heaven* and *earth*, or between *God* and *man*. But he saith plainly, *priesthood* and *princehood* have one *original*, and little odds, and *small difference*. Theodorus Balsamon saith thus: *Nota canonem, qui dicit, spirituales dignitates esse præstantiores sæcularibus, seu mundanis dignitatibus. Sed ne hoc eo traxeris, ut ecclesiasticæ dignitates præferantur imperatoriis: illis enim subjiciuntur:* Balsamon in Sexta Synod. canon. 7. “Mark well this canon, that saith, ‘The spiritual dignities are better than the temporal or worldly dignities.’ But ye may not gather thereof, that the *dignities of the church are above the dignity of an emperor, for they are subject and inferior to him.*” Thus you see, M. Harding, how easily your light conjectures may deceive you. And, therefore, another of your doctors saith: *Supponunt, quod potestas regalis sit corporalis, et non spiritualis; et quod habeat curam corporum, et non animarum: quod falsum est:* Joh. de Parisiis, cap. 18. [p. 132.] “They imagine, that the *prince’s power* is only *bodily*, and not *ghostly*: and that the *prince* hath the charge of men’s *bodies*, but none of their *souls*: *but this is stark false.*”

And whereas you so highly extol your *pope’s universal power*, as if it were *supernatural* and heavenly, and came only from *God*; another of your doctors saith: *Ea, quæ sunt jurisdictionis papæ, non sunt supra naturam et conditionem negotii, nec supra conditionem hominum. Quia non est supra conditionem hominis, quod homines præsent hominibus. Imo naturale est quodammodo:* Joh. de Parisiis, De potest. Regia, et Papal. cap. 25. [cap. 24. p. 147.] “Such things as belong to the pope’s jurisdiction, are not above nature,

nor above the condition of the thing itself, nor above the capacity of a man: for it is not above the nature of a man, for man to rule over men: nay, rather, in a sort, it is natural.”

Now, M. Harding, if the *prince's power* be from God as well as the *pope's*: if the *pope's power* concerning jurisdiction be *natural* as well as the *prince's*: if they flow both from one *original*: if they have so small *difference*, what meant you, then, by these odious comparisons, so highly and so ambitiously to advance the one, and so disdainfully and scornfully to abase the other? What meant you, so vainly to say, “that *kings and emperors have their authority by the positive law of nations: and popes have their authority by the supernatural grace of God?*” Touching the *prince's power*, we are certainly assured, by *God's holy word*, it is from God. As for the *pope's infinite and universal power*, throughout the whole scriptures, from the *Genesis* unto the *Apocalypse*, unless it be the *power of darkness*, ye can find nothing.

Ye say, “Kings have evermore been anointed and blessed by bishops.” This is another foul *untruth*. For you might easily have known, that *Christian kings* in old times were never *anointed*. Your own *doctor* saith: *In Novo Testamento non legimus quod sacerdotes debeant inungere reges: nec etiam nunc observatur in omnibus regibus Christianis: ut patet in regibus Hispaniæ*: “We read not in the New Testament, that priests or bishops ought to anoint kings. Neither is that order at this day used amongst all kings that be christened: as it appeareth by the kings of Spain.” For they are not anointed. Again ye say, and that ye bring in as a special good argument of your side, “The emperor kneeleth to the priest for absolution: *ergo*, the emperor is not the head of the church.” How may a man answer such follies better than with the like folly. The pope himself, by your own decrees, is bound to confess his sins, and kneeleth down to a simple priest for absolution. For your *canonists* say: *Papa tenetur confiteri peccata sua uni sacerdoti: et simplex sacerdos potest illum ligare et absolere*: “The *pope* is bound to

Hervæus  
[leg. Johann.  
de Parisiis]  
De potest.  
Pap. cap. 18.  
[sub initio.]

confess his sins to some one priest: and a simple priest may both bind him and absolve him." *Ergo*, by your own conclusion, *the pope is not head of the church*. Such a handsome proctor the *pope* hath gotten to promote his cause.

With such pretty stuff, M. Harding, ye think to overrun and to conquer the world.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 15. Divis. 2.*

Wherefore, if it were lawful for them to do thus, being but *civil magistrates*, and having the chief rule of *commonweals*, what offence have our *princes* at this day committed, that they, being in the like degree, may not have leave to do the like? Or what especial gift of learning, or of judgment, or of holiness, have these men now, that they, contrary to the custom of all the ancient and catholic bishops, who used to confer with *princes* and *peers* concerning *religion*, do now thus reject and cast off *Christian princes* from knowing of the cause, and from their meetings?

M. HARDING.

..... We answer, It was <sup>a</sup> never lawful, in any temporal prince, to judge in causes of religion. <sup>a</sup> Neither did any prince before this time ever use it.....

<sup>a</sup> Untruth, as may easily appear by that hath been said before.

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

This is another of your *absolute truths*, M. Harding. For answer whereof, it may please you indifferently to weigh that I have written a little before touching the same.

Part. 6. cap. 14. Divis. 4. et 5.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 15. Divis. 3.*

Well, thus doing, they wisely and warily provide for themselves, and for their *kingdom*, which otherwise they see is like shortly to come to nought. For if so be, they, whom God hath placed in greatest *dignity*, did see and perceive these men's practices,

[Vol. iv. p. 82.]

[Vol. iv. p. 82.]

how *Christ's commandments* be despised by them, how the *light* of the *gospel* is darkened and quenched out by them, and how themselves also be subtly beguiled and mocked, and unawares be deluded by them, and the way to the *kingdom of heaven* stopped up before them; no doubt, they would never so quietly suffer themselves, neither to be disdained after such a proud sort, nor so despitefully to be scorned and abused by them. But now, through their own lack of understanding, and through their own blindness, these men have them fast yoked, and in their danger.

## M. HARDING.

<sup>a</sup> Otherwise it were not the kingdom of darkness.  
<sup>b</sup> When they be once es-  
pled: and not before.

Bishops <sup>a</sup>cannot uphold their kingdom by wrong doing. <sup>b</sup>That is the way to pull them down. Therefore we are well assured, that your schismatical superintendentship cannot stand, though all the power of the world were bent to hold it up. Your wicked state is not planted of God, and therefore it shall be rooted out. It is God that ruleth: it is God that setteth up, and putteth down. This state of Christ's church hath continued, and the successor of Peter hath governed it; whereas the groundless building of all the heretics, from Simon Magus, downward, to this day, hath failed.....Luther is rotten, and his new found religion decayed, and the pope sitteth in Peter's chair, and so shall his successors to the end.

Ye would men to believe, that emperors and kings are deceived by the popes and bishops. But, I pray you, what is the cause, that princes cannot espy these deceits (if any such were) as well as ye? If themselves lack your knowledge, yet have they wise men about them, who, for their duties' sake, and their allegiance to them, would soon advertise them, how by the bishops they be subtly beguiled and mocked.....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Of the maintenance of your kingdom, M. Harding, *Christ* said unto certain of your *forefathers: Hoc est tempus vestrum, et potestas tenebrarum*: "This is your time, and the power of darkness. Blind they are, and the guides of the blind. If the blind lead the blind, they will both fall into the ditch." The *lion*, or wild *bull*, be they never so cruel,

or great of courage, yet if ye may once closely cover their eyes, ye may easily lead them whither ye list, without resistance. Even so doth the *pope hoodwink* and blindfold the *princes* of the world, and hold them in ignorance: which done, he maketh them to *hold his stirrup, to lead his horse, to kneel down and to kiss his shoe, and to attend upon him at his pleasure.* But if they knew either him, or themselves, they would not do it.

St. Chrysostom saith, as it is noted before:.....*Hæretici sacerdotes claudunt januas veritatis. Sciunt enim, si manifestata esset veritas, quod ipsorum ecclesia esset relinquenda: et ipsi de sacerdotali dignitate ad humilitatem venirent popularem:* “*Heretical bishops shut up the gates of the truth. For they know, that, if the truth be once laid open, their church shall be forsaken: and they, from their pontifical dignity, shall be brought down to the baseness of the people.*”

Chrysost. in  
Opere im-  
perfect.  
Homil. 44.  
[vi. app. 186.]

Petrus Ferrariensis, in consideration hereof, complaineth thus: *O miseros imperatores, et sæculares principes, qui hæc et alia sustinetis.....et vos servos ecclesiæ facitis: et mundum per eos infinitis modis usurpari videtis: nec de remedio cogitatis: quia prudentiæ et sapientiæ non intenditis:* “*Alas, miserable are ye, the emperors and princes of the world, that abide these and other like things,*” (at the *pope’s* hands,) “*and make yourselves slaves unto their church. Ye see, the world is by innumerable ways miserably abused by them: yet ye never bethink yourselves of any remedy, because ye apply not your minds to wisdom and knowledge.*”

Pet. Ferrari-  
en. Citatur  
ab Illyric.  
inter Testes  
Veritatis.  
[art. 34<sup>o</sup>.]

St. Hierom saith: *Ut sagittent in obscuro rectos corde. Isti tantam sibi assumunt auctoritatem, ut sive dextra doceant, seu sinistra, id est, sive bona, sive mala, nolint discipulos ratione discutere, sed se præcessores sequi. Tunc hi, qui prius decipiebant, nequaquam ultra ad eos valebunt accedere, postquam se senserint intellectos:* “*To strike in the dark them that be simple of heart, these men challenge unto themselves such authority, that whether they teach with the right hand, or with the left, that is to say, whether*

Hier. in  
Esai. lib. 9.  
30. [iii. 258.]

they teach good things, or bad, they will not have their disciples, or hearers, with reason to examine their sayings, but only to follow them, being their leaders. For then they, which before deceived the people, can no more come unto them, after they once perceive they be espied.”

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 16. Divis. 1.*

Verily, we, for our parts, as we have said, have done nothing in altering *religion*, upon either rashness or arrogance: nor nothing, but with good leisure, and great consideration. Neither had we ever intended to do it, except both the manifest and most assured *will of God*, opened to us in his *holy scriptures*, and the regard of our own salvation, had even constrained us thereunto. For, though we have departed from that *church*, which these men call catholic, and by that means get us envy amongst them that want skill to judge, yet is this enough for us, and it ought to be enough for every wise and good man, and one that maketh account of everlasting life, that we have gone from that *church* which hath power to err: which Christ, who cannot err, told so long before, it should err: and which we ourselves did evidently see with our eyes, to have gone from the *old*<sup>31</sup> *holy fathers*, and from the *apostles*, and from *Christ* himself, and from the *primitive and catholic church of God*: and we are come, as near as we possibly could, to the *church of the apostles*, and of the *old catholic bishops and fathers*: which *church*, we know, was sound and perfect, and, as Tertullian termeth it, a *pure virgin*, spotted, as then, with no *idolatry*, nor with any foul or shameful

<sup>31</sup> [There is nothing in the original to correspond to the word “old.”]



fault: and have directed, according to their customs and ordinances, not only our *doctrine*, but also the *sacraments*, and the form of *common prayer*.

M. HARDING.

.....Ye have treated thereof after your accustomed manner, that is to say, with all untruth and lies . . . .

Ye come in with many gay words: whereto, with guilty conscience, inwardly, ye say, yea, thereto, with lying tongue, outwardly, do ye not say, nay?

This generation of loose apostates, incestuous vow-breakers, sacrilegious church-robbers, despisers of all holiness, breakers of the dead men's wills, overthrowers of all ancient order and discipline . . . .

If it be so, where be your signs? Where be your miracles? Where be the examples of your rare virtue and holiness . . . .

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The rest of your speech we will pass over, as talk of course. Touching your curious demand of *signs* and *miracles*, pope Leo may answer you. For, whereas certain of your forefathers, in old times, said, "If he be the *King of Israel*, let him come down from the *cross*, and we will believe;" pope Leo saith thus unto them: *Non erat vestra cœcitat̄is arbitrio, stulti scribæ, et imp̄i sacerdotes, ostendenda potentia Salvatoris*: "Ye foolish scribes, and wicked priests, the power of our Saviour was not to be shewed at the discretion of your blindness." God sheweth his *miracles* when, and where, and to whom he will.

St. Chrysostom saith: *In fine temporis concedenda est potestas diabolo.....ut faciat signa utilia: ut jam ministros Christi non per hoc cognoscamus, quia utilia faciunt signa, sed quia omnino hæc signa non faciunt*: "In the end of time, power shall be given to the *devil*, to work *profitable signs* and *miracles*: so that then we cannot know the *ministers of Christ* by that they work *profitable miracles*, but by that they *work no miracles at all*."

St. Augustine saith: *Non dicat,.....Ideo verum est, quia illa vel illa mirabilia fecit, vel iste, vel ille: aut quia homines ad memorias mortuorum nostrorum orant, et exaudiuntur: aut quia illa vel illa ibi contingunt, &c.* Removean-

*tur ista, vel figmenta mendacium hominum, vel portenta fallacium spirituum*: "Let no man say, Therefore it is true, for that this man, or that man, hath wrought this or that *miracle*; for that men make their *prayer* at the *tombs* of our dead, and obtain their desires: or for that these or these *miracles* be wrought there, &c. Away with these things: they may be either the *jugglings and mockeries of deceitful men, or else illusions of lying spirits.*"

Chrysost. in  
Matt. hom.  
49. [Op. imp.  
vi. app. 204.]

Again, St. Chrysostom saith: *Per signa cognoscebatur, qui essent veri Christiani, qui falsi. Nunc autem signorum operatio omnino levata est: magis autem invenitur apud eos, qui falsi sunt Christiani*: "In old times it was known by *miracles*, who were the *true Christians*, and who the *false*. But now the working of miracles is taken quite away, and is rather found among them that be false Christians."

Aug. in Joh.  
tract. xliii.  
[iii. pt. 2.  
398.]

Therefore, St. Augustine saith: *Contra illos mirabiliarios cautum me fecit Deus meus, dicendo, In novissimis diebus exurgent pseudoprophetae, facientes signa et portenta, ut inducant in errorem, si fieri possit, etiam electos*: "Against these mongers of miracles my God hath armed me, saying, 'In the latter days there shall rise up false prophets, working signs and wonders, to deceive the elect of God, if it be possible.'"

Matt. xxiv.  
24.

Neither is the *gospel of Christ* preached this day utterly without *miracles*. The *blind* see: the *dumb* speak: your *idols* are fallen: your great *Babylon* is come to ground. These, M. Harding, if you have eyes to see them, are no small *miracles*. St. Chrysostom saith: "*The conversion of the world is a miracle.*" St. Augustine saith: "*Modo caro caeca non aperit oculos miraculo Domini: et cor caecum aperit oculos sermone Domini*: "Now-a-days the blind flesh openeth not her eyes by the *miracle of our Lord*: but the *blind heart* openeth his eyes at the *word of our Lord.*"

Chrys. in 1  
Cor. hom. 6.  
[x. 46. 47.]  
Aug. de Ver-  
bis Dom. se-  
cund. Matt.  
ser. 18. [v.  
420.]

Eodem loco.  
[ibid.]

And again: *Modo aures corporis surdae non aperiuntur: sed quam multi habent clausas aures cordis, quae tamen, verbo Dei penetrante, patescant*: "Now-a-days the deaf ears of the body be not opened: yet many there are, that have the ears of their heart shut up: which ears notwithstanding are opened by entering of the *word of God.*"

Therefore, we may rightly say to you with other words of St. Augustine: *Quisquis adhuc prodigia, ut credat, inquirat, magnum est ipse prodigium: qui, mundo credente, non credit*: “Whosoever yet requireth *miracles* to bring him to the *faith*, is himself a great miracle, that, the world believing, remaineth still in unbelief.”

Whereas the Pharisees said of Christ, “Let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe him;” St. Hierom saith unto them, ..... *Etiamsi de cruce descendet, similiter non crederetis*: “Yea, although he should come down from the cross, yet would ye not believe him.”

But it were a world to behold the glorious countenance of your *miracles*, M. Harding. Your *crosses* can speak: your *idols* can go: your *images* can light their own lamps: your *holy water* is able to calm the sea, to chase away mice, and to make barren women to conceive. If you doubt hereof, confer with M. Cope, one of your own Louvanian company, or with that worthy prelate, the bishop of Verona, your holy father Lipomanus. I am ashamed to remember the things, that you are not ashamed, even now in these days, to publish in writing. Howbeit, such *religion!* such *miracles!* St. Hierom saith: *Mendacium Antichristi Christi veritas devorabit*: “The *truth of Christ* shall devour and consume the *falsehood of Antichrist.*”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 16. *Divis. 2.*

And, as we know both Christ himself, and all good men heretofore have done, we have called home again to the *original* and first *foundation*, that *religion* which hath been foully neglected, and utterly corrupted by these men. For we thought it meet thence to take the pattern of reforming *religion*, from whence the ground of *religion* was first taken; because this one reason, as saith the most ancient father Tertullian, hath great force

[Tertull. adv. Praxeam, c. 2. p. 501.]

[Iren. lib. 3. c. 2. p. 175.]

against all heresies: “*Look whatsoever was first, that is true: and whatsoever is latter, that is corrupt.*” Irenæus oftentimes appealed to the *oldest churches*, which had been nearest to Christ’s time, and which it was hard to believe had been in error. But why at this day is not the same common regard and consideration had? Why return we not to the pattern of the *old churches*? Why may not we hear at this time amongst us the same saying, which was openly pronounced in times past in the *council at Nice*, by so many *bishops* and *catholic fathers*, and nobody once speaking against it, Ἐθὴ ἀρχαία κρατεῖτω; “*Hold still the old customs?*”

M. HARDING.

Ye say much in your own commendation, but lies be no proofs: ye have not called religion home again to the original and first foundation, as ye say: but ye have quite overthrown all true religion from the foundation. As for your apeish novelty, ye have taken the pattern thereof from Satan, author of division, the ancient enemy of Christ, and of his true religion. We admit the saying of Tertullian, (though it be not altogether as ye allege it,) that this reason hath great force against all heresies: “*Whatsoever was first, that is true: whatsoever is latter, that is corrupt.*” Of the blessed sacrament, Christ said first, &c. <sup>a</sup>

Contra Praxeam.

a Here followed somewhat touching the sacrament and sacrifice, which matters are elsewhere answered more at large.

Ye would seem to be fain that we followed the advice of Irenæus. We are content with all our hearts. And with Irenæus we appeal to that tradition which is from the apostles, which (as he saith) is kept in the churches by priests that succeeded them. With Irenæus, leaving other churches, whose successions of <sup>Lib. 3. c. 2.</sup> bishops it were a long work to rehearse, we require to have recourse, for trial of our faith, to the tradition of doctrine of the Roman church, which he termeth *greatest, oldest*, best known to all, founded and set up by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul. We appeal to the faith of that church, taught abroad in the world, and by successions of bishops brought down unto us. For to this church, <sup>b</sup> saith Irenæus, must all the church of <sup>Lib. 3. c. 3.</sup> Christ repair, wheresoever it be, for that it is the chief of all, and for that the tradition of the true doctrine, which the apostles left behind them, <sup>c</sup> is there faithfully kept. Wherefore, if ye

b Irenæus never knew the disorders and deformities that now are in the church of Rome.

c Untruth. For, as now, it is all unfaithfully perverted.

would, after the counsel of Irenæus, resort to Rome for decision of the controversies that be betwixt you and us, and would them to be tried by that sense of doctrine, <sup>d</sup> which hath continued by successions of bishops even from Peter to Pius the Fourth, now pope; and would stand to the authority of that see apostolic, all strife were ended, we should be at accord. But we have little hope ye will follow this godly counsel of St. Irenæus, that blessed martyr, whose body your brethren, the Huguenots of France, villanously burned at Lyons, A. D. 1562, after it had rested there thirteen hundred years and more.....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The preeminence, that Irenæus giveth to the *church of Rome*, standeth in consent, and unity, and agreement of *doctrine*; not in superiority or government over all the world. For proof whereof ye may understand that Irenæus, in the same place likewise, specially noteth the *church of Smyrna*, planted by Polycarpus; and the *church of Ephesus*, planted by St. John; and, generally, sundry other great *churches*, planted by men of *apostolical dignity*: unto which he willeth us in like manner to repair: and not only to the *church of Rome*. The emperor Theodosius willeth his subjects to conform themselves in *doctrine*, not only to the *Roman bishop*, but also either to Nectarius, the *bishop* of Constantinople: or to Timotheus, the *bishop* of Alexandria: or to Pelagius, the *bishop* of Laodicea: or to Diodorus, the *bishop* of Tharsus: or to Amphilocheus, the *bishop* of Iconium: or to Optimus, the *bishop* of Antioch: or to Helladius, the *bishop* of Cæsarea: or to Otrejus, the *bishop* of Melite: or to Gregorius, the *bishop* of Nice: or to Terennius, the *bishop* of Scythia: or to Marmarius, the *bishop* of Martianopolis. Unto all and every of these notable great *churches*, the emperor willeth all other inferior *churches* to repair.

By such examples the fathers in the *council of Chalcedon* were contented to direct their *faith*. For thus they break out in a general shout: *Omnes ita credimus: Leo papa ita credit: Cyrillus ita credit: Leo et Anatolius ita credunt*: "All we believe thus: pope Leo believeth thus: Cyrillus (the bishop of Alexandria) believeth thus: Leo

<sup>d</sup> Untruth, manifest and apparent to all the world.

Iren. lib. 3. c. 3. [pp. 175. 176. 177.]  
Valde longum est, omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones.

Cod. Theod. lib. 16. tit. 3. [leg. tit. 1. c. 3. Episcopis tradi.]

Conc. Chalcedon. act. 2. [vi. 960. b.]

and Anatolius (the bishop of Constantinople) believe thus."

Tertul. con-  
tra Marcion.  
lib. 4. [c. 5. p.  
415.]

So saith Tertullian: *Videamus, quod lac a Paulo Corinthi-  
thii hauserint: ad quam regulam Galatæ sint recocti* [leg.  
*recocti*]: *quid legant Philippenses, Thessalonicenses,  
Ephesii: quid etiam Romani de proximo sonent, quibus  
evangelium Petrus et Paulus, sanguine quoque suo signa-  
tum, reliquerunt*: "Let us see, what milk the Corinthians  
suck of St. Paul: after what pattern the Galatians were  
reformed: what the Philippians read, what the Thessalo-  
nians, what the Ephesians: what sound the Romans give,  
that are so near us, unto whom Peter and Paul have left  
the gospel, sealed and confirmed with their blood." In  
like sort writeth Gregory Nazianzene of the church of  
Cæsarea: *Cujuslibet ecclesiæ, tanquam corporis Christi,  
habenda est ratio; maxime vero nostræ* [leg. *vestræ*] (*Cæ-  
sariensis*) *quæ et ab initio fuit, et nunc est, mater prope  
omnium ecclesiarum: eam Christiana respublica, velut cen-  
trum suum circulus, undique observat, non solum propter  
orthodoxam doctrinam ubique ab initio prædicatam, sed  
etiam propter conspicuam concordie gratiam, quam divini-  
tus accepit*: "We must make great account of all churches,  
even as of the *body of Christ*; but specially of this our  
*church of Cæsarea*: for that it hath been from the begin-  
ning, and still is in a manner, the *mother of all churches*.  
The whole *Christian commonweal* beholdeth this *church*  
of every side, even as the *circle* beholdeth the *centre*; not  
only for the *catholic doctrine* that from thence hath been  
published everywhere, but also for the notable *grace of  
concord* that it hath received from above."

Nazian. Ep.  
18. [al. 41.  
ii. 36.]

Thus the ancient godly fathers willed the faithful to  
have recourse unto every of these churches, of Smyrna,  
of Ephesus, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Laodicea,  
of Tharsus, of Iconium, of Antioch, of Cæsarea, of Melite,  
of Nice, of Scythia, of Martianopolis, of Corinthus, of  
Galatia, of Philippi, of Thessalonica, of Ephesus, and of  
Rome: not for any secret unremovable virtue in them  
contained, but only, as Irenæus saith, that the *tradition*

and doctrine of the apostles had continued there still without corruption.

Therefore Tertullian saith: *Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ apostolorum suis locis præ-sidentur* [l. præ-sident]: *apud quas ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, et repræsentantes faciem uniuscujusque. Proxima est tibi Achaia: habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos, habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes* [Prior. leg. *Si non potes*] *in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, (habes) Romam: unde nobis quoque autoritas præsto est: "Run over, and behold the apostolic churches, whereas the apostles' chairs are yet still continued, and whereas the authentic writings of the apostles are openly pronounced, sounding out the voice, and representing the face of each one of them. The next country to you is Achaia: there have you the church of Corinth. If ye be not far from Macedonia, there have ye the church of Philippi, and the church of Thessalonica. If ye may go over into Asia, there have ye the church of Ephesus. If ye border near to Italy, there have ye the church of Rome, from whence we also (dwelling in Africa) may with speed receive authority."*

Again, touching the name of a church apostolic, whereby ye would evermore seem to understand the church of Rome, he saith thus: *Tot ac tantæ ecclesiæ, una est illa ab apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. Sic omnes primæ* [Priorius leg. *prima*], *et omnes apostolicæ, dum unam* [al. *una*] *omnes probant unitatem: "These so many, and so great churches, are all that same one first church planted by the apostles, from whence issued all the rest. And so are they all first churches, and all apostolic, in that they all follow one unity."*

Thus the ancient fathers taught the people to reform themselves by the example and doctrine, not only of the church of Rome, but also of all other notable apostolic churches.

Neither were they directed only by the authority of ancient churches, but also by the authority of certain par-

Iren. lib. 3.  
c. 3. [p. 176.]  
In qua semper conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.  
Tertull. de Præscription. contra Hæreticos. [c. 26. p. 215.]

Tertull. de Præscription. contra Hæreticos. [c. 20. p. 209.]

Euseb. lib. 5.  
c. 3. [i. 213.]

particular *worthy men*. For resolution in cases of doubt, some sent to St. Augustine; some to St. Hierom; some to the *bishops of France*; some to the *bishops of Rome*; and some to others. St. Hierom thus writeth unto St. Augustine: *Tu, ut episcopus in toto orbe notissimus, debes hanc promulgare sententiam, et in assensum tuum omnes coepiscopos trahere*: "Thou, as the most notable *bishop* in all the world, oughtest to publish this *decree*, and to draw all thy *fellow-bishops* unto thy judgment." Yet was St. Augustine the *bishop of Hippo in Africa*, and not of *Rome*. Certainly, wheresoever any flame of truth and learning may appear, out of what place soever it break forth, men will of themselves willingly and greedily flee unto it.

Inter Aug.  
epist. 11. [ii.  
170.]

Damas. Hier.  
[ii. 562.]

Damasus, the *bishop of Rome*, wrote unto St. Hierom in doubtful cases, to know his *counsel*. St. Hierom himself saith: *Filius meus Apodemius..... de oceani littore, atque ultimis Galliarum finibus, Roma præterita, quæsit Bethlehem*: "My son Apodemius, coming from the shore of the *ocean sea*, and from the furthest coast of *France*, leaving *Rome*, sought for *Bethlehem*," (where I dwell, to confer with me.)

Hieronimus  
ad Algasiam.  
[iv. 187.]

Ambros. lib.  
10. epist. 83.  
[ii. 882.]

Thus, we see, godly men, desirous to know the truth, and to be resolved of their doubts, left the *bishop of Rome*, with all his *cardinals*, and went eight hundred miles further, to seek *counsel* of poor *Hierom*. Likewise St. Ambrose saith: *Post Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ, episcopi quoque Romanæ ecclesiæ definitionem, per literas plerique meam adhuc expectant sententiam*: "After the resolution of the *church of Alexandria*, and also of the *bishop of the church of Rome*, many men yet write letters unto me, and would also understand my judgment<sup>32</sup>." Pope Liberius himself writeth thus unto Athanasius, the *bishop of Alexandria*: *Si mecum*

Apud Athan.  
tom. 1. [tom.  
ii. 664.]

<sup>32</sup> [S. Ambros. "Unde necesse fuit, quia etiam post Ægyptiorum supputationes, et Alexandrinæ ecclesiæ definitiones episcopi quoque Romanæ ecclesiæ per literas plerique meam adhuc expectant sententiam, quid existimem scribere de die Pascha." The Bened. edd. are much per-

plexed with the construction of this passage; doubting whether "episcopi" is the nominative, and so the subject to "expectant," or, as they ultimately settle it, the genitive in the sense of "episcoporum" indefinitely; on the ground, that many popes had published Constitutions about Easter.]



*sentis, quæso subscribas* [al. *rescribas*], *quo certiores reddamur, num ejusdem nobiscum suffragii sis, eademque statuas de vera fide: ut et ego securior efficiar, tuaque mandata indesinenter obeam*: “If ye be of my judgment, then I besecch you to subscribe” (your name unto these articles), “that I may be out of doubt, whether you think as I think, touching the *true faith*: and that I may be the better confirmed in myself, and may evermore *do your commandments* without delay<sup>33</sup>.” Here, you see, your *head of the church* offereth himself, with all his *universal power*, to be at the commandment of another inferior *bishop*. Bernard, being but an *abbot*, writeth thus unto pope Eugenius: *Aiunt, non vos esse papam, sed me. Et undique ad me confluant, qui habent negotia*: “They say that I am *pope*, and not you. And, on every side, they that have suits come running unto me.”

Bern. epist. 238. [al. 239. vol. i. 235. ed. 1690.]

Thus were men wont to seek for *counsel*, not only at *Rome*, but also wheresoever it might be found. And therefore was Origen called *Magister ecclesiarum*, “the *informer or master of the churches*.” St. Basil, *Canon fidei*, “the ruler of the faith.” Eusebius Samosatensis, *Regula veritatis*, “the standard of the truth.” Athanasius, *Orbis oculus*, “the eye of the world<sup>34</sup>.” And, in doubtful cases, they were as diligently sought upon as the *pope*.

Hieron. in Apol. advers. Ruffin. [iv. pt. 2. p. 377.] Nazianz. ad Simpliciam. [ii. 70.] Nazianz. ad Heronem. [i. 462.]

Here, by the way, it were a worthy matter to consider some of the profound and learned resolutions that we have received from the *see of Rome*. Augustine, the *Italian monk*, whom some have called the *apostle of England*, demanded of pope Gregory, by way of great counsel, whether a woman with child might be baptized, or no: and how long afterward it might be lawful for her to come to the *church*.

Gregor. lib. 12. Ind. 7. c. 9. [tom. ii. p. 1157.]

Bonifacius, the *apostle of Germany*, demanded the like questions of pope Zachary, whether *jays, daws, storks*,

Inter Decret. Zachariae. [Crabb. tom. ii. 452.]

<sup>33</sup> [This epistle is spurious, but it bears evidence to the sentiments current at even a later date than that assigned to it.]

<sup>34</sup> [The true references are as follows: (Bp. Jewel has slightly

misplaced the names:) Nazianz. ad Simpliciam calls Basil “*canon Veritatis*.” Naz. Eusebio Samosatensi, Eusebius, “*canon Fidei*” [ii. 39]: Naz. ad Heronem, Athanasius *της οἰκουμένης ὀφθαλμόν*.]

*beavers, otters, hares, and wild horses*, be man's meat, or no: what order were to be taken with *man*, or *horse*, having the falling sickness: at what time of the year it may be lawful, or wholesome, for folks to eat *bacon*; and, if a man list to eat it *raw*, how old it ought to be before he eat it: what may be done, if a *priest* have a *black in his eye*: who may *hallow oil*: who may wear the *pall*: at what time, in what place, in what sort, over or under, openly or secretly, it may be lawful to wear it.

Inter Decret.  
Alexandr. 3.  
pt. 30. cap. 2.  
  
Si maculam  
in oculo.  
Inter Decret.  
Gregor. 2. ad  
Bonifacium.  
[il. 433.]

To these, and other like doubtful and profound questions, the *pope* hath given out his answers, and that in such grave and solemn sort, as if no other creature under heaven, besides his holiness, were able to understand such high mysteries.

Aug. de Civ.  
lib. 20. c. 26.  
Vives.

There fell out sometime an odious quarrel between the Thomists and Scotists, whether the *blessed Virgin* were conceived in sin, or no. The one said, yea: the other cried, nay. There were learned men of both sides: parties grew: the schools were inflamed: the world was troubled: no conference, no doctor, no council, was able to quiet the matter, and to make them friends. The Scotists alleged for themselves the *council of Basil*: the Thomists cried out, the *council of Basil* was disorderly summoned, and, therefore unlawful. In the midst of this heat, pope Sixtus took upon him to be *judge* between them, and to determine the bottom of the cause. In conclusion, when all the world looked to be resolved, and satisfied in the question, the *pope* commanded both the Thomists and the Scotists to depart home, and to dispute no more of the matter, but to let all alone: and so left them as doubtful as he found them. This was a resolution for a *pope*.

Joh. Calvin,  
de Reliquiis.  
[Opp. tom.  
viii. p. 213.  
ed. Ametel.  
1667.]

A great contention fell out between them of *Ratisbon* in *Germany*, and the *abbey of St. Denis in France*, whether of them had the whole *body of St. Denis*: for that either part said, and bare the world in hand, they had the whole. To Rome they went: the *pope* sat sadly in judgment, and examined their allegations, and grew to conclusion: and, in the end, gave his advised and definitive sentence, that either part, as well they of France, as also the others of

Germany, had the whole *body of St. Denis*: and that whosoever would say nay, should be an *heretic*. Of such substance and certainty are the *oracles of your see of Rome*.

Some of your friends have said: *Veritas per Christum cathedræ alligata est,.....non personis*: “Christ hath fastened his *truth*, not to the *popes’ persons*, but to his *chair*.”<sup>Nic. Cusan. ad Bohæm. epist. 2. [p. 836.]</sup> Meaning thereby, that the *pope*, whatsoever he decree or say, sitting in St. Peter’s *chair*, can never err. And thus, by this doctor’s judgment, we are taught to give credit rather to the *pope’s chair* than to the *pope*.

Yet, nevertheless, the same Irenæus, whom ye have here alleged, openly reprovèd pope Victor; and St. Cyprian likewise reprovèd pope Stephen; for that they thought, notwithstanding their *chair*, they were in error. Erasmus, speaking of the answer of pope Innocentius unto the *council of Carthage*, saith thus: *In hac epistola, et dictionem, et ingenium, et eruditionem, tali præsule dignam, cogimur desiderare*: “In this epistle we miss both eloquence, and wit, and learning, meet for such a prelate.”<sup>Euseb. lib. 5. c. 23. [al. c. 24. i. 245.] Cyprian ad Pompeium. [p. 140.]</sup> St. Ambrose saith: *In omnibus cupio sequi ecclesiam Romanam. Sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus. Ideo quod alibi rectius servatur, et nos recte custodimus*: “I desire in all things to follow the *church of Rome*. Howbeit, we ourselves, for that we be men, have understanding and judgment too. Therefore, whatsoever is better kept in other places, we do well to keep the same.”<sup>Inter Epist. Aug. ep. 91. Erasm. [tom. ii. 270. ed. 1528.]</sup>

But touching the state of Rome that now is, Arnulphus said openly in the *council of Remes*: *Cum hoc tempore Romæ nullus sit, ut fama est, qui sacras literas didicerit, .....qua fronte aliquis illorum docere audebit, quod non didicerit?* “Forasmuch as now-a-days, as it is reported, there is none in Rome” (neither *pope*, nor *cardinal*) “that hath learned the *scriptures*, with what face dareth any of them to teach us that thing that he himself never learned?”<sup>Ambros. de Sac. lib. 3. c. 1. [ii. 363.]</sup>

It is not sufficient to say, *The pope sitteth in Peter’s chair*. As *Antichrist* may sit in place of *Christ*, so may *Judas* sit in place of *Peter*. St. Hierom saith: *Bethel*,

Hieron. in  
Osee lib. i.  
cap. 4. [iii.  
1263.]

*quæ prius vocabatur domus Dei, postquam vituli in ea positi sunt, appellata est Bethaven, id est, domus inutilis, et domus idoli: "Bethel, that before was called the house of God, after that Jeroboam's golden calves were set up in it, was called Bethaven, that is to say, a house unprofitable, and the house of an idol."* And what marvel is it, if the like have happened to the church of Rome.

Cyprian ad  
Pompeium.  
[p. 141.]

Therefore, we think it better to examine and try the grounds of your religion by the word of God, that is one, and uniform, and endureth for ever, than by your touch of Rome, that is so uncertain, and so mutable, and so often hath deceived us. St. Cyprian saith: *Si ad divinæ traditionis caput et originem revertamur, cessat error humanus: "If we return to the head and original of the heavenly tradition" (which is the word of God), "all human error giveth place."*

Chrysost. in  
Genes. hom.  
67. [iv. 642.]

Touching the rest of your needless talk, our brethren in France, whom in your pleasure ye call *Huguenots*, burnt not the body of *Irenæus*. They knew he was a blessed martyr of God: and his body sometime the temple of the Holy Ghost. Without any reproach or villany, either done or meant to that holy father, if they burnt any thing, which also may well be doubted, they burnt only an idol, that you had so unreverently set up against the glory of God. Chrysostom saith: *Joseph moriens, ait, Ossa mea efferetis hinc vobiscum,.....ne Ægyptii memores beneficiorum ejus.....corpus justı haberent in occasionem impietatis: "Joseph, lying in his deathbed, said unto his children, and nephews, 'Ye shall carry my bones with you forth out of Egypt:' lest the Egyptians, remembering the good things he had done, should use that good man's body to an occasion of wickedness or idolatry."*

Aug. de mi-  
rabıl. Sacr.  
Script. lib. i.  
cap. ultimo.  
[iii. app. 16.]

So saith St. Augustine: *Nemo conscius erat sepulchri Mosis, ne populus, si cognovisset, ubi esset, adoraret: "No man was made privy to Moses' grave: lest, if the people had known where his body had been, they should adore it."*

In the former  
Reply, Art.  
17. [vol. iii.  
328.]

Your objection of the sacrifice is elsewhere answered more at large. St. Augustine saith: *Nunc manibus non*

*offerimus carnem, sed corde et ore offerimus laudem*: "Now we offer not up flesh with our hands, but with heart and mouth we offer praise." Again he saith:.....*Intus habeo sacrificium, quo flectam Deum meum*: "Within myself I have a *sacrifice*, wherewith I may pacify my *God*." August. contra Judæos, cap. 9. [viii. 38.] August. in Psalm. 41. [iv. 364.]

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 17. Divis. 1. and 2.*

When Esdras went about to repair the ruins of the *temple of God*, he sent not to *Ephesus*, although the most beautiful and gorgeous *temple of Diana* were there: and when he purposed to restore the *sacrifices and ceremonies of God*, he sent not to *Rome*, although peradventure he had heard that there were the solemn sacrifices called *Hecatombæ*, and other called *Solitorilia, Lectisternia, and Supplicationes*, and Numa Pompilius' *Ceremonial books, or manuals, or portueses*, containing the service of their gods. He thought it enough for him, to set before his eyes, and follow the pattern of the *old temple*, which Solomon at the beginning builded, according as God had appointed him, and also those old *customs and ceremonies*, which God himself had written out by special words for Moses. [Ezra iii. 2. 10.]

The prophet Haggai, after the temple was repaired again by Esdras, and the people might think, they had a very just cause to rejoice, on their own behalf, for so great a benefit received of Almighty God, yet made he them all burst out into tears, because that they which were yet alive, and had seen the former building of the temple, before the Babylonians destroyed it, called to mind, how far off it was yet from that beauty and excellency which it had in the old times past before. For then, indeed, would they have thought the *temple* worthily repaired, if it had answered to the ancient pattern, [Hagg. ii. 3. Ezra iii. 12.]

and to the majesty of the first *temple*. St. Paul, because he would amend the abuse of the *Lord's supper*, which the Corinthians even then begun to corrupt, he set before them *Christ's institution* to follow, saying: "*I delivered unto you that thing that I first received of the Lord.*" And when Christ confuted the error of the Pharisees, *Ye must*, saith he, *return to the first beginning: for "from the beginning it was not thus."* And when he found great fault with the *priests* for their uncleanness of life, and covetousness, and would cleanse the temple from all evil abuses, *This house*, saith he, *at the first beginning, was "a house of prayer,"* wherein all the people might devoutly and sincerely pray together. And so it were your part to use it now also at this day. For it was not builded to the end it should be "*a den of thieves.*" Likewise also the good and commendable *princes* mentioned of in the *scriptures*, were praised specially by these words, that they had walked in the ways of their *father David*: that is, because they had returned to the *first and original foundation*, and had restored the *religion* even to the perfection wherein David left it. And, therefore, when we likewise say, that all things were quite trodden under foot by these men, and that nothing remained in the *temple of God*, but pitiful spoils, and decays, we reckoned it the wisest and the safest way to set before our eyes those *churches*, which we know for a surety, that they never had erred, and yet never had neither *private mass*, nor *prayers in a strange and barbarous language*, nor this corruption of *sacraments*, and other toys<sup>35</sup>.....

[1 Cor. xi.  
23.]

[Matt. xix.  
8.]

<sup>35</sup> [Harding remarks upon this word. The rest of his observations here amount only to "needless talk."]

And forsomuch as our desire was, to have the *temple* of the Lord restored anew, we would seek none other foundation, than the same, which we knew was long ago laid by the *apostles*, that is to wit, *our Saviour Jesus Christ*. And forsomuch as we heard God himself speaking unto us in his *word*, and saw also the notable examples of the *old and primitive church*: again, how uncertain a matter it was to wait for a *general council*, and that the success thereof would be much more uncertain: but specially, forsomuch as we were most ascertained of *God's will*, and therefore counted it a wickedness to be too careful, and overcumbered about the judgments of mortal men, we could no longer stand taking advice with flesh and blood, but rather thought good to do the same thing, that both might rightly be done, and hath many a time been done, as well of other good men, as also of many catholic bishops: that is, to remedy our own churches by a *provincial synod*. For thus, we know, the *old fathers* used to put matters in experience, before they came to the *public universal council*. There remain yet at this day sundry canons, written in *councils of free cities*, as of Carthage under Cyprian, as of Ancyra, Neocæsarea, and Gangra, which is in Paphlagonia, as some think, before that the name of the *general council at Nice* was ever heard of. After this fashion, in old time, did they speedily meet with and cut short those *heretics*, the Pelagians, and the Donatists, at home, by private disputation, without any *general council*. Thus also, when the emperor Constantinus evidently and earnestly took part with Auxentius, the bishop of the Arians' faction, Am-

brose<sup>36</sup>, the bishop of the *Christians*, appealed not unto a *general council*, where he saw no good could be done, by reason of the *emperor's* might and great labour<sup>37</sup>: but only to his own *clergy* and people, that is to say, to a *provincial synod*. And thus it was decreed in the *council at Nice*, that the bishops should assemble twice every year. And in the *council at Carthage*<sup>38</sup> it was decreed, that the bishops should meet together, in each of their provinces, at least once in the year: which was done, as saith the *council of Chalcedon*, of purpose, that if any errors or abuses had happened to spring up any where, they might immediately, at the first entry, be destroyed, even where they first began. So likewise, when Secundus and Palladius rejected the *council of Aquileia*, because it was not a *general and common council*, St. Ambrose, *bishop of Milan*, made answer, that no man ought to take it for a new or strange matter, that the bishops of the *West part* of the world did call together *synods*, and make *private assemblies* in their provinces, for that it was a thing before that time not seldom used by the bishops of the *West church*, and by the bishops of *Græcia* used oftentimes and commonly to be done. And so Charles the Great, being *emperor*, held a *provincial council in Germany*, for putting away *images*, contrary to the *second council at Nice*. Neither party,

[Concil. Nic.  
can. 5.  
Mansi ii.  
669.]  
[Mansi iii.  
880.]

[Mansi vii.  
389. cap. 19.]

[Mansi iii.  
602. b.]

[Concil.  
Francof.]

<sup>36</sup> [This reading appears in the edd. of the Defence of the Apology of 1567, and 1570. The Latin Apology reads "Athanasius." As the author has given no reference, it is difficult to determine which is the true reading. Each reading is attended with chronological difficulties. "Ambrose" seems rather the more probable.]

<sup>37</sup> [Apol. Lat. : . . "propter imperatoris potentiam et studium partium."]

<sup>38</sup> [Concil. Carth. ii. : . . "singulis quibusque annis concilium convocatur: ad quod omnes provinciarum quæ primas sedes habent de conciliis suis ternos legatos mittant."]



even amongst us, is this so very a strange and a new trade. For we have had ere now in England *provincial synods*, and have governed our *churches* by home-made *laws*. What should one say more? Of a truth, even those greatest *councils*, and where most assembly of people ever was, (whereof these men use to make such an exceeding reckoning,) compare them with all the *churches* which throughout the world acknowledge and profess the *name of Christ*, and what else, I pray you, can they seem to be, but certain *private councils of bishops* and *provincial synods*? For admit, peradventure, Italy, France, Spain, England, Germany, Denmark, and Scotland meet together: if there want Asia, Græcia, Armenia, Persia, Media, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, and Mauritania, in all which places there be both many *Christian* men, and also bishops: how can any man, being in his right mind, think such a *council* to be a *general council*? And where so many parts of the world do lack, how can they truly say, they have the consent of the whole world? Or what manner of *council*, ween you, was the same last of *Trident*? Or how might it be termed a *general council*, whereas out of all *Christian kingdoms* and *nations* there came unto it but only forty bishops, and of the same, some so cunning<sup>39</sup>, that they might be thought meet to be sent home again to learn their grammar, and so well learned, that they had never studied any part of *divinity*?

## M. HARDING.

Your waiting for a general council, was not uncertain. For at the setting forth of your Apology, it was far and well entered, and almost ended. Whatsoever success thereof should follow, ye ought not to have refused it, <sup>a</sup> being in all respects lawful.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth.  
For in many respects it was unlawful.

<sup>39</sup> [Apol, Lat. "ita disert."]

Your assurance of God's will is none. That is but your common by-word, as it hath always been of heretics. Ye ought to have shewed good evidence for your being sure of God's will, before ye attempted these great and dangerous changes in religion..... Neither becometh it you to call the determinations of a general council the judgments of mortal men, so much as concerneth declaration of necessary points of faith, but the prompting and teaching of the Holy Ghost.

As for your provincial synod, it was none. Synods cannot be kept without bishops. Before ye claim the name of a synod for your packing and huddling together, ye must prove yourselves bishops, which ye are not able to do. Whatsoever ye say, <sup>b</sup> there were never good men, nor catholic bishops, that kept provincial synods, contrary to approved and lawful general councils, <sup>c</sup> as your synod is most contrary. Neither can ye pretend that ye followed any old fathers, putting things in experience before the coming to an universal council.....

Your council provincial, holden in Germany by Charles the Great, against the second Nicene council general, <sup>d</sup> is a false forged matter, as the book against images is, which one Eli Phil, the man in the moon's son, Calvin, Illyricus, and other heretics, have fathered upon that most godly and catholic emperor.

The council which you mean was a godly and a catholic council, holden at Frankfort by pope Adrian and Charles the Great, <sup>e</sup> against the wicked council of the heretics, named <sup>e</sup> image-breakers, which they held a little before that at Constantinople, which of those heretics was called the seventh and general, of the catholics *pseudosynodus*, that is to say, the false or forged council. Of both these councils, thus writeth Abbas Urspergensis, so much commended of Melancthon: "The council which a few years before was assembled at Constantinople <sup>39</sup>, in the time of Irene and Constantine her son, of them called the seventh and general, (in this council holden at Frankfort,) was repealed and put away by consent of all, as void and superfluous, so as from thenceforth it should be named neither the seventh, nor ought else....."

If you believe not this as the witness of a catholic writer, then believe Anselmus Rid, an earnest professor of your own the newest gospel, who writeth, that Adrian, the bishop of Rome, and king Charles, at the council holden at Frankfort, execrated and accursed as heretical, the council of the empire of Constantinople and of the Greeks, which they held for the abolishing of saints' images. Those be his very words <sup>40</sup>. Believe Peucerus,

<sup>39</sup> [The fact is, the second Council. Nic. was concluded at Constantinople, and hence is sometimes called by that name.]

<sup>40</sup> [The very words in the edit.

of 1550, are these: "In centum  
" quinquaginta trium antistitum  
" conventu damnatis divorum i-  
" maginum execratoribus."]

<sup>b</sup> Untruth, by many examples soon reproved.

<sup>c</sup> Untruth. For our synod is most agreeable to the old councils.

<sup>d</sup> A great untruth: as it may soon appear.

<sup>e</sup> Untruth. For the words be plain: *Pseudosynodus pro adorandis imaginibus, abdicata est. Ado.*

In Præfat. ad Ducem Bavarie.

In Catalogo annorum et principum, &c. Bernæ Impresso, anno 1550.

In addition. ad Carton.

Philip Melancthon's son in law, writing, that the council of Nice was kept by common consent of the Greek emperor and of Charles. If the second council of Nice, which was altogether for images, was holden by consent of Charles, how held he a council in Germany, for putting away images, against the council of Nice? Believe Carion, and specially Pantaleo, of Zurich, a man of your own, the most evangelical religion, who, upon warrant of the authority of Regino, writeth, that the council of Frankfort abrogated and disannulled the Greeks' council, that was against the worship of images. Briefly, how falsely you and sundry other of your sect have herein belied that worthy prince, Charles the Great, it may easily appear by that Paulus Æmilius writeth of him: That he sent twelve bishops out of France to the council then holden at Lateran in Rome, in which the image-breakers' false named and forged council was abrogated.

Where, of general councils ye make private and provincial synods, ye do besides learning, reason, and custom of the church. A council is not accounted general, because bishops of all countries under heaven be assembled, <sup>f</sup>but because many be assembled, and all be lawfully called. Else, in times when heresies reign, the church should never have the necessary remedy of a general council: for always heretics would refuse to come to it, as ye have to come to the late council at Trent.

In Persia, Media, Egypt, Mauritania, I ween ye find few bishops at this day, nor many in the other countries which ye reckon, and those in manner altogether ignorant and schismatics. Yet the patriarchs of Assyria, or Syria Orientalis, and of Armenia, who of late years were at Rome, have for their provinces both subscribed to the council of Trent <sup>g</sup>and received the whole decrees of the same for their peoples.

Your report of forty bishops only present at the council of Trent, and of their slender learning, is as true as your doctrine contrary to that council is, <sup>h</sup>that is to say, in plain terms, stark false. It is well known there were at this late council of Trent, in this pope's time, well near two hundred bishops.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

What hope we might conceive of your *late chapter of Trident*, we were sufficiently warned by the former, holden under pope Paulus III. and pope Julius III., wherein, notwithstanding your many years study, and great conference of so many, and so learned, and so excellent, and so much ado, yet in the end ye were never able, neither to suppress your open stews, nor to avoid your *priests' concubines*, nor to cause your bishops to be resident upon their charge, and to do their duties, nor to resolve us,

<sup>f</sup> By this rule the council of Trident was not general.

<sup>g</sup> Untruth, without shame or measure.

<sup>h</sup> Untruth, manifest. Read the records and subscriptions of the same council.

Omnipotentis Dei benig-  
nitate et apo-  
stolorum Pe-  
tri, et Pauli  
auctoritate  
freti. [Har-  
duin. x. 6.]

Ambros. Ca-  
tharinus.  
[Concil. Trid.  
Sess. 2. Crabb.  
iii. 988.]

Cornel. E-  
pisc. Biton-  
tinus. [Crab.  
iii. 981.]

Sess. 6. [l. 7.  
Hard. x. 55.]  
Salva semper  
in omnibus  
sedis aposto-  
licæ auctori-  
tate.  
9 quæ. 3.  
Nemo.

Joh. Sleidan.  
anno 1551.  
[lib. 22.]

Illyr. in pro-  
test. advers.  
Concil. Trid.  
p. 84. [p. 78.]

Aug. de Uni-  
tate Eccles.  
cap. 10. [ix.  
358.]

whether the *pope* be above the *council*, or the council above the *pope*. In the summon and first entry of your assembly there, pope Paul had forgotten Christ, and left him quite out of company <sup>41</sup>, and supplied the want of him with the authority of Peter and Paul, as it is plain and evident by his bull. Another of your *reverend fathers* there maketh *Mary* the *blessed Virgin equal with Christ*, and calleth her his *most faithful fellow: Fidelissimam Christi sociam*. Another of the same company telleth us, that the *pope is the light that is come into the world: Papa lux venit in mundum*. To be short, the whole issue and conclusion of all your doings there, by the full agreement of all your fathers, hangeth upon the pope's only pleasure, as by express words uttered in the sixth [seventh] session of the same *council* it may appear. And, by your doctrine, the *pope* may not be controlled, whatsoever he do, neither by the *clergy*, nor by all the whole world. And whatsoever the *pope* shall will to stay or pass, your doctors tell us, *His only will must stand for law*.

For these and other like causes, both the emperor Charles V. and also Francis the French king, beside sundry other *Christian princes*, made open protestation against your said *Tridentine conventicle*, being then removed to *Bononia*, and said it was no lawful *general council*, but only an assembly of a few certain persons, to serve one man's affection, and to seek for gain. Such is the opinion, that your own princes have of your assemblies.

It becometh us not (ye say) to call the determinations of your general councils, the judgments of mortal men. Yet it became St. Augustine to call the same, *Concilia contententium episcoporum*: "The *councils* of quarrelling *bishops*."

<sup>41</sup> [The words, as reported by Harduin, do not quite agree with Bp. Jewel's statement, or with his marginal quotation. "Hujus igitur ipsius Dei omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, ac beatorum ejus apostolorum Petri et Pauli auctoritate freti,"

&c. The bull, however, closes with words quite as profane as those reported in the margin: "Si quis autem hoc attentare præsumserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus, se noverrit incursum."]

And again: *Humanarum contentionum animosa et pernicioso certamina*: “The bold and hurtful contentions of worldly quarrels.” If it like you not, that your *councils* should be called the *judgments of men*, then call them, as St. Augustine doth, “The councils of quarrelling bishops:” or, “The hurtful contentions of worldly quarrels.” But what need we many words? Your own Panormitane saith: *Leges summorum pontificum et conciliorum appellantur statuta humana: et sic stricte non possunt dici jus divinum*: “The laws and determinations of popes and councils are called the determinations and *laws of men*, and so in strait manner of speech they cannot be called the *laws of God*.”

Eod. lib. cap. 7. [ib. 346.]

Extra de Consang. et Affin. Non debet. [Panor. tom. iii. pt. 2. fol. 37. col. 1. No. 4.]

Ye say, we are no bishops, and therefore have no authority to hold a synod. Even so your fathers in old time said, that St. Paul was no *apostle*, and that St. Basil and St. Hilary were no *bishops*. Of St. Paul, it is plain, therefore, he saith in his own defence: “Am not I an *apostle*? Am not I a free man? Have I not seen the Lord Jesus?” St. Hilary saith of himself: *Auxentius de persona (mea) calumniatus est, damnatum me a Saturnino, audiri, ut episcopum, non oportere*: “The heretic Auxentius layeth a quarrel to my person: and, forasmuch as *Saturninus the heretic* hath condemned me,” he saith, “I may not be heard as a *bishop*.”

1 Cor. ix.

Hilar. contra Arianos et Auxentium. [p. 1267.]

Basil. ep. 72. [iii. 386.]

Σύνοδον ἀθεοτύτων προσαγορεύουσι, μὴ καταδεχόμενοι ἐπισκόπους αὐτοὺς λέγειν. . .

Likewise, the *Arian heretics* used to say, that St. Basil, and other like learned and catholic fathers of that time, were no *bishops*. St. Basil thereof writeth thus: “They call the council of catholic *bishops a council of wicked men*: neither will they once vouchsafe to name them *bishops*, lest they should seem to allow the decrees, that they have made against them. And they challenge them to be no *bishops*, for that, as they say, they are the captains of a wicked heresy.” In like sort he writeth unto Patrophilus, of the heretic Eustathius: “He taketh great heed lest he should happily [haply] be forced to call us *bishops*.” Thus, M. Harding, in denying us to be *bishops*, ye do none otherwise but as other your predecessors have done before you.

Καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν προσετίθεισαν

τοῦ μὴ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐπισκόπους, διότι αἰρέσεώς φησι, πονηρὰς προεστήκασι.

Basil. ep. 82. [iii. 378.]

φροντίζει τοῦ μὴ εἰς ἀνάγκην ἐλθεῖν, προσεπιεῖν ἡμᾶς, ὡς ἐπισκόπους.

Of the bishops and prelates of your side, I will say nothing. What your own friends have thought of them, I have said before.

Mark 1. 3.

As for us, it shall be sufficient, if we be only the voice of a crier in the wilderness. St. Paul, to avouch his *apostleship*, said openly thus: *Gratia Dei sum id quod sum*: “By the *grace of God* I am that I am.”

1 Cor. xv. 10.

Ye say, “A provincial council may not repeal a council general.” As if the authority of your *councils* stood only in number, and not in truth. Howbeit, the simple truth of God shall overweigh falsehood, be it never so general. But even thus said Auxentius, the *Arian heretic*, against St. Hilary. These be his words: *Ego quidem, piissimè imperatores, existimo non oportere sexcentorum episcoporum unitatem, post tantos labores, ex contentione paucorum hominum refricari*: “My most *gracious lords*, in my judgment, it is not meet, after so great pains taken, for the contentious striving of a few, to hazard the consent and unity of *six hundred bishops*.” Thus the *heretic* Auxentius alleged great multitudes of his companions against St. Hilary, and the *catholics*: which, he said, were but a few.

[Inter opp.  
Hilari ed.  
Bened. col.  
1270.]

Notwithstanding, it were no hard matter to shew evident examples of *general councils*, that have been overruled by *particulars*. The *general council of Nice* determined, as you say, but you say it untruly, that all appeals, out of all parts of the world, should lie to Rome. Yet the *particular or provincial council of Africa* saith: *Si provocandum putaverint, non provocent, nisi ad Africana concilia. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverit appellandum, a nullo intra Africam in communionem recipiatur*: “If they shall think it good to appeal, let them not appeal but only to such *councils*, as shall be holden within Africa. But whosoever shall appeal beyond the *seas*” (that is to say, to the bishop of Rome), “let no man within Africa receive him to his *communion*.”

Conc. Afric.  
cap. 92. [iv.  
507.]

Sozom. lib. 1.  
c. 23. [ii. 47.]  
Concil. Carthag. 2. cap.  
2. [iii. 693.]

The *general council of Nice* durst not to dissolve *priests' marriage*: the *particular council of Carthage* dissolved it utterly. The order of private or auricular *confession*, which, in your phantasy, was received generally through-

out the whole *church of God*, was, notwithstanding, quite abolished<sup>42</sup> in the *church of Constantinople*, only by the particular advice of Nectarius.

Your *black friars*, in their *particular chapters*, have controlled and cut off the *general determination of the council of Basil*, touching the conceiving of our Lady in original sin. And Albertus Pighius, by his like *particular authority*, telleth you, that as well this *council of Basil*, as also the *council of Constance*, being both *general*, (in that they said, the *council* is above the *pope*,) “decreed plainly against *nature*, against the manifest *scriptures*, against all *antiquity*, and against the *catholic faith of Christ*.”

Certainly, the *truth of God* is not bound, neither to person nor to place. Wheresoever it be, either in few or in many, it is evermore *catholic*, even because it is the *truth of God*. In the *council of Constantinople*, it is written thus: *Definierunt pariter, ut si quid in provincia qualibet emergeret, provinciæ concilio finiretur*: “The fathers agreed all together, that, if any matter should happen to grow in the province, by a *council of the province* it should be ended.” Likewise saith Isidorus: *Manifestum est, quod illa, quæ sunt per unamquamque provinciam, ipsius provinciæ synodus dispenset, sicut Nicæno constat decretum esse concilio*: “It is clear, that matters happening in every *province*, by a *provincial synod* may be ordered, as it is concluded in the *council of Nice*.” Likewise St. Ambrose saith: *Sciabant esse consuetudinem, ut in Oriente, orientalium esset concilium: intra Occidentem, occidentalium*: “They knew it was a custom, that a *council of the east bishops* should be holden in the East, and a *council of the west bishops* should be holden (apart) in the West.”

St. Augustine saith: *Literas episcoporum, et per sermonem forte sapientiore cujuslibet in ea re peritioris, licet reprehendi, si quid in eis forte a veritate deviatum est*: “*Bishops*’

Socrat. lib. 5. cap. 9. [leg. cap. 19. tom. li. 287.]

Aug. de Civit. lib. 20. cap. 6. [leg. c. 26.] Vives. [li. 593.]

Albert. Pigh. in Hierarch. [lib. 6. c. 2. p. 402.]

Hist. Trip. lib. 9. c. 13.

Isid. in Præfat. in Concilia. [Crabb. tom. 1. p. 4.]

In Concilio Aquileen. [iii. 602. c.]

Aug. de Baptism. contra Donatist. lib. 2. cap. 3. [ix. 98.]

<sup>42</sup> [Some commentators have doubted, whether the words of Socrates extend to the absolute abrogation of private confession. But it is at least evident, that such

confession was henceforward not compulsory, as a condition preliminary to admission to the holy communion.]

letters, if they swerve any thing from the *truth*, may be controlled by the discretion of any other man, that hath more skill in the matter.”

In like sort, abbot Panormitane, your own doctor, saith, as it hath been alleged before: *In concernentibus fidem, etiam dictum unius privati esset præferendum dicto papæ, si ille moveretur melioribus rationibus Novi et Veteris Testamenti*: “In matters concerning the faith, the saying of any one *private man* were to be taken before the saying of the *pope*, if he were moved with better reasons of the *Old and New Testament*, than the *pope*.”

Howbeit, we have not, by our *provincial council*, removed or shaken the authority of any one *ancient general council*, M. Harding. For of all the *ancient councils* that have been, touching the cases that lie between us in controversy, ye are not yet able to allege one. We have, upon good causes, removed your vanities and unseemly follies: and have restored again, so much as in us lay, the *decrees and canons* of the *ancient councils*. Hincmarus, the *bishop of Rheims*, saith thus: *Cum duarum aut trium provinciarum præsules in unum conveniunt, si, antiquorum canonum institutione muniti, aliquid prædicationis, aut dogmatis instituunt, quod tamen ab antiquorum patrum dogmatibus non discrepet, catholicum est, quod faciunt: et fortasse dici potest, universale*: “When the *bishops* of two or three *provinces* meet together, if they, by the warrant of the *old councils*, appoint any matter of preaching or doctrine, so that it disagree not from the doctrine of the *ancient fathers*, it is catholic that they do, and perhaps may be called *universal*.” Such are our doings, M. Harding: they agree with the doings of the *ancient fathers*, and have the warrant of the *councils* of the *primitive church*, and therefore they are catholic.

The credit of the emperor Charles’ *book*, reporting the decrees of the *council of Frankfort* touching the *adoration of images*, I leave wholly to the indifferent discretion of the reader.

It was printed, not at *Geneva*, as you surmise, but in *Paris*. The setter out proveth it not to be forged, by many good and likely reasons. An ancient copy of the

Extra, de  
Elect. et  
Electi potest.  
Significastl.  
Abb. [Pa-  
norm. tom. i.  
pt. 1. fol. 122.  
col. 1.]

Hincmarus  
Rem. cap. 20.  
[tom. ii. 457.]



same is yet still to be seen in Rome, in Lateran, even in the *pope's own library*. Augustinus Steuchus, the master of the same *library*, reporteth the same. The emperor Ludovicus, son unto Charles, wrote a book, yet extant, and remaining in France, to like purpose. Eckius also beareth witness unto the same *book* of the emperor Charles, although untruly and guilefully, as his manner is. For he saith that Charles wrote four *books in defence of images*, whereas, indeed, the *books* are directly written against *images*.

Aug. Steuch.  
de Donat.  
Const. [lib. 2.  
fol. 226. B.]  
lib. 1. cap. 6.  
Eck. de Ima-  
ginibus.  
[Loc. com.  
art. 16.]

Although ye think Eli Phili<sup>43</sup>, or I know not who, may easily be charged with corruption and forgery, yet why the *pope* himself should corrupt and forge his own *book*, in his own *library*, against himself, it were hard for you to shew good reason.

“The council of Frankfort” (ye say) “was godly and catholic, and made decrees against image-breakers, in the behalf of images.” Yet, notwithstanding, Aventinus saith: *In Frankfordiensi concilio scita Græcorum, de adorandis imaginibus, rescissa sunt*: “In the council of Frankfort, the Grecians’ decrees for the adoration of images were quite abolished.” Regino saith: *Pseudosynodus Græcorum, quam pro adorandis imaginibus fecerunt, rejecta est*: “The false council of the Greeks, which they had made for adoration of images, was repealed in the council of Frankfort.” Likewise Ado saith: *Pseudosynodus, quam Græci septimam vocant, pro adorandis imaginibus, abdicata est penitus*: “The false council, which the Greeks call the seventh, wherein decrees were made for the adoration of images, was there utterly put away.”

Aventin. fol.  
337.

Regino.

Ado. [fol.  
181.]

Hincmarus, the archbishop of Rheims, speaking of the same council of Frankfort, saith thus:.....*Pseudosynodus Græcorum destructa est, et penitus abdicata. De cujus destructione, non modicum volumen, quod in palatio adolescentulus legi, ab eodem imperatore Romam est per quosdam episcopus missum*: “The false council of the Greeks was

Hincmarus  
c. 20. [tom.  
ii. 457.]

<sup>43</sup> [Eli Phili: the name by which the editor Johannes Tilius Mel-densis called himself. Vossius Hist. Lat. lib. 2. shews that the author was Alcuin: see Replie, supra vol. iii. 257. note <sup>94</sup>.]

repealed and utterly overthrown in the *council of Frankfort*. Whereof, when I was a young man, I read a pretty big book in the *pope's palace in Rome*, which book was sent thither by certain bishops from the said emperor Charles."

Certain words of the said *lewd* or *false council* of the Greeks, amongst others, are these: *Qui timet Deum, adorat imagines, ut filium Dei: qui adorat imaginem, et dicit, Hoc est Christus, non peccat: peccat qui non adorat imaginem. Qui non adorat imaginem, est hæreticus: imago adoranda est eodem cultu, quo sancta Trinitas*: "He that feareth God adoreth an image, as he would adore the Son of God: he that adoreth an image, and saith, 'This is Christ,' offendeth not: he offendeth, that adoreth not an image: he that adoreth not an image, is an heretic: we must adore an image with the same reverence wherewith we adore the holy Trinity."

Citantur in libro Carol. Magni. [lib. iii. cap. 28. p. 452.]

Now, whether these and other like worthy sayings and sentences were to be reprov'd, or no, it may please you, M. Harding, to consider.

"That council" (ye say) "is called general, not whereunto all Christian nations do resort indeed, but whereunto all Christian nations are lawfully summoned." As this answer is true, and not denied, so, by the same, your late *council of Trident* may in no wise be called *general*. For what lawful summons sent your pope Pius either to Preter Gian<sup>44</sup> into Ethiopia; or to other bishops and Christians in India: or (Europa only, and that no whole, excepted) what summons sent he into any other kingdom or country of the world?

But ye say, "In Persia, Media, Egypt, Mauritania, and in other countries adjoining, there are few Christians at this day to be found." Yet the authors of *Novus Orbis*, describing the state of the world, say thus: "*In all countries, whithersoever ye come, there be some Christians.*" Again: "*In India many kings and princes profess Christ.*" And again: "*In Armenia and Cilicia, in a manner, the*

[<sup>44</sup> Prester John.]

whole people is christened. Only they are subject to the cham of Tartary. Their priests be married: and whoso is unmarried may be no priest."

Ye say: "The patriarchs of Assyria and Armenia" (that Fol. 324. never saw neither the one country nor the other) "were at Rome," (ye know not when,) "and subscribed to all the articles of your council of Trident." O, M. Harding, ye can get no great credit by open mockery. It is no hard matter for your *pope*, out of his own guard, to make such *patriarchs* enow, one for *Jerusalem*, another for *Constantinople*, another for *Alexandria*, another for *Antioch*, another for *Sidon*, another for *Tyrus*: and I marvel, if there be not some *patriarch*, one or other, for *Sodom* and *Gomorrah*. These poor holy and hungry fathers are contented at all times to yield their submissions, and to set their hands to whatsoever they shall be required, and, in the names of those countries that they scarcely ever heard of, to confess the *pope*, their master, to be all, and more than all. With such vain shows and vizards it pleaseth you to smooth the world.

If ye doubt hereof, ye may easily find, that one Augustinus de Roma, in your late *council of Basil*, bare the name of the *archbishop of Nazareth* in *Jewry*: and yet, poor man, had he never seen *Nazareth* in all his life. Likewise, that one Petrus Paludensis, a poor friar observant, not long sithence, bare the name of the *patriarch of Jerusalem*: and yet had he never seen *Jerusalem*, nor knew which way to go to it. But what need mo examples? Your own *Ceremoniary of Rome* telleth you thus: *Con-* Conc. Basili-  
en. [xxix.  
109. a.]  
*sueverunt antiqui ponere patriarchas quatuor ecclesiarum principalium, inter episcopos cardinales mixtim. Nostro tempore ponuntur immediate post cardinales. Sunt enim quodammodo titulares:* "They were wont, in old times, to place the *patriarchs* of the four principal churches, together with the cardinal bishops, one with another. But now-a-days they are placed next beneath all the *cardinals*. For in a manner they have now nothing else but the names of *patriarchs*." Such guests were your *patriarchs* of *Assyria* and *Armenia*, that subscribed to your *council* of Petr. Paluden.  
[in calc.  
operis.]  
Patriar. Hierosolymitanus.  
Ceremoniarum lib. 1.  
section. 3.  
[fol. 44. b.]

*Trident*. They bare the names of these countries, M. Harding: but the countries they had never seen.

It is most certain, that the *Christian patriarchs*, and *bishops* of those countries, will neither communicate with the *pope*, either in sacraments, or in prayers, nor anywise yield to his authority, nor give any manner of honour or reverence to his person, no more than to Mahomet, or Antichrist, as I have sufficiently shewed before.

Touching the *number of bishops* present at your *former assembly at Trident*, I refer myself to the records of the same. If ye find there more than *forty bishops*, I am content to lose my credit. And yet of the same number, *blind sir Robert of Scotland*, as I have said before, and *M. Pates of England*, were silly poor *bishops*, God knoweth, endued only with bare names, without *bishoprics*<sup>45</sup>. In your latter assembly, two of your holy fathers were slain there presently in advoutery<sup>46</sup>. By mean of which misfortune, your number by so much was abated.

These be the great worthies of the world: these, Cornelius Bitontinus, one of the same company, calleth the *stars* of the *churches*, and the *mighty army of God's angels*. These have power to determine matters that they never understood, by authority only, but not by knowledge.

Alphonsus de Castro, as I have shewed you before, saith thus: "It is certain, that some popes be so void of learning, that they understand not the *grammar rules*." Erasmus, speaking of sundry the great learned of your side, saith thus: "*Sibi videntur semi-dei, miro supercilio præ se despicientes grammaticos: qui si grammaticæ litassent, non ad hunc modum se pueris deridendos propinarent*:" "They think themselves *half gods*, and with high looks they despise *poor grammarians*: but if they had well learned their *grammar*, they would not offer such occasions that children and babes should scorn at their folly."

Concerning the whole matter, your *doctors of Sorbona*, in *Paris*, have concluded thus: *Ut concilium legitime con-*

Flacius Illyric. in protestatione adversus Concil. Tridentin. [p. 79.]

Alphon. adversus Hæreses, lib. 1. cap. 4.

Erasm. in Epistolam Hieron. ad Eustochium.

Articul. 22.

<sup>45</sup> [Supra vol. vi. 219, note 70, 71, and 72.]

<sup>46</sup> [Vol. vi. 220, note 73.]

*gregetur, sufficit, quod solennitas et forma juris solenniter sit servata. Quia si quis trahere velit hoc in disputationem, utrum prælati, qui ibi sedent, habeant rectam intentionem, et utrum sint docti, et utrum habeant scientiam sacrarum literarum, et animum obediendi sanæ doctrinæ, esset processus in infinitum:* “That the *council* be lawfully assembled, it is sufficient that the solemnity and form of law be solemnly observed. For if a man would cast doubts, whether the *bishops* that sit in *council* have a good meaning, and whether they be learned, and whether they be skilful in the *scriptures*, and whether they have a mind to obey sound doctrine, or no, then we should never make an end.”

These be they, M. Harding, to whom ye would have us to give ear, whatsoever they say, even as to the *secretaries of the Holy Ghost*. But St. Augustine saith: *Ecclesie inter nos agitur causa, non mea. Ecclesia in nullo homine spernere, a suo didicit Redemptore:* August. contra Crescon. l' b. 3. cap. So. [ix. 481.] “It is the *church's* cause, that we talk of: it is not mine. The *church* hath learned of her *Redeemer* to put no trust in any man.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 18. *Divis. 1.*

Howsoever it be, the truth of the gospel of Jesus Christ dependeth not upon *councils*, nor, as St. Paul [1 Cor. iv. 3.] saith, upon the judgments of mortal creatures<sup>47</sup>. And if they which ought to be careful for *God's church* will not be wise, but slack their duty, and harden their hearts against God, and his Christ, going on still to pervert the right ways of the Lord, God will stir up the very stones, and make children and babes cunning<sup>48</sup>, that there may ever be some to confute their lies.

<sup>47</sup> [Apol. Lat. “ab humano die;” *ἐστιν, ἵνα ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ, ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας.*] so the margin of the English Bible, “day:” both from the Greek: Ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν

<sup>48</sup> [Apol. Lat. “disertos.”]

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Hereto M. Harding answereth nothing else, but thus: "The council is the school of truth: the bishops cannot foreslow their duties: the church of Rome cannot err." Which tales we have so often, and not without weariness, heard already. Petrus de Palude, amongst other your doctors, saith: *Non est credendum, ecclesiam Romanam errasse a fide. Ipsa enim potest e contrario cum Christo dicere, Ego testimonium perhibeo de meipsa. Testimonium meum verum est:* "No man may believe that the church of Rome may err from the faith: contrariwise, that church may say with Christ, 'I bear witness of myself: and my witness is just and true.'" Therefore, so long as the church of Rome can speak for herself, there is no doubt but all is well.

Petr. de Palude de Po-  
testat. Papæ.  
Artic. 4.

## THE APOLOGY, Chap. 18. Divis. 2.

For God is able (not only without councils, but also, will the councils, nill the councils) to maintain and advance his own kingdom. "Full many be the thoughts of man's heart," (saith Solomon,) "but the counsel of the Lord abideth stedfast: there is no wisdom, there is no knowledge, there is no counsel against the Lord." "Things endure not" (saith Hilarius) "that be set up with man's workmanship: by another manner of means must the church of God be builded and preserved: for that church is grounded upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, and is holden fast together by one corner-stone, which is Christ Jesus<sup>49</sup>."

Proverb. xix.  
21.

Hilarius in  
Psalm. 126.  
[p. 417.]

<sup>49</sup> [Hilar. "Humanis enim operibus extracta non permanet (sc. domus). . . . Extruenda aliter, custodienda aliter (sc. ecclesia) est. . . . fundamentum ejus super prophetas et apostolos locan-  
"dum est. Lapidibus vivis augenda est, angulari lapide construenda." In the Lat. Apol. the passage is not quoted with verbal accuracy.]

M. HARDING.

... Where ye say, that by another manner of means the church of God must be builded and preserved, shew us what other means they are, and we must say ye are very cunning men, who correct, I will not say, *Magnificat*, but Christ's own ordinance for government of his church, who hath ordained <sup>a</sup>apostles, prophets, evangelists, shepherds, and teachers, (as is before mentioned,) *in ædificationem corporis Christi*, "to the building up of the body of Christ," which is his church. Ye shall pardon us if we believe St. Paul before you. We see, what is the mark ye shoot at, that the lawful successors of the apostles, prophets, and evangelists, and the lawful shepherds and doctors being put from the building of Christ's body, the church, yourselves may take the work in hand, and govern all. Set your hearts at rest: it shall not be so...

<sup>a</sup> By this reckoning it appeareth not, that God ever ordained popes or cardinals to build his church.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Indeed, Christ hath ordained *apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors*, and *teachers*, for the government of his church; notwithstanding the same be not always allowed to sit in *councils*, nor be always known by *rochets*, or *mitres*. If God had not provided other *pastors* and *feeders*, besides your *prelates*, the whole church might starve for hunger. St. Paul's words be true: but your idle constructions are untrue. We find not fault with *God's ordinance*: but we rejoice in *God's mercy*, for that it hath pleased him to visit his people, and to discover the multitude of these vanities, wherewith you have so long, and so uncourteously, beguiled the world. Therefore, we correct not *Magnificat*, M. Harding, as you say: but rather, we humbly sing, *Te Deum laudamus*, "and rejoice in God our Saviour." The right and only way of building *God's house*, is, to lay the foundation thereof upon the *everlasting word and will of God*. St. Paul saith: "Other foundation no man can lay, but the same that is laid already, which is Christ Jesus." I Cor. iii. 11. The prophet Esay saith, "*To the law*" (of God) "*and to the testimony*." Isa. viii. 20. If they speak not according to this word, they shall have no morning light." Therefore St. Hilary saith, as it is alleged in the Apology: *Aliter extruenda, aliter custodienda (ecclesia) est:.....fundamentum ejus super prophetas et apostolos collocandum [al. locandum] est.....Ecclesia*

Hilarius in Psalm. 126. [p. 417.]

*ita a Deo, id est, doctrinis Dei, ædificata* [l. *ædificanda*] *non concidet*: “Otherwise must the church be built, and otherwise must it be kept. The foundation of it must be laid upon the apostles and prophets. The church being thus built by God, that is to say, by the doctrine of God, shall never fall.”

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 19. *Divis. 1.*

But marvellous notable, and to very good purpose, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 86.]</sup> for these days, be St. Hierom's words: “Whomsoever (saith he) the devil hath deceived, and enticed to fall asleep, as it were, with the sweet and deadly enchantments of the mermaids, the syrens, those persons doth God's word awake up, saying unto them, ‘Arise, thou that sleepest: lift up thyself, and Christ shall give thee light.’ Therefore, at the coming of Christ, of God's word, of the ecclesiastical doctrine, and of the full destruction of Nineveh, (and) of that most beautiful harlot, then shall the people, which heretofore had been cast in a trance under their masters, be raised up, and shall make haste to go to the mountains of the scripture: and there shall they find hills, I mean Moses, and Joshua, the son of Nun: other hills also, which are the prophets: and hills of the New Testament, which are the apostles and the evangelists. And when the people shall flee for succour to such hills, and shall be exercised in the reading of this kind of mountains, though they find not one to teach them, (for the harvest shall be great, but the labourers few,) yet shall the good desire of the people be well accepted, in that they have gotten them to such hills; and the negligence of their masters shall be openly reprov'd.” These be St. Hierom's words, and that so plain, as there needeth no interpreter. For they agree so just with the things we now see

Hieron. in  
Nahum, cap.  
3. [iii. 1590.]

Ephes. v. 14.



with our eyes have already come to pass, that we may verily think he meant to foretell, as it were, by the spirit of prophecy, and to paint before our face the universal state of our time: the fall of the most gorgeous *harlot Babylon*: the repairing again of *God's church*: the blindness and sloth of the *bishops*, and the good will and forwardness of the people. For who is so blind, but he seeth these men be the *masters*, by whom the people, as saith St. Hierom, hath been led into error, and lulled asleep? Or who seeth not that *Rome*, that is, their *Nineveh*, which sometime was painted with fairest colours, now, her vizard being pulled off, is both better seen, and less set by? Or who seeth not, that good men, being awaked, as it were, out of their dead sleep, at the light of the gospel, and at the voice of God, have resorted to the *hills of the scriptures*, waiting not at all for the *councils* of such *masters*?

## M. HARDING.

Ye wrest the saying of St. Hierom to your purpose, that is to say, so as it may seem to be spoken against the church that now is, wherein ye make him a prophet. And that this place might sound the more against the clergy, to the commendation of the people, and to stir them to read the scriptures: after your accustomed manner, ye stick not to add somewhat of your own in one place; to take away a little of the doctor in another place; to alter the words in another place. Who looketh so narrowly for trial of this, as your secretary thought maliciously when he wrote it, by diligent conference of this Apology with St. Hierom, he shall find it.

Now, concerning the right sense of the place, St. Hierom's intent was not to foretell and paint before our face (as you say) the universal state of our time, but to tell and declare the meaning of the prophet Nahum, <sup>a</sup>signifying the state of the time now past, to wit, the time of Christ's first coming into the world: for the words do expressly speak thereof. After St. Hierom's exposition, by Nineveh that prophet meaneth the world: by the Assyrian king, the devil. And there he prophesieth the ruin of the world, and of the devil, at the coming of Christ. St. Hierom

<sup>a</sup> Untruth. For St. Hierom in the same place saith: *Hæc in consummatione mundi magis complentur,* [iii. 1577.] *Hucusque de mundi ruina.*

b Untruth. For he speaketh oftentimes of her: and saith plainly, that Rome is Babylon.

b speaketh never a word of your harlot Babylon, whereof ye and your unlearned ministers have never done babbling, meaning thereby the holy Roman church.

c As though sithence the birth of Christ there never had been neither Nineveh, nor Babylon, nor ignorance, nor negligence in the clergy.

First, you, sir defender, that penned this gear, have played a false part, by dividing the one member of the sentence into two: or rather, by putting in one word, and leaving out another. For where St. Hierom hath thus, *Et consummationis Nineveh speciosissima quondam meretricis*, whereby he meant the undoing of the devil's power in the world once, that is to say, <sup>c</sup> before the coming of Christ, a most beautiful harlot, that you might give occasion of reproach to the Roman church, which, falsifying the doctor's sense, you understand by Nineveh, you have set it forth thus: *Et consummationis Nineveh, et speciosissima meretricis*. Then you descant upon it, as though St. Hierom had so written, and say, that he setteth before our face the fall of the most gorgeous harlot Babylon, which you interpret to be Rome. And then, further corrupting St. Hierom's sense, you make him to speak of the repairing again of God's church, as though at this day it were, by default of the catholic clergy, fallen down, and should be set up again by you and your ministers: also of the blindness of the bishops of our time, that they be the masters by whom the people hath been led into error, and lulled asleep. And hereto ye add, "as saith Hierom," where St. Hierom saith not so, neither of the masters at Christ's first coming, but of the devil, who brought the people asleep, by whom he understandeth <sup>d</sup> not the people that liveth now, but them that were deceived by the devil under evil masters, before the coming of Christ.

In Comment. in Nahum, cap. 3.

d No doubt, if there be credit sufficient in this commentary.

But because this defender thinketh he hath acquitted himself like a clerk, by alleging this place out of St. Hierom against the catholic church, I require all the learned to read over what St. Hierom writeth upon the end of the prophet Nahum, from these words of the text, *Brucus irruit et evolavit*, &c. forth to the end of the chapter, and most diligently to mark that goeth immediately before the place by this defender alleged. As for thee, good reader, that understandest not the Latin tongue, I assure thee, St. Hierom speaketh those words of <sup>e</sup> heretics, <sup>e</sup> of teachers of evil doctrine, of such as will not hear the voice of the church, of which sort this new English clergy is. And in that discourse he commendeth to true believers, not only the hills, that is, the written scriptures, but also the doctrine of the church, (as thou seest in the allegation put in the Apology,) and before that he commendeth likewise *latibula doctorum*, "the caves of the doctors," in which the faithful people also, as by flying to the hills, couch themselves safe from danger of the devil, stirrer of heresies. So that if the place be well scanned, by that allegation they shall seem to have made a rod to whip themselves. The whole place being over long to recite here, a sentence or two, that are specially meant of such as they be, may suffice.

In Nahum 3.

e As though the pope's clerks were not heretics, and teachers of false doctrine.

*Vae itaque his*, &c. "Woe then to those which are teachers

of perverse doctrines in Nineveh," by which is signified the world. "And aptly to them it is said, Thy shepherds have slept: for they have given sleep to their eyes, and slumbering to their eyelids. And therefore have they not found a place for our Lord, nor a tabernacle for the God of Jacob. Neither have they heard out of Ephrata, that is to say, *frugifera ecclesia*, "the fruitful church." Nor have they found the church in the thickets of the woods. Neither only the shepherds of this rifraff, (*mixticii hujus*, he meaneth by  $\delta$  *συνμικτός*, which is the word of the seventy translators, "all sorts of people deceived by false teachers,") and of the locust, (they are the captain heretics,) which in time of frost sitteth in the hedges, have slept: but by the king of Assyrians (who is the devil) they have been lulled asleep. For always it is the study of the devil how he may bring asleep waking souls." Thus St. Hierom.

Now I report me to those that have eyes to see, whether our new clergy may not seem those whom the devil lulled asleep, (gladly I use their own term,) in their new devices, in their own liked conceits, in their schisms and heresies, in their unjust possession of benefices and bishoprics, those yet living to whom the right belongeth, in their presumption of that office they are not duly called unto, in their malice toward the church, in the continual satisfying of their fleshly lusts, and in their unlawful and lecherous embracings.

Let them fear the dreadful saying of St. Hierom, following straight after their allegation: *Non est sanitas contritioni tuæ*, &c.: "There is no health for thy bruise: thy wound swelleth." Therefore the rifraff of Nineveh cannot be healed, because he layeth not down his pride, and the wound is always fresh, and daily he is wounded, whiles the devil striketh at him. And when all cometh to all, there is no health for his bruise. For although he seem to himself whole, yet is his soul broken, and crushed with the beetle of the whole earth, that founceth down upon it. And it is not healed, because continually it is lifted up with pride. But if it become humble, and submit itself to Christ, "a contrite and humble heart God despiseth not." Thus describeth St. Hierom these men. Neither let them say, they submit themselves to Christ, whom and whose gospel they have so much in their mouths, until they follow his doctrine, saying of the governors of his church, "He that heareth you, heareth me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." And thus much for answer to the place of St. Hierom.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here is a marvellous work. "Sir defender singeth descant, and quitteth himself like a clerk. He altereth St. Hierom's mind: he saith, 'St. Hierom saith so,' whereas

St. Hierom saith not so: he, of proud Nineveh, hath made the church of Rome: he, of the devil, hath made Antichrist: he babbleth about Babylon: he divideth one sentence into two: he putteth in one word, and leaveth out another: he is lulled asleep: he scattereth his riraff: he doth and saith," I know not what, whatsoever it shall please M. Harding of his courtesy to report.

Touching this heinous imagined corruption, and altering of St. Hierom's mind, St. Chrysostom saith: *Qui mendax est, neminem putat verum dicere, ne ipsum quidem Deum:* "He that himself is a liar, imagineth that no man saith the truth, no not God himself." With such corruption and change of words, Palladius, a lewd fellow, thought himself sometime able to charge St. Hierom. St. Hierom's words thereof are these: *Concionatur, me (esse) falsarium: me verbum non expressisse de verbo: pro honorabili, dixisse charissimum.....Hæc et hujusmodi nugæ mea crimina sunt:* "He preacheth and publisheth abroad, that I am a falsary: that I have not precisely translated word for word: that I, instead of this word *honourable*, have written these words, *dearly beloved*. These things, and such trifles, are laid to my charge."

To these follies St. Hierom answereth thus: *Cum ipsa epistola doceat, nihil mutatum esse de sensu, nec res additas, nec aliquod dogma confictum, 'faciunt næ isti intelligendo, ut nihil intelligant: et dum alienam imperitiam volunt coarguere, produnt suam:* "Whereas the epistle itself declareth, that there is no alteration made in the sense, and that there is neither matter of substance added, nor any doctrine imagined, verily, by their great cunning, they prove themselves fools: and, seeking to reprove other men's unskilfulness, they betray their own."

Ye say, St. Hierom in these words spake nothing, neither of the church of Christ, nor of your clergy of Rome. For trial whereof, let St. Hierom himself be heard to speak, as a witness indifferent of himself. First, in other places he saith thus: (to this place we shall resort afterward:)\* *Dicimus, Non venient super nos mala. Audiamus sententiam Domini.....: Sion, et Hierusalem, et*

Chrysost. in Matt. hom. 19. in Opere imperfecto. [vi. app 97.]

Hieron. ad Pamma. de optimo genere interpretandi, tom. 2. [iv. pt. 2. 249.]

In eadem Epist. [ib. 250.]

Hieronym. in Michæ, cap. 3. [iii. 1521.]

*Mons Templi speculatorium, et visio pacis, et templum Christi in consummatione, et in fine* ..... : “ We say, There shall no hurt come upon us. Let us hear the saying of our Lord, ‘ Sion, and Jerusalem, and the Mount, that is the watch-tower of the temple, and the sight of peace, and the temple or church of Christ, shall be consumed, and brought to an end.’ ”

These words be plain, not only that the haute lady *Nineveh*, but also that the church or temple, that beareth the name of Christ, shall be consumed, and brought to an end.

Likewise he saith: ..... *Quos Deus inseruit ex oleastro in radicem bonæ olivæ, si (illi) immemores recesserint a conditore suo, et adoraverint Assyrium, cur illos Deus non evertat, et ad eandem sitim reducat, in qua prius fuerunt?* “ Even they whom God hath grafted from out of the wild olive tree, into the root of the good olive,” (that is to say, the children of the church,) “ if they forget themselves, and flee from their Maker, and worship the king of Assyria,” (that is to say, *Antichrist*, or any other creature, that is not God,) “ why may not God overthrow them, and bring them to the same thirst and drought they were in before?”

Hieronym. in Sophoniam, cap. 2. [li. 1668.]

Mark, M. Harding, St. Hierom applieth these words, not only unto *Nineveh*, but also unto the church of God. Again he saith: *Abominatio desolationis, intelligi potest omne dogma perversum: quod cum viderimus stare in loco sancto, id est, in ecclesia,.....debemus fugere de Judæa ad montes:* “ The abomination of desolation may be taken for any wicked doctrine: which when we shall see standing in the holy place, that is to say, in the church of Christ, then we must flee from Jewry to the mountains (of the scriptures.)”

Hier. in Mat. cap. 24. lib. 4. [iv. 115.]

And again likewise he saith: ..... *Paxillus auferetur de loco fidei, hoc est, de ecclesia, per impietatem quotidie succrescentem: et qui super eum ante pependerit fide, postea infidelitate frangentur, et cadent, et peribunt:* “ The pin or bar” (whereby he meaneth Christ, for that the faithful hang

Hier. in Esa. cap. 23. [l. cap. 22. iii. 201.]

upon him, as in a house things are hanged up safely upon a *pin*) “ shall be taken away from the place that was faithful, that is to say, from the church, because of the wickedness that daily groweth. And they that before hung upon him by faith, afterward by infidelity shall be broken down, and fall, and perish.”

Whatsoever *gloss* ye shall give to the other words of St. Hierom, certainly these words are plain and evident, and will not easily receive your *gloss*. Likewise, St. Gregory, speaking, not of the *first coming of Christ*, but of the time that is described to be before the end of the world, saith thus: *In diebus illis ecclesia, quasi quodam senio debilitata, per prædicationem parere filios non valebit.....*: “ In those days the *church*, as being overmuch weakened with age, shall not be able by preaching to bear children.”

Greg. in Job.  
c. 9. lib. 19. c.  
29. [1. 613.]

Now, touching your clergy, St. Hierom himself saith: *Ipsi quoque sacerdotes, qui legem Domini docere deberent, et subjectos sibi populos a leonis furore defendere, quodam stupore infatuati, vertentur in amentiam*: “ The *priests* themselves, that ought to teach the *law of our Lord*, and to defend the people committed to their charge from the fury of the *lion*,” (that is, the *devil*,) “ being amazed, and bereft of their wits, shall be turned into madness.”

Hier. in Jer.  
lib. 1. cap. 4.  
[iii. 548.]

Again he saith: *Scit rex Assyrius, non posse se oves decipere, nisi pastores ante consopierit. Semper diaboli studium est, vigilantes animas consopire*: “ The *king of Assyria*” (that is, the *devil*) “ knoweth that he can never deceive the sheep, unless first he cast the *shepherds* into a trance. It is evermore the *devil's* policy to lay watchful souls asleep.”

Hier. in Na-  
phtham. 3. [iii.  
1589.]

And therefore again he saith: *Auferet Dominus nomina vanæ gloriæ, et admirationis falsæ, quæ versantur in ecclesia..... Sed et nomina sacerdotum cum sacerdotibus, qui frustra sibi applaudunt in episcopali nomine, et in presbyterii dignitate, et non in opere*: “ God will take away the *names of vain glory* and *false credit*, that are in the *church*, and the *names of priests*, together with the *priests* themselves, that vainly boast themselves of the *names of bishops*,

Hier. in So-  
phoniam, c.  
1. [iii. 1647.]

and of the *dignity of priesthood*, but do nothing." Hitherto, I trow, it is plain, that St. Hierom, by these words, meant not only *Nineveh*, as you say, but also the *church*, and the same *church* that is called the *church of God*.

"But about Babylon" (ye say) "ye never make an end of babbling." What babbling then, I pray you, made St. Hierom, when he said, *Petrus in prima Epistola, sub nomine Babylonis*, [suppl. *figuraliter*] *Romam significat?* Hier. in Catal. Script. Eccles. in Marco. [iv. pt. 2. 104.]

"St. Peter, in his first Epistle, meant *Rome*, under the name of *Babylon*."

St. Augustine saith: *Roma est quasi secunda Babylon*: Aug. de Gen. contra Manich. lib. 2. cap. 1. Aug. in Psal. aliv.

"Rome is as the second Babylon <sup>50</sup>." Again he saith: *Cives Babylonice nos fecerunt: dimisimus Creatorem: adoravimus creaturam: dimisimus eum a quo facti sumus: adoravimus illud quod fecimus*: "They have made us the *citizens of Babylon*:" (for) "we have left our Creator, and have worshipped a creature: we have left him that made us; and have adored that thing that we made ourselves."

Likewise saith Primasius: *Tunc Babylon cadet, quando novissime* [leg. *novissimam*] *potestatem persecuendi sanctos acceperit*: Primasius [lib. 4.] in Apoc. c. 16.

"Then shall Babylon come to ground, when she shall last of all take power to persecute the *saints of God*."

And again: *Vidi mulierem sedentem super vestem coccineam, plenam nominibus blasphemice, habentem capita septem. Septem capita dicit septem montes: Romam, quæ super septem montes præsidet, significans*: In idem cap. [4. in cap. 17.]

"I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet robe, full of names of blasphemy, *having seven heads*. *Seven heads he calleth the seven mounts (upon which Rome was built)*: meaning thereby, *Rome* that sitteth upon seven hills."

Ludovicus Vives, your own very friend, saith thus: *Hieronymus, ad Marcellam scribens, non aliam existimat describi, &c.*: Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. 18. c. 22. Vives. [ii. 387.]

"St. Hierom, writing unto Marcella, thinketh there is none other *Babylon* described by St. John in his Revelations, but the *city of Rome*."

<sup>50</sup> [These words are found, not, as indicated in the margin, in the work "De Gen. contr. Manichæos," but in "De Civ. Dei," lib. 18. 2. (ed. Ben. vii. 489. In the next reference there is some mistake.)]

Ambros. Ansbert. in Apoc. lib. 6. [p. 269.]

Ambrosius Ansbertus saith: *Ubi est illa dudum super omnium regna exaltata, inclyta Roma, Babylon secunda?* “Where is that noble Rome, advanced of late above all kingdoms, the second Babylon?”

I pass over Beatus Rhenanus, Aventinus, Petrarcha, Dantes, and a great number of other your own doctors, mentioned before in place more convenient: all whom ye may not of your courtesy charge with babbling.

Ye say: “St. Hierom meant not the state of our time, but only the state of the time now past:” that is to say, as it is said before, *the time of Christ’s first coming into the world*. And this, in your margin, ye call the right sense of St. Hierom, truly reported. Howbeit, your reader, that hath eyes to see, may easily find, that this is your own only sense, M. Harding, and not St. Hierom’s. For I beseech you, how was Nineveh fully destroyed, or what gospels were there written, at the *first coming of Christ into the world?* St. Hierom’s meaning and speech is plain:

Hieronym. in Nahum, c. 3. The true sense of St. Hierom’s words.

“*The people, before the second coming of Christ, which shall be in glory, shall leave their negligent and idle schoolmasters, which have of long time deceived them; and shall flee to the mountains of the scriptures. And albeit they find not one to teach them, yet shall their desire and endeavour be accepted before God, for that they have sought unto these mountains: and the negligence and slothfulness of their masters shall be reprov’d.*”

Chrysost. in Gen. hom. 35. [iv. 349.]

To like purpose St. Chrysostom saith: *Fieri non potest, ut is qui divinis scripturis magno studio ferventique desiderio vacat, semper negligatur. Licet enim desit nobis hominis magisterium, tamen ipse Dominus, superne intrans in corda nostra, illustrat mentem: rationi jubar suum infundit: detegit occulta: doctorque fit eorum quæ ignoramus: tantum si nos ea, quæ a nobis sunt, afferre velimus:* “It cannot possibly be, that he that with earnest study and fervent desire readeth the scriptures, should evermore be forsaken. For although we want the instruction of man, yet God himself from above entering into our hearts, lighteneth our mind: poureth his beams into our wits: openeth things that were hidden: and becometh unto us a schoolmaster



of that we know not: only if we will do so much as in us lieth.”

So saith St. Hierom: *Postquam conversi fuerint, et clarum Christi lumen aspexerint, pascent in viis, et in semitis sanctarum scripturarum: et dicent, Dominus pascit me, et nihil mihi deerit: “When they shall be turned, and shall behold the clear light of Christ, they shall feed in the paths and ways of holy scriptures: and shall say, ‘The Lord feedeth me, and I shall want nothing.’”*

Hieronym. in  
Esa. lib. 13.  
cap. 49. [iii.  
354.]

Psal. xxiii. 3.

Again he saith: *Circundabit sibi, quasi murum firmisimum, scripturarum doctrinam, ne ad interiora ejus possit hostis irrumperere: “He will enclose himself with the doctrine of the scriptures, as with a strong wall, that the enemy may not enter into his heart.”* Again he saith: *Hæc est via: ambulate in ea. Neque ad dextram, neque ad sinistram. Tunc omnes errores, et idola, et similitudines veritatis.....comminues, atque disperges, et ita judicabis imunda, ut ea menstruatæ mulieris sordissimo sanguini compares: “This is the way: walk in it. Go neither to the right hand, nor to the left. Then shalt thou break and scatter all errors, and idols, and counterfeit likeness of the truth: and shalt judge them to be so filthy, that thou shalt liken them to most vile and loathsome blood.”*

Hieronym. in  
Nahum, c. 3.  
[iii. 1586.]

Hieronym. in  
Esa. lib. 9. c.  
30. [iii. 258.]

But forasmuch as ye say, “All these words of St. Hierom pertain unto some other matter,” (I know not what,) “and not unto the overthrow of Babylon, or fall of Antichrist, that shall be before the end of the world,” notwithstanding St. Hierom’s words of themselves be plain enough, yet it may please you to consider these words of St. Chrysostom, touching the same. Thus he saith: *Tunc qui in Judæa sunt, fugiant ad montes, id est, qui sunt in Christianitate, conferant se ad scripturas.....Montes sunt scripturæ apostolorum, et prophetarum, &c. Sciens Dominus tantam confusionem rerum in novissimis diebus esse futuram, ideo mandat ut Christiani, qui sunt in Christianitate, volentes firmitatem accipere fidei veræ, ad nullam rem fugiant, nisi ad scripturas. Alioqui si ad alias res aspexerint, scandalizabuntur et peribunt, non intelligentes quæ sit vera ecclesia. Et per hoc incident in abominationem desolationis: “Then*

Chrysost. in  
Matt. hom.  
49. [in Op.  
imp. vi. app.  
204.]

let them that be in Jewry flee to the *mountains*: that is to say, let them that be in *Christ's profession* flee to the *scriptures*. The *scriptures of the apostles and prophets be the mountains, &c.* Our Lord, knowing that there should be such confusion in the last days, therefore commandeth, that Christian men that believe in Christ, willing to have an assurance of the *true faith*, should have recourse to nothing else but unto the *scriptures*. Otherwise, if they have regard to any other thing, they shall be offended and perish, not understanding what is the *true church*. And by mean hereof they shall fall into the *abomination of desolation.*"

Here, M. Harding, no gloss will serve you. Certainly these words were spoken not of the *first coming of Christ into the world*, as you imagine, *but of the kingdom of Antichrist*, and of the end and consummation of the world.

Greg. in Job.  
cap. 29. lib.  
19. cap. 9.  
[i. 613.]

Hereof St. Gregory saith thus: *Ecclesia post eosdem dies, quibus deprimitur, tamen circa finem temporum grandi prædicationis virtute roborabitur*: "The church, after these days of her affliction, shall afterward, notwithstanding, be strengthened with great power and might of preaching."

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 20. Divis. 1.*

But by your favour, some will say, these things<sup>[Vol. iv. p. 87.]</sup> ought not to have been attempted without the *bishop of Rome's* commandment, forsomuch as he only is the knot and band of *Christian society*. He only is that *priest, of Levi's order*, whom God signified in the Deuteronomy, from whom counsel, in matters of weight, and true judgment, ought to be fette<sup>50</sup>: and, whoso obeyeth not his judgment, the same man ought to be killed in the sight of his brethren: and that no mortal creature hath authority to be judge over the pope, whatsoever he do: that Christ reigneth in heaven, and the pope in earth: that the pope alone can do as much as Christ or God himself

<sup>50</sup> [The obsolete form for "fetched."]

can do, because Christ and the pope have but one *consistory*: that without him is no *faith*: no *hope*: no *church*: and whoso goeth from him, quite casteth away and renounceth his own salvation. Such talk have the *canonists*, the *pope's parasites*, but with small discretion or soberness. For they could scantily say more, at least they could not speak more highly of Christ himself.

## M. HARDING.

What some will say we know not. We tell you, that your change of religion, and manifold heresies, ought not to have been attempted at all, neither without the bishop of Rome's commandment, nor with his commandment. Touching the bishop of Rome himself, you have never done with him. He is a great block in your way. And so hath he ever been in the way of all heretics. Yet could he never by you or them be removed. To your scoffs against him, and belying of the canonists, before by you uttered, and here idly repeated, my former answer may suffice.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 20. *Divis. 2.*

As for us, truly we have fallen from the bishop of Rome upon no manner of worldly respect or commodity. And would to Christ, he so behaved himself, that this falling away had not needed: but so the case stood, that, unless we left him, we could not come to Christ. Neither will he now make any other league with us, than such a one as Nahas, *the* Sam. xi. 2. *king* of the Ammonites, would have made in times past with them of the *city of Jabes*, which was, to put out the right eye of each one of the inhabitants, and so to receive them into his friendship. Even so will the pope pluck from us the *holy scripture*, the *gospel* of our salvation, and all the confidence which we have in Christ Jesu, as the eye from our head<sup>51</sup>.

<sup>51</sup> [There are no Latin words to correspond to the words "as the eye from our head."]

And upon other condition can he not agree upon peace with us.

M. HARDING.

Ye are not fallen from the bishop of Rome only, which were a damnable schism, but ye are fallen from Christ's church..... Your comparison of the pope with king Nahas is not very agreeable. But, sirs, ye speak more maliciously than credibly. Be ye good Christian men, and conform yourselves to the catholic faith—

—and deny Christ and his gospel: for this also ye should have added—

and I warrant you, the pope will not pluck from you, neither the scriptures, nor your confidence in Christ Jesu, no more than he doth from us.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 20. Divis. 3.*

For whereas some use to make so great a vaunt, that the pope is only *Peter's successor*, as though thereby he carried the *Holy Ghost* in his bosom, and could not err, this is but a matter of nothing, and a very trifling tale. God's grace is promised to a good mind, and to any one that feareth him, not unto sees and successions. "*Riches,*" saith St. Hierom, [Vol. iv. p. 88.] "*may make one bishop to be of more might than the rest: but all bishops,*" whosoever they be, "*are the successors of the apostles.*" If so be the place and consecration only be sufficient, why, then, Manasses succeeded David, and Caiaphas succeeded Aaron. And it hath been often seen, that an idol hath been placed in the temple of God. In old time, Archidamus, the Lacedemonian, boasted much of himself, how he came of the blood of Hercules, (as the *pope*, this day, boasteth himself of the succession and place of Peter<sup>52</sup>.) But one Nicostratus in this wise abated his pride: nay, quod he, thou seemest not to de-

[Ad Evagr. tom. iv. pt. 2. 803.]

<sup>52</sup> [These words have nothing to correspond to them in the original.]

scend from Hercules. For Hercules destroyed evil men, and thou makest good men evil. And when the Pharisees bragged of their lineage, how they were of the kindred and blood of Abraham: “Ye,” John viii. 40. saith Christ, “seek to kill me, a man which have told you the truth, as I heard it from God. Thus Abraham never did. Ye are of your father the devil, and will needs obey his will.”

## M. HARDING.

The pope succeedeth Peter in authority and power. For whereas the sheep of Christ continue to the world's end, he is not wise that thinketh Christ to have made a shepherd temporary, or for a time, over his perpetual flock. Then, what shepherdly endowment our Lord gave to the first shepherd, at the institution of the shepherdly office of the church: that is he understood to have given ordinarily to every successor. To Peter he gave that he obtained by his prayer made to the Father, that his faith should not fail. Again, to him he gave grace that to perform, the performance whereof at him he required, to wit, that he confirmed and strengthened his brethren, wherefore the grace of steadfastness, of faith, and of confirming the wavering and doubtful in faith, every pope obtaineth of the Holy Ghost for the benefit of the church. And so the pope, although he may err by personed error, in his own private judgment, as a man, and as a particular doctor, in his own opinion: <sup>a</sup> yet, as he is pope, the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ in earth, the shepherd of the universal church, in public judgment, in deliberation, and definitive sentence <sup>a</sup> he never erreth, <sup>a</sup> nor never erred. a Untruth, joined with impudent flattery and extreme folly. For whensoever he ordaineth or determineth any thing by his high bishoply authority, intending to bind Christian men to perform or believe the same, he is always governed and holpen with the grace and favour of the Holy Ghost. This is to catholic doctors a very certainty, though to such doughty clerks as ye are, it is but a matter of nothing, and a very trifling tale.

God's grace, in one respect, is promised both to a good mind, and to one that feareth God; and also, in another respect, to the successors of Peter. St. Hierom's saying to Evagrius, which now you have alleged three or four times, will not handsomely serve you for so divers points, as a shipman's hose for divers legs. <sup>b</sup> Once again I tell you, thereby he meaneth nothing else, but that the greatness of Rome ought not to give authority to a wrong private custom, (by which, deacons, in certain cases, were preferred before priests,) against the right general custom of the world. And bishops be the successors of the apostles, we grant, b This place of St. Hierom is answered before, part 2. chap. 3. division 5. [supra iv. . 381.]

c Peter was the shepherd, and the apostles the sheep. A vain untruth without savour, Cyprian saith; *Christus parem dedit apostolis omnibus potestatem.*

d The pope succeedeth in power, but not in holiness.

e All this may be called the succession of folly.

yet is the pope the successor of Peter, <sup>c</sup> who was shepherd of all Christ's lambs and sheep, and therefore also <sup>c</sup> of the apostles themselves, and so hath a higher authority. . . .

As for your example of Archidamus, who, boastingly, fetched his pedigree from Hercules, you must consider, succession of virtue always followeth not succession of blood. Now we do acknowledge in the pope a succession of shepherdly power, even such as was in Peter. <sup>d</sup> Which power is not taken away by lack of Peter's holiness.

Christ, likewise, by his answer to the Pharisees, though he affirmed they succeeded not Abraham in love of truth, and that for their malice they were of their father the devil: yet he denied not, but that they came lineally of Abraham, and were of his blood, though not of his godliness. Such succession mean not we, speaking of the pope, whose succession is derived of Peter: but the succession of power and authority, <sup>e</sup> and of infallibility of faith in judgment and sentence definitive.

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Here we have found one *pope* with two capacities. In one respect, he is a *man*: in another respect, he is more than a *man*: but whether in that respect he be angel or archangel, it is past in silence. One way he succeedeth Peter: another way he succeedeth I know not whom. One way he may err: another way, though he would never so fain, *he cannot err*. In his bed, at his table, on horseback, or elsewhere, we may well mistrust him: for in these places he may be deceived as well as others. But in *council*, in *consistory*, and in *place of judgment*, it is most certain, ye say, *he cannot err*. For in these places he hath the Holy Ghost, I trow, at his commandment. His *power pastoral*, his *succession* in authority and *infallibility of faith*, his *place*, his *chair*, and his *consecration*, are sufficient for ever to preserve him from error. To like purpose Sallust sometime said of Cicero: *Aliud stans, aliud sedens, de republica sentit*: "While he standeth up he hath one mind touching the common state, when he sitteth down he hath another." It is fit for a *pope* to have shift of minds. Apollo's *nun*, while she sat mewed in her cave, was inspired, and prophesied, and gave oracles: but after that she came abroad, she was no wiser than other women. Thus your doctors say, as it is before reported: *Veritas*

Sallustius in Ciceronem.

Nic. Cusan. ad Bohemos ep. 2. [p. 835.]

*adhæret cathedræ*:—*Papa sanctitatem recipit a cathedra*:  
 “The *pope's truth* is fastened unto his chair: the *pope* from his chair receiveth his *holiness*.”

It shameth me, M. Harding, to see you so vainly occupied about these vanities. Ye may well be liberal in dealing hereof. They cost you but little: they are only your own. *Scriptures, doctors, or councils*, to witness your sayings, ye allege none. For further declaration of this whole matter, I beseech thee, good Christian reader, to consider the short treaty that I have written before touching the sundry *errors* and evident *heresies*, that have been notably found in *popes*. Alphonsus de Castro, one of M. Harding's own special doctors, saith: *Non dubitamus an hæreticum esse, et papam esse, coire in unum possint, &c. Non enim credo aliquem esse adeo impudentem papæ assentatorem, ut ei tribuere hoc velit, ut nec errare, nec in interpretatione sacrarum literarum hallucinari possit*: “We doubt not, whether one man may be a *pope* and a *heretic* both together. For, I believe, there is none so *shameless a flatterer of the pope*, that will say” (as you say, M. Harding), “The *pope* can never *err* nor be deceived in the exposition of the *scriptures*<sup>53</sup>.” There is no flatterer so shameless, that will so say.

Likewise Erasmus saith: *Si verum est, quod quidam asserant, Romanum pontificem errore judiciali errare non posse, quid opus est generalibus conciliis? Quid opus est in concilium accersere jurisconsultos, ac theologos eruditos? Si papa pronuncians labi non potest, cur datus est appellationi locus, vel ad synodum, vel ad eundem rectius edoctum.....? Quorsum attinet, tot academias in tractandis fidei quæstionibus distorqueri, cum ex uno pontifice, quod verum est, audire liceat? Imo qui fit, ut hujus pontificis decreta cum illius (pontificis) decretis pugnent?* “If it be true that some men say, that the *bishop of Rome* can never err in error of judgment, what need we then so many *general councils*? And, in the same, what need we so many *lawyers and learned divines*? If the *pope* cannot err in giving sentence, wherefore lieth

Part. 6. cap. 5. divis. 2. [Supra vol. vi. 250.] Alphons. De Hæret. lib. 1. cap. 4. [ed. 1534.]

Erasm. in Annot. in 1 Cor. vii. [p. 497.]

<sup>53</sup> [Supra vol. iv. p. 472, and note 34.]

there any appeal from the *pope*, either to a *council*, or else to the *pope himself*, being better informed? What need we to trouble so many *universities*, in discussing of matters of faith, whereas we may learn the truth of the *pope alone*? Nay, how cometh it about, that one *pope's decrees* are found *contrary to another's*," if it be so certain that the *pope*, whosoever he be, and whatsoever he say, can never err?

That ye speak of Peter's *succession*, is vain and childish.

Athan. in  
Apolog. Se-  
cunda.

Of such folly Athanasius saith: *Persuasus est in magnitudine urbium religionem esse sitam*: "This wise man imagineth that religion standeth in the *greatness of cities*."

Hieron. ad  
Evagrium.  
[iv. pt. 2. p.  
803.]

St. Hierom saith: *Potentia divitiarum, et paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem episcopum non facit. Cæterum omnes apostolorum successores sunt*: "The wealth of riches, and the baseness of poverty, maketh a bishop neither higher nor lower. . . *But all bishops be the apostles' successors*."

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 21. *Divis. 1.*

Yet, notwithstanding, because we will grant some-<sup>[Vol. iv. p. 88.]</sup> what to *succession*, tell us, hath the *pope alone succeeded Peter*? And wherein, I pray you? In what *religion*, in what office, in what piece of his life, hath he succeeded him? What one thing (tell me) had Peter ever like unto the *pope*, or the *pope* like unto Peter? Except, peradventure, he will say thus: That Peter, when he was at Rome, never taught the *gospel*, never fed the flock, took away the keys of the kingdom of heaven, hid the treasures of his Lord, sat him down only in his *castle of St. John Lateran*, and pointed out with his finger all the places and chambers of *purgatory*, and kinds of punishments, committing some poor souls to be tormented, and other some again suddenly releasing thence at his own pleasure, taking money for so doing: or that he gave order to say *private masses*



in every corner: or that he mumbled up the *holy service*, with a loud<sup>54</sup> [*l. low*] voice, and in an unknown language: or that he hanged up<sup>55</sup> the *sacrament* in every *temple*, and on every altar, and carried the same about before him whithersoever he went, upon an ambling jannet, with lights and bells: or that he consecrated, with his holy breath, *oil, wax, wool, bells, chalices, churches, and altars*: or that he sold *jubilees, graces, liberties, avousons*<sup>56</sup>, *preventions, firstfruits, palls, the wearing of palls, bulls, indulgences, and pardons*<sup>57</sup>: or that he called himself by the name of the *head of the church, the highest bishop, the bishop of bishops, alone most holy*: or that, by usurpation, he took upon himself the right and authority over other bishops' churches: or that he exempted himself from the power of any *civil government*: or that he maintained wars, and set princes together at variance: or that he, sitting in his *chair*, with his *triple crown* full of labels, with sumptuous and Persian-like gorgeousness, with his *royal sceptre*, with his *diadem* of gold, and glittering with stones, was carried about, not upon a palfrey<sup>58</sup>, but upon the shoulders of *noblemen*. These things, no doubt, did Peter at Rome in times past, and left them in charge to his successors, as you would say, from hand to hand: for these things be now-a-days done at Rome by the popes, and be so done, as though nothing else ought to be done.

## M. HARDING.

The pope alone hath succeeded St. Peter. Ask you, wherein? in what religion? in what office? We tell you, he succeeded in

<sup>54</sup> [This false print for "low" is found in the ed. of 1609. Apol. Lat. "summissa."]

<sup>55</sup> [Apol. Lat. "collocasse."]

<sup>56</sup> ["Expectationes."]

<sup>57</sup> ["Diplomata."]

<sup>58</sup> [There is nothing to correspond with these words in the Latin.]

a Untruth. For the pope feedeth not. Peter's chair, in which he sat at Rome, and ruled the church, in Christian religion, <sup>a</sup>in that office which Christ committed to Peter, when he said, *Pasce oves meas*, "Feed my sheep." Than which office he never gave greater, nor with like circumstance of charge, <sup>b</sup>nor to any other gave he it, than to Peter. For to him alone he said, "Feed my sheep." What ask ye us of this officer's life?.....

b Untruth. For the same power was given to all the rest.

c And well proved.

You ask, what thing had Peter ever like unto the pope, or the pope like unto Peter? We tell you, Peter had authority to feed Christ's sheep, like unto the pope. And the pope hath authority to feed Christ's sheep, like unto Peter. <sup>c</sup>Like power, like commission. He that gave them authority to feed, gave them also authority to do whatsoever may pertain to feeding.....

#### THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

For that ye tell us so many fair tales of *Peter's succession*, we demand of you, wherein the *pope succeedeth Peter*: you answer, "*He succeedeth him in his chair*:" as if Peter had been sometime installed in Rome, and had sat solemnly all day with his *triple crown* in his *pontificalibus*, and in a *chair of gold*. And thus, having lost both *religion* and *doctrine*, ye think it sufficient, at least, to hold by the *chair*; as if a soldier that had lost his sword would play the man with the scabbard. But so Caiaphas succeeded Aaron: so wicked Manasses succeeded David: so may *Antichrist* easily sit in *Peter's chair*.

Dist. 40. Multl.

Dist. 40. Non est facile.

Chrysostom saith: *Non cathedra facit sacerdotem: sed sacerdos cathedram: nec locus sanctificat hominem: sed homo locum*: "It is not the *chair* that maketh the *bishop*, but it is the *bishop* that maketh the *chair*: neither is it the *place* that halloweth the *man*, but it is the *man* that halloweth the *place*." Likewise St. Hierom saith: *Non sanctorum filii sunt, qui tenent loca sanctorum*: "They are not always the children of *holy men* that sit in the rooms of *holy men*."

Niceph. lib. 13. cap. 28. [il. 410.]

He doth great wrong unto St. Peter, that placeth such a one in such a *chair*: for neither is the *pope* in any thing like St. Peter; nor was St. Peter in any thing like the *pope*. When Simeones saw, that Arsacius, an *unlearned* and an *unworthy old doting man*, was placed in Chrysostom's room, he cried out, *Pro pudor, quis, cui?* "Out, for

shame: what a sorry hind is this! and in whose place have we set him<sup>59</sup>?" Even so may we justly say of the *pope's* sitting in Peter's *chair*, *Pro pudor, quis, cui?* If he have any regard of himself, he cannot think of St. Peter without blushing.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 21. Divis. 2.*

Or, contrariwise, peradventure they had rather say thus, that the *pope* doth now all the same things, that we know Peter did many a day ago: that is, that he runneth up and down into every country to preach the gospel, not only openly abroad, but also privately from house to house: that he is diligent, and applieth that business, in season and out of season, in due time and out of due time: that he doth the part of an evangelist, that he fulfilleth the work and ministry of Christ, that he is the watchman of the *house of Israel*, receiveth answers and words at God's mouth: and even as he receiveth them, so delivereth them over to the people: that he is the *salt* of the earth: that he is the *light* of the world: that he doth not feed himself, but his flock: that he doth not entangle himself with the worldly cares of this life: that he doth not use a *sovereignty* over the *Lord's people*: that he seeketh not to have other men minister unto him, but himself rather ministereth unto others: that he taketh all bishops as his fellows and equals: that he is *subject to princes*, as to persons sent from God: that he giveth to Cæsar that which is Cæsar's: and that he, as the *old bishops of Rome* did without contradiction, calleth the *emperor, his gracious lord*. Unless, therefore, the popes do the like now-a-days, as Peter

<sup>59</sup> [Niceph. φεῦ μετὰ τίνα τίς;]

did, there is no cause at all, why they should glory so much of Peter's name, and of his *succession*.

## M. HARDING.

.... The pope now runneth not up and down into every country, he goeth not openly and privately from house to house, and to every alehouse, as ye would him to do, like one of your ministers: neither, I trow, ye masters, that be superintendents yourselves, think it convenient that ye go from house to house, to preach your gospel at these days. And would ye the pope to abase himself to that ye think becometh not yourselves? He hath (as meet it is) other fit men to help to bear his burden with him. And whereas one body sufficeth not for so great and so many affairs; for counsel, he hath many heads; for oversight, many eyes; for care, many hearts; for preaching, many tongues; for work, many hands; for knowledge, many ears; for expedition of matters, many feet; for the great weight of his charge, many shoulders: briefly, for all necessary and behoveful cases, convenient helps. The like helps would St. Peter use, were he now living....

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

To speak of the *pope's* running up and down from alehouse to alehouse, it is great folly. It should be sufficient, if he would go from *church* to *church*, and remember his charge, and *feed the flock*, and *preach the gospel*. Ye say, "The pope hath many heads, many eyes, many hearts, many tongues, many hands, many ears, many shoulders." And thus, of your *pope* ye make a *monster*, with many eyes, ears, tongues, and hearts of others, and none of his own. A wise man sometime said: *Improbe facit, qui, cum alienis oculis omnia ei agenda sint, postulet aliorum vitas committi sibi*: "It is but lewdly done, if a man, that must oversee all things with other men's eyes, desire to have the lives of others committed over to his charge."

Titus Livius.

God give him eyes to see, and ears to hear, and heart to understand: that he may know the time of *God's visitation*.

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. *Divis.* 1.

Much less cause have they to complain of our departing, and to call us again to be fellows and

[Vol. iv. p. 90.]

friends with them, and to believe as they believe. Men say, that one Cobilon, a Lacedemonian, when he was sent *ambassador* to the *king of the Persians*, to treat of a league, and found by chance them of the court playing at dice, he returned straightway home again, leaving his message undone. And when he was asked why he had slackt to do the things which he had received by public commission to do, he made answer, he thought it should be a great reproach to his commonwealth to make a league with dicers. But if we should content ourselves to return to the *pope*, and to his *errors*, and to make a covenant, not only with dicers, but also with men far more ungracious, and wicked, than any dicers be: besides that this should be a great blot to our good name, it should also be a very dangerous matter, both to kindle God's wrath against us, and to clog and condemn our own souls for ever.

## M. HARDING.

.... Ye do well to compare yourselves with this Cobilon. For, indeed, <sup>a</sup> ye do as he did. Ye were sent <sup>b</sup> by Christ to his vicar, Peter's successor, to be fed and governed like sheep under the shepherd . . . Christ and his church be a perfect body, he the head, the true believers knit together in charity the members, each one in his order and degree. He is the vine, we the boughs and branches. <sup>c</sup> What member cut off from the body, liveth? What bough broken from the tree, groweth? As every such member dieth, and bough withereth, so if ye remain not in the catholic church, which is the body of Christ, ye draw no life from the head, ye have no part of the spirit that from thence redoundeth to every member, ye have no portion of the vital juice that issueth from the root. Then what remaineth, but that ye be cast into the fire? For this cause St. Cyprian and other fathers oftentimes have said, that out and besides the church, there is no salvation.

<sup>a</sup> We fly wicked company, as he did.  
<sup>b</sup> Untruth. For where did Christ ever send us to the bishop of Rome?  
<sup>c</sup> By this rule the pope is left void of life: for that he is divided from Christ, that is the Head.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Christ never told us, neither of any his *vicar general*: nor of *Rome*: nor of *Lateran*: nor of *Peter's chair*: nor willed us to have recourse to the *bishop of Rome*, more

than to any other several bishop. Therefore, M. Harding, we must reckon this amongst the rest of your untruths.

It is true that you say, "A member divided from the body cannot live." But your conclusion is untrue, like the rest. For *Rome is not the body*, but only a member of that *body*: *Rome is not the tree*, but only a *bough*: *Rome is not the head*, but only a *spring*. And therefore, seeing it is now divided from that *body*: seeing it is broken from that *tree*: seeing it is cut off from that *head*, it is no marvel, though it be starved, though it be withered, though it be left dry, without either spirit or life: as this day it appeareth to the eyes of all them, that will behold it,

THE APOLOGY, Chap. 22. *Divis. 2.*

For, of very truth, we have departed from him, <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 90.]</sup> who we saw had blinded the whole world this many a hundred year: from him, who too far presumptuously was wont to say, *he could not err*, and whatsoever he did, *no mortal man had power to condemn him, neither king, nor emperor, nor the whole clergy*, nor yet all the people in the world together, no, though he should carry away with him a thousand *souls into hell*: from him, who took upon him power to command, not only men, but even the *angels of God*, to go, to return, to lead souls into purgatory, and to bring them back again when he list himself<sup>60</sup>: who, Gregory saith, without all doubt, is the very forerunner and standard-bearer of *Anti-christ*, and hath utterly forsaken the *catholic faith*: from whom also these ringleaders of ours<sup>61</sup>, who now with might and main resist the gospel, and the truth, which they know to be the truth, have ere this departed every one of their own accord and good-will: and would even now also gladly depart

<sup>60</sup> [Supra vol. vi. pp. 119, 120, notes 4 and 5.]  
with the marginal references, and <sup>61</sup> [Apol. Lat. "coryphæi nostri."]

from him again, if the note of inconstancy and shame, and their own estimation among the people, were not a let unto them. In conclusion, we have departed from him, to whom we were not bound, and who had nothing to say for himself, but only, I know not what virtue or power of the place where he dwelleth, and a continuance of succession.

## M. HARDING.

As ye confess your departing, so would God ye understood your guilt.....

Those reverend fathers and godly learned men, whose rooms ye hold wrongfully, whom it liked your interpreter to call ringleaders, resist not the gospel, but suffer persecution for the gospel. Your gospel, that is to say, your vile heresies and blasphemies, worthily they detest. Your new truth, that is to say, your false and wicked lies, they abhor. Neither ever departed they from any part of the duty of catholic men, <sup>a</sup> by their own accord and good-will, as ye say. <sup>a</sup> But wherein they stept aside, they were compelled by such fear, as might happen to a right constant man, I mean the terror of death, which, as Aristotle saith, of all terrible things is most terrible. Now because yet they find the terror of a guilty conscience, more terrible than death of their persons, they intend, by God's grace assisting them, never so to step aside again, but rather to suffer whatsoever extremities. Whose blood, or the blood of any of them, if God to his honour shall at any time permit you to draw, which so much ye thirst, soon after look ye for the returning of the Israelites again: that text being then fulfilled, *Completa sunt iniquitates Amorrhæorum.*

a M. Harding's reverend fathers continued twenty years together in hypocrisy.

Were not they well assured of the truth, most certain it is, whatsoever ye say, they would not make so foolish a bargain as yourselves do, as to buy vain estimation among the people with the certain loss of their souls.

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"Certain of your friends" (whom ye call *reverend fathers*) "suffer imprisonment" (ye say) "and persecution for the gospel." Notwithstanding, it is not so long sithence the said *reverend fathers* were themselves the burners and persecutors of the *gospel*. Such complaint sometime made Arius the wicked *heretic*. For thus he writeth: "I Arius, that suffer persecution for the truth, that ever prevaieth." Ruffinus, notwithstanding he were a great favourer of the

Epiphanius, Διά τὴν ἀεὶ νικῶσαν ἀλήθειαν διωκόμενος. [ii. 731.]

Hier. ad ver-  
sus Ruffin.  
lib. 2. [iv. pt.  
2. 389.]

*Origenian heretics*, yet he said even as you say: *Nostra fides persecutionis hæreticorum tempore, cum in sancta Alexandria ecclesia degeremus, in carceribus et exiliis, quæ pro fide inferebantur, probata est*: “While we lived in the holy church of Alexandria, in the time of the persecution of heretics, our faith was proved in prisons and banishments, which were laid upon us for the faith’s sake.” Unto whom St. Hierom, in his pleasant manner, answereth thus: *Miror quod non adjecerit, Vincit Jesu Christi: liberatus sum de ore leonis: Alexandria ad bestias depugnavi: cursum consummavi: fidem servavi: superest mihi corona justitiæ*: “I marvel much, that he said not further, Ruffinus the prisoner of Jesus Christ: I was delivered out of the lion’s mouth: I was thrown amongst wild beasts at Alexandria: I have past my course: I have kept the faith: now there remaineth for me the crown of righteousness.”

Hier. eodem  
loco. [ib.]

Thus the wolf, when he is restrained from spoil and ravine, may likewise complain of *persecution*.

Hieron. ad A-  
pronium. [iv.  
pt. 2. 804.]

St. Hierom, writing unto Apronius, of the state of the east churches, where he then lived, saith thus: *Hic quieta sunt omnia. Etsi enim venena pectoris non amiserint, tamen os impietatis non audent aperire. Sed sunt sicut aspides surdæ, obturantes aures suas*: “All things here are quiet: for albeit they have not left the poison of their hearts, yet they dare not open their wicked mouths: but they are as the deaf serpents, shutting up their ears, and will hear nothing.”

The said *reverend fathers*, that as now sit so firmly of your side, not long ago were well contented both to maintain and to publish the contrary, as well as you. “Howbeit, all this” (you say) “they did not of good will, but only of fear, and of such fear as may happen upon a constant man.” That is to say, of mere *hypocrisy* and *dissimulation*, and by open flattering of their *prince*.

And thus to save your fathers from being schismatics, ye are well content to make them hypocrites. Thus say you. But your said *reverends* themselves would have told you far otherwise.

Doctor Gardiner of himself saith thus: “*In discuss-*



ing and trial of the truth, I did not so easily content myself. But I so framed myself, that, as it had been in asking the judgment of all my senses, unless I perceived that I first of all heard them with mine ears, smelled them with my nose, saw them with mine eyes, and felt them with my hands, I thought I had not seen enough.”

Steph. Gardin. de vera Obed.  
He examineth the matter with all his senses.

Again he saith: “This advised consideration hath pulled away all scrupulous doubts: and by the working of God’s grace, hath conveyed and brought them into the light of the verity.”

He is persuaded by the working of God’s grace.

And again: “Indeed, to tell you at a word, that compelleth me that compelleth all men, even the mighty power of the truth.”

He is compelled by the power of the truth.

Likewise saith doctor Bonner, touching the same: “The matter was not rashly taken in hand: but with judgment and wisdom examined and discussed.” Again he saith: “The bishop of Winchester had long ago thoroughly bolted this matter, even unto the bran.”

Doct. Bonner in Præfat. in veram Obed.

He examineth the matter to the uttermost.

If these tales be true, M. Harding, then is your tale most untrue. If ye will justify yourself, ye must needs condemn your reverend fathers. Certainly, your tales being directly contrary, to make them both true, it is not possible.

But here ye begin to fray us with your propheticall threats. “If we once begin to touch your blood, then” (ye say) “your Louvanian Israel immediately afterward shall be restored.” I think you mean, *Domus Jacob de populo barbaro*.

In such blind prognostications I have no skill. God oftentimes suffereth iniquity and falsehood to prevail for a season, to chasten the unkindness of his people. Let his will be done with mercy, as it shall seem good in his eyes. But if ye prevail again, ye shall prevail to your own confusion. Well ye may repress the truth of God, as your fathers have often done before: but utterly to abolish it ye shall never be able.

Such vain hope had the Jews in old times to recover their religion and ceremonies, and utterly to overthrow the gospel of Christ. They conspired together, got masons and carpenters, and began to cast the foundation, to repair

Chrysost. in Orat. contra Judeos. [5. tom. 1. 645.]

their *temple*. Immediately the emperor Constantine raised a power, and set upon them, and put them to the sword, as rebels and traitors. Others that he spared alive, he made slaves, and cut off some their tongues, some their hands, some their ears, some their noses: some he burnt in the face, and so sent them abroad for an example, from town to town, throughout the world.

Ambros. lib.  
5. epist. 29.  
[ii. 949.]

Afterward, when the wicked emperor Julian, in despite of Christ, had given the Jews leave to build and repair their temple, as it is said before, and the prince's power assisting them, no power seemed able to withstand their purpose, then God himself, from heaven above, encountered with them. Earthquakes brake out, and overthrew their buildings. Lightnings fell down, and burnt both the tools in their hands, and the coats on their backs. Then was the *gospel of Christ* more beautiful and more glorious than ever it had been before.

Greg. in Pri-  
mum Regum,  
cap. 3. lib. 3.  
c. 5. [iii. 137.]

St. Gregory saith: *Tulerunt Dagon, et restituerunt eum in locum suum, hoc est, in templo, ubi arca Dei posita fuerat. Quid est ergo Dagon in locum suum restituere, nisi idololatricæ statum subtili consideratione perquirere? Et quia, quo subtilius idololatricæ error aspicitur, eo verius condemnatur, subjunctum est, Rursus diluculo surgentes, invenerunt Dagon jacentem super faciem, coram arca Domini: "They took the idol Dagon, and restored him again into his place: that is to say, in the temple of God, where the ark of God was placed before. And what is it to restore again Dagon into his place, but discreetly and advisedly to examine the state of idolatry? And forasmuch as the better the error of idolatry is seen, the better it is condemned, therefore it followeth further, They rising in the morning, found Dagon lying flat upon his face before the ark of the Lord."*

Prov. xxi. 30.

Even so, M. Harding, if ye raise up your Dagon once again, once again he shall come to ground, and shall squat his hands and feet, and be utterly dismembered by the fall, and shall lie grovelling, as a block, before the presence of the *ark of God*. "*There is no counsel against the Lord.*"

The noble prince Joshua, after that he had once, by

God's commandment, destroyed the city of Jericho, ad-  
 jured all his posterity in this sort: "*Accursed be he before* Josh. vi. 26.  
*the Lord, that shall stand up and restore again this city of*  
*Jericho. In the death of his eldest son he shall lay the founda-*  
*tion: and in the death of his youngest child he shall close the*  
*gates."*

Theodoretus saith: "The wicked shall not be able to  
 prevail against God. But if they once get the over hand,  
 yet shall they come down again, as it is written by the  
 prophet Esay."

Theod. Eccl.  
 Hist. fol. 285.  
 in Græco.  
 κἀν γὰρ πάλιν  
 ἰσχύσωσι, καὶ πάλιν  
 ἡττηθήσονται.

As for drawing of your blood, ye need not so greatly to  
 complain. The *gospel of Christ* is not bloody. It hath  
 hitherto prevailed without any one drop of all your blood.  
 God give you grace to repent, lest your own blood be  
 upon your own head in the day of the Lord. Fire, and  
 sword, and merciless cruelty, are the only instruments of  
 your doctrine. And therefore ye seem now to say in your  
 blind hope, as cursed Esau sometime said of his brother  
 Jacob; *Venient dies luctus patris mei, et occidam Jacobum*  
*fratrem meum*: "The days shall come that my father shall  
 die: then will I kill my brother Jacob."

Gen. xxvii.  
 41.

Athanasius saith: *Cædi Christianorum proprium est*:  
*cædere autem Christianos, Pilati et Caiaphæ officia sunt*:  
 "It is the part of Christians to suffer persecution: but to  
 persecute the Christians, it is the very office of Pilate and  
 Caiaphas."

Athan. ad so-  
 litariam vi-  
 tam agentes.  
 [l. 368.]

We will say unto you with St. Augustine: *Illi in vos*  
*sæviant, qui nesciunt quo cum labore verum inveniantur, et*  
*quam difficile caveantur errores*: "Let them persecute  
 you, and use cruelty over you, that know not what a  
 labour it is to find the truth, and how hard it is to beware  
 of error."

Aug. contra  
 Epist. Fun-  
 damenti, cap.  
 i. [cap. 2.  
 viii. 151.]

Again he saith: *Nemo de præteritis insultat erroribus,*  
*nisi qui divinam misericordiam expertus non est, ut careret*  
*erroribus. Tantum id agamus, ut errores aliquando finian-*  
*tur*: "No man upbraideth other with errors past, but he  
 that hath not felt God's divine mercy to be void of errors.  
 Let this be our only labour, that errors at last may have  
 an end."

Abdias in Pe-  
tro. [fol. 12.]

We will say of you as St. Peter sometime said of Simon the *sorcerer*, when the people for anger, seeing his falsehood, would have stoned him to death: *Imo vivat, et regnum Christi crescere videat, vel invitus*: “Nay, nay, let him live, and let him see the kingdom of Christ to grow and prosper, even against his will.” Thus, M. Harding, may we say to you. As for your blood, we long not for it.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 23. Divis. 1.*

And as for us, we of all others have most justly left <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 91.]</sup> the *pope*. For our kings, yea, even they which with greatest reverence did follow and obey the authority and faith of the *bishops of Rome*, have long sithence found and felt the yoke and tyranny of their kingdom. For the *bishops of Rome* sometime took the crown from the head of our king, Henry the Second, and compelled him to put aside all his princely estate and majesty, and, like a mere private man, to come unto their legate with great submission and humility, so as all his subjects might laugh him to scorn. More than this, they caused bishops, and monks, and some part of the nobility, to be in the field against our king John, and set all the people at liberty from their oaths, whereby they ought allegiance to their king: and at last, wickedly and most abominably, they bereaved the same king, not only of his kingdom, but also of his life<sup>62</sup>. Besides this, they excommunicated and cursed king Henry the Eighth, that most famous *prince*, and stirred up against him, sometime the *emperor*, sometime the *French king*: and, as much as in them was, put our *realm* in hazard, to have been a very prey and spoil unto the enemy. Yet were they but fools and madmen, to think, that either so mighty a

<sup>62</sup> [See Fuller, Church History A. D. 1215.]

*prince* could be frayed with bugs and rattles; or else, that so *noble* and great a *kingdom* might so easily, even at one morsel, be devoured and swallowed up.

M. HARDING.

Concerning the case between these three kings of England, and the bishops of Rome, for the time being, I say little. If they did well, and the bishops evil, they have their reward, the other their punishment: if otherwise, or howsoever, each one at God's judgment shall have his deserved measure. But be it granted, all were true ye say, though we know the more part to be false. What though king Henry the Second were evil treated of pope Alexander, about the murdering of St. Thomas, the archbishop of Canterbury, and king John, likewise, of that zealous and learned pope, Innocentius the Third, &c.?

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

Notwithstanding the *pope*, as his manner hath been, raise commotion within the *realm*, and arm the subjects against their *sovereign*, and pull the *crown imperial* from his head, yet, by your doctrine, whosoever dare speak in his *prince's* right is a fool, and killeth himself: as if there were no life or salvation, but only under the frantic government of the *pope*. Such obedience and loyalty the *pope* hath taught you towards your *prince*.

THE APOLOGY, *Chap. 23. Divis. 2.*

And yet, as though all this were too little, they would needs have made all the *realm tributary* to them, and exacted thence yearly most unjust and wrongful taxes. So dear cost us the friendship of the *city of Rome*. Wherefore, if they have gotten these things of us by extortion, through their fraud and subtle sleights, we see no reason why we may not pluck away the same from them again, by lawful ways, and just means. And if our *kings*, in that darkness and blindness of the former times, gave them these things of their own accord and liberality, for *religion's* sake, being moved with a certain

opinion of their feigned holiness; now, when the ignorance and error is espied out, may the *kings*, their *successors*, take them away again, seeing they have the same authority the *kings* their *ancestors* had before. *For the gift is void, except it be allowed by the will of the giver: and that cannot seem a perfect will, which is dimmed and hindered by error.*

## M. HARDING.

a No doubt. For the very cause hereof was avarice and treachery.

As for Peter-pence, and what other soever sums of money were yearly paid to the church of Rome, which were not by extortion and subtle sleights by the popes gotten, as ye slander, but freely and discreetly, by the prince and the realm, <sup>a</sup>for a great cause granted: it is not a thing that so much grieveth the pope, as your departure from the true faith and church doth, as it may well appear by that which happened in queen Mary's reign, in which time, although the pope were acknowledged, yet himself never was known to have demanded his Peter-pence, or any other yearly payments again. But what is this to your schisms and heresies? This helpeth you nothing for answer to the heinous crime of your apostasy. The liberality of our country to the see of Rome, which is the mother of all the west churches, hath been so small in comparison of certain other realms, as with the honour of the realm it might not seem to find itself grieved therewith. Yet here ye set a gnat to an elephant, and make great ado about a little. The realm is not so much enriched by retaining that small sum from the pope, as it is dishonoured by your indiscreet talk, savouring altogether of misery and niggardness. Ye should have shewed better stuff at least in the end of your book. The last act of a fable, by rules of poetry, should be best. Ye have done like a foolish poet, making your end so bad. The pope seeketh not your money: he seeketh you. He seeketh the safety of your souls. <sup>b</sup>He seeketh, like a good shepherd, how to reduce the strayed sheep of England unto the fold of Christ's church. God grant we may see his good intent happily achieved.

b But remember the old verse: *Curia Romana non captat ovem sine lana.*

## THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

The *pope* hath enriched himself, and gotten the treasures of the world into his own hands, not by fraud or guile, as you say, but only by the free liberality of *kings* and *princes*. Yet St. Augustine saith: *Non possumus dicere, Nemo nos invasores arguit: violentie nullus accusat: quasi non majorem interdum prædam a viduabus blandimenta*

Aug. de verbis Domini, secund. Mat. serm. 19. [v. app. p. 150.]

*eliciant, quam tormenta. Nec interest apud Deum, utrum vi, an circumventionem quis res alienas occupet; dummodo quoquo pacto teneat alienum:* “We cannot say, No man chargeth us with extortion: no man accuseth us of violence. For oftentimes of poor widows a man may get more by flattery than by racking. And there is no difference before God, whether a man hold another man’s goods by open violence, or by guile, if the thing that he holdeth be not his own<sup>60</sup>.”

But how may this, by your learning, M. Harding, be called the *liberality of the prince*? He is *liberal*, that is free in bestowing of his own. But you tell us, that all the *temporal goods of the world are the pope’s*, and not the *prince’s*: and that the *prince* hath nothing, but by favour and sufferance of the *pope*. Your doctor’s words be these:

*Papa est dominus omnium temporalium, secundum illud dictum Petri, Dabo tibi omnia regna mundi:* “The pope is the lord of all temporal goods, according to that saying of St. Peter,” (that St. Peter never spake: for they are the words of the devil,) “I will give thee all the kingdoms of the world.”

Archidiaconus de Hæres. Ver. Et quia tanta, fol. 15. Citatur à Felino, de Offic. et Potest. Judicis delegati, Ex parte 1. [fol. 192.] Matt. iv. 9.

Another of your doctors saith thus: *Dicunt, quod solus papa est verus Dominus temporalium, ita quod potest auferre ab alio quod aliis suum est. Sed prælati cæteri, et principes, non sunt domini, sed tutores, procuratores, et dispensatores:*

Johan. de Parisiis, de Potest. Reg. et Papal. [cap. 6. p. 114.]

“They say, that the pope only is the very lord of temporal things, so that he may take from any man that is his own. As for other prelates and princes, they be the overseers, and farmers, and stewards of worldly things, but not the lords.” And Matthias Parisiensis saith, that pope Innocentius III. called king John, the king of England, *Vasalum suum*, that is to say, his feud-man, or his tenant, meaning thereby, that the *realm of England was the pope’s, and not the king’s*. If all this be true, how can the kings of England, in granting any thing to the *pope*, be counted *liberal*? Verily, it is an easy kind of *liberality*, for a man to give that thing that is not his own.

Matth. Paris. in Johan. [leg. in Henric. iii. p. 749. 30.]

<sup>60</sup> [This sermon is not by St. Augustine.]

“ But the pope” (ye say) “ setteth no more by all his revenues out of England, than an elephant by a gnat, and that therefore, during the whole time of queen Mary, he never demanded of us any manner of yearly payment.” We must bear with your error herein, M. Harding, for that ye never were the *pope's collector*, and therefore not much acquainted with his books. Otherwise ye might have remembered, that cardinal Pole, being not the *pope*, but only a *legate*, or messenger from the *pope*, had a thousand pounds paid him yearly out of one *bishopric in England*, towards the provision of his kitchen. Ye might have remembered, that all the *bishops of England* paid the *pope the whole first fruits of all their livings*, which, by any common estimation, amounted to more somewhat than a *gnat*. And although I were never neither skilful nor curious in the *pope's collections*, yet, as well for the discovery of so great untruth, as also for the better satisfaction of the reader, I have thought it good briefly, and by the way, to touch what may be found in old records of good credit, touching the same.

First, therefore, the *archbishop of Canterbury* paid unto the *pope*, for his *annates* or *first fruits*, at every vacation, ten thousand florins, beside other five thousand florins for the use and right of his *pall*.

The *archbishop of York* paid likewise for his *first fruits* ten thousand florins, and, as it is thought, other five thousand florins for his *pall*.

The *bishop of Ely* paid for his *first fruits* seven thousand florins.

The *bishop of London* paid for his *first fruits* three thousand florins.

The *bishop of Winchester* paid for his *first fruits* twelve thousand florins.

The *bishop of Exeter* paid for his *first fruits* six thousand florins.

The *bishop of Lincoln* paid for his *first fruits* five thousand florins.

The *bishop of Lichfield and Coventry* paid for his *first fruits* three thousand florins.



The *bishop of Hereford* paid for his *first fruits* one thousand and eight hundred florins.

The *bishop of Salisbury* paid for his *first fruits* four thousand and five hundred florins. And so the rest, each man according after his rate.

Here is to be noted, that a *florin* is an Italian crown, of the value of four shillings and sixpence sterling.

Thus much I have noted only for example. By these few the discreet reader may easily guess the exactions and payments of the other *bishops*.

The whole value of the *pope's first fruits* throughout Europe, as I find in one record, (although very unperfect, for that it lacketh sundry great, known, and notable bishoprics, as Durham, Carlisle, Worcester, Norwich, Bath, Chichester, which, with many other mo *archbishoprics* and *bishoprics*, as well within the dominions of our kings of England, as also in sundry other Christian kingdoms and countries, are left unreckoned,) ariseth to the sum of two thousand thousand, four hundred threescore thousand, eight hundred forty and three florins.

Legatio Adri-  
an. Pape VI.  
Excusa Wit-  
tenber.  
Anno 1538.

Notwithstanding ye make your *pope* as big as an *elephant*, yet, M. Harding, these reckonings are over huge, in any reasonable proportion, to be resembled to a *gnat*. Here I leave out the yearly perquisites that the *pope* made of his *elections*, *preventions*, *dispensations*, *pluralities*, *trialities*, *totquots*, *tolerations*: for his *bulls*, his *seals*, his *signatures*: for *eating flesh*, for *eggs*, for *white meat*, for *priests' concubines*, and for other like merchandise I know not what. The sum whereof notwithstanding amounteth to more than nine hundred thousand florins. As for your *smoke farthings* and *Peter pence*, I make no reckoning; by the vile and contemptuous report whereof, ye shew yourself not only ignorant and unskilful in that ye write, which argueth some folly, but also injurious unto your country. Read Matthias Parisiensis, and ye shall find both by what tyranny and treachery, and also what masses and intolerable sums of money, the *pope's* ministers have carried out of this realm.

Anno 1215. "The pope" (saith he) "being diseased with a spiritual dropsy," that is to say, with an unquenchable thirst of money, "shook out all the priests' purses, and spoiled the abbeyes of all their treasures."

Anno 1246. [P. 706.] Again: "The pope made a decree in Rome, that the goods and monies of all bishops and priests, deceased within England, should be taken to his use."

Eodem anno. [P. 716.] "The pope gave strait commandment to the bishops of England, that all parsons and vicars, being resident upon their benefices, should pay yearly unto him the third part of all the values of their said benefices: and, that all parsons and vicars, being not resident, should pay unto him the one full half part of their benefices. All these payments to continue during the space of three whole years." Which amounteth at the least to the sum of a hundred and threescore and ten thousand pounds.

Anno 1247. [P. 730.] The bishops of England, after great and forcible intreaty, agreed together to give the pope a contribution of eleven thousand marks.

Eodem anno. At that time the poor prior of Winchester was forced to pay yearly three hundred threescore and five marks towards the furniture of the pope's table.

Eodem anno. [L. 1257. P. 956.] The pope made a strait decree, that all bishops elect should immediately travel out of England to Rome, to attend upon his holiness, as Matthias saith, *Ut Romanorum loculos impregnaret, in ruinam regni Angliæ*: "To stuff the Romans' purses, and to decay the kingdom of England."

Matth. Westmonaster. Anno 1301. [P. 416.] The pope had the tenths of all the spiritual livings in England during the space of ten whole years <sup>61</sup>.

Anno 1255. [Matt. Paris.] Rustandus, the pope's legate, exacted intolerable great payments of the clergy of England, in a synod holden in London, as Matthias saith: *Per scripta papæ, plena injuriis et iniquitate, quæ possent patientissimum cor virulenter sauciare*: "All this he did by the authority of the pope's letters, full of injury and iniquity: which were able most

<sup>61</sup> [In Matt. Westmon. the period named is "triennium."]

cruelly to wound any heart, were it never so patient." The *bishops of London and Worcester* answered the *pope's legate*, that they would rather lose their lives than they would give their consent to so open injury, and servitude, and intolerable oppression of the church.

The king had entered into an obligation to pay unto the *pope two hundred thousand marks, besides other fifty thousand pounds sterling*. For payment whereof the *bishop of Hereford*, being then the *pope's agent*, had bound the *bishops of England*, before they were ware. Such like pretty gnats your *pope* can strain, if kings and princes will give him leave.

Johannes Sarisburiensis, otherwise called Rupertus Carnotensis, in the familiar talk that he had with pope Adrian IV., said thus unto him: *Ipse Romanus pontifex omnibus fere est intolerabilis:.....lætatur spoliis ecclesiarum: quæstum omnem reputat pietatem:.....provinciarum diripit spolia, acsi thesauros Cræsi studeat reparare:* "The *pope* is now become intolerable almost to all the world: he rejoiceth in the spoil of churches: all manner of gain he counteth holiness: he maketh such havoc of *kingdoms* and *provinces*, as if he had intended to repair again Cræsus' treasury." Again: "His legates so rage and ramp for money, as if the infernal furies were sent from hell to go at liberty." What shall we need many words? *Ambition and avarice have no bottom*. Matthias [*leg. Matthæus*] Parisiensis saith: *In Romana curia omnia possunt pecunie:* "Money may do all things in the *court of Rome*." And he calleth these unsatiable prollings<sup>62</sup> of the *pope*, *quotidianas extortiones*, "daily extortions<sup>63</sup>." Again he saith, that the *king of England*, upon a very frivolous and fond matter, made true payment unto pope Alexander the Fourth, of *nine hundred and fifty thousand marks*. *Which thing* (he saith) *is horrible and abominable to be thought of*.

Job. Sarisb.  
lib. 6. cap. 24.

Lib. 5. c. 16.  
Ac si mittatur  
ab inferis  
Tisiphone,  
vel Megæra.

Anno 1247.

Anno 1257.  
Quod est  
horribile  
gitatu. [p.  
948.]

<sup>62</sup> [This word, which is not found in the English dictionary, is probably derived from the German word "prellen," to cheat.]

<sup>63</sup> [Under the year 1247, we

find the expressions "intolerabilibus et frequentibus exactionibus "D. Papæ," (p. 720.) and "Curia Romanæ Charybdis insatiabilis." (p. 729.)]

To be short, that ye may the better view the bigness and quantity of your *gnat*, doctor Bonner hereof writeth thus: D. Bonner, in Prefatione in Libell. Steph. Gardineri, De vera Obedient. Anno 1240. [p. 524.] “The *pope's* prey in England was so great, that it came to as much almost as the revenues of the crown.”

Therefore Matthias [*leg.* Matthæus] saith: *Imperator reprehendit regem Angliæ, quod permetteret terram suam tam impudenter per papam depauperari*: “The emperor friendly reprov'd *Henry the Third, king of England*, for that he suffered his kingdom so impudently to be impoverished by the *pope*.”

Anno 1245.  
[p. 666.]

Again he saith: “*King Henry the Third* made open complaint by his *ambassador in the council of Lyons in France, of the pope's innumerable exactions*.”

Likewise he saith before: *Rex Henricus III. repressit impetum legati, propter violentiam denariorum*: “The king stay'd the attempts of the *pope's legate*, touching his intolerable greediness in prolling for money.”

Ye see, therefore, M. Harding, neither is this *gnat* so little, as by your scornful comparison, to the great dishonour of this *noble realm*, ye would seem to make it: nor is the grief and complaint thereof so new as ye bear us in hand. *King Canutus, the king of England*, almost six hundred years ago, being at Rome, wrote home to the *archbishops, and bishops, and states of the realm*, on this wise: *Conquestus sum item coram domino papa, et mihi valde displicere dixi, quod mei archiepiscopi in tantum angariabantur immensitate pecuniarum, quæ ab eis expetebantur, &c.*: “Also I have made my complaint unto the *pope*, and told him, that it much misliketh me that my *archbishops* should be vexed with such unreasonable sums of money required of them.”

Wilhelmus Malmesbur. Anno 1031. [lib. ii. cap. 11.]

Anno 1094.  
[p. 19.]

Likewise Matthias Parisiensis writeth of *king William the Conqueror*: *Concipiens indignationem contra papam, allegavit, quod nullus archiepiscopus, vel episcopus, de regno suo, ad curiam Romanam, vel ad papam, haberet respectum*: “*King William*, upon displeasure conceived against the *pope*, said, that no *archbishop* or *bishop* of his *realm* should from thenceforth have regard either to the court of Rome or to the *pope*.”

All this notwithstanding, ye say the *pope* is an *elephant*: and all these sums, in comparison of his treasures, are but a *gnat*.

Verily all these, and other far greater reckonings, the realm of England is well able to defray. Neither make we any account of the money, but of the deceitful extorting of the money: neither is it dishonourable to the *realm* to repress these lewd and injurious mockeries, and to preserve the subject from open spoil. Other *kings* and *countries* have oftentimes done the same. *Louis, the French king*, whom for his holiness they have made a *saint*, hereof complaineth thus: *Exactiones impositas per Romanam curiam, quibus regnum nostrum miserabiliter depauperatum est, levare aut colligi nullatenus volumus*: “These exactions, or payments of money, laid upon us by the court of Rome, by mean whereof our realm is miserably impoverished, we will not in any wise to be levied or gathered.” The gains and pilferies that the Pharisees made of the people, were not so great. Nevertheless, Christ said unto them, “*Woe be unto you, ye Scribes and Pharisees, that raven up poor widows’ houses, under pretence of long praying.*” Ludovicus.   
 Matt. xxiii.   
 14.

I know you make no great account of *Laurentius Valla*, yet thus he writeth touching the unsatiable ambition and greediness that in his time he saw in the *church of Rome*: *Quid ergo, summe pontifex, omnes reges ac principes occidentis spoliare urbibus, aut cogere, ut annua tibi tributa pensitent, sententia est? At ego contra existimo, justius licere principibus spoliare te imperio omni quod obtines*: “What then, my lord pope, is it your mind to spoil all the kings and princes of the west of their towns and territories, or else to force them to bear you an yearly tribute? Nay, in my judgment, it were far meeter that they should spoil you of all that empire that you have gotten.” Thus wrote *Laurentius Valla* an hundred year and more before *Luther* began to preach. And therefore whatsoever he were, I trow at least he was no *Lutheran*.

“*Rome*” (ye say) “is the mother church of all the West.” And, therefore, I trow, we are bound to pay

whatsoever payments she shall require. If we allow such simple reasons, then is the *pope* likewise bound to pay to the *church of Jerusalem* whatsoever payments she shall require. For Jerusalem is indeed the *mother church*, not only of the West, but also of all the whole world. Howbeit, it is a cruel *mother* that devoureth up her own children. St. Paul saith: *Non debent filii parentibus thesaurizare, sed parentes filiis*: “The children ought not to lay up treasure for their parents, but the parents for their children.” But Johannes Sarisburiensis in his Polycraticon saith: *Roma nunc non tam matrem exhibet, quam novercam*: “Rome now sheweth herself not so much a natural *mother*, as a *stepdame*.” For she spoileth and devoureth her children.

<sup>2</sup> Cor. xii. 14.

Lib. 6. cap. 24.

“This defender,” (ye say,) “in making his end so bad, hath played the part of a foolish poet.” Here, M. Harding, we have good cause to think your *divinity* is waxen cold, seeing you are thus driven to plead in *poetry*. But may we believe the *church of Rome* is of late grown so holy, that *money* is now become the vilest part of all her play? Certainly, if your *pope* once lose his *money*, all his players will soon sit a-cold. One of your own doctors saith thus: *Cessante tali reddito, qui maximus est, attentata hodierna tyrannide, sedes apostolica contemneretur*: “If this rent, (*of simony*), which is very great, were once staid, considering the *tyranny of princes that now is*, the *apostolic see of Rome would be despised*.” In which words thus much is also to be noted by the way, that whatsoever *prince* will not suffer the *pope* to take what him listeth, must be taken, and judged as a *tyrant*. Therefore, Johannes Andreae, one of your greatest *canonists*, saith thus: *Roma fundata fuit a prædombus, et adhuc de primordiis retinet: dicta Roma, quasi rodens manus. Unde versus, ‘Roma manus rodit: quos rodere non valet, odit:’* “The first foundation of Rome was laid by *thieves*: and hitherto she savoureth still of her beginning, and is called *Roma, quia rodit manus*. Thereof cometh the common verse, ‘*Rome biteth you by the hands. And whom she cannot bite, them she hateth.*’”

Felin. de Offic. et Potestat. Judicis delegati. Ex parte 1. [fol. 192.]

In sexto: de Elect. et Elect. potest. Fundament. In Glossa. [et ap. Johan. Andr. in 6tum fol. 30. col. 2.]

The state of the *Roman popedom* sprung first of *money*, and increased by *money*, and standeth now, neither by truth of *doctrine*, nor by severity of *discipline*, nor by *prayer*, nor by *holiness*, nor by ought else, but only by *money*. Set *money* apart, and the *pope* is equal with other *bishops*. Codrus Urceus saith: *Pontifex maximus, si non virtute, tamen pecunia*: “The *pope* is the greatest *bishop*, although not in *virtue*, yet at least in *money*.” Therefore we may say of the *pope*, as Diphilus sometime said of Pompeius: *Nostra miseria Magnus es*.

Codrus Urceus Serm. 1.

Cicero ad Attic. lib. 2.

Baptista Mantuanus, speaking of the state of Rome, saith thus:

[Bapt. Mant. de calam. tempor. lib. iii. l. 127.]

VENALIA NOBIS

TEMPLA, SACERDOTES, ALTARIA, SACRA, CORONÆ,  
IGNIS, THURA, PRECES, CÆLUM EST VENALE, DEUSQUE.

“Amongst us in Rome, *churches, priests, altars, masses, crowns, fire, incense, prayers, and heaven, are set to sale. Yea, God himself amongst us may be had for money.*”

Budæus saith: *Sanctiones pontificiæ non moribus regendis usui sunt: sed, propemodum dixerim, argentariæ faciendæ auctoritatem videntur accommodare*: “The *pope’s canons* serve not now to guide men’s lives: but, if I may so say, they serve rather to make a bank, and to get money<sup>63</sup>.”

Budæus in Pundectis.

Bernard of Clunice saith thus:

ROMA DAT OMNIBUS OMNIA DANTIBUS: OMNIA ROMÆ  
CUM PRETIO:

Bernar. Cluniacen. in Satyra [de contemptu mundi, lib. 3. p. 95.]

“Rome giveth all things to them that give all things: all things at Rome will pass for *money*.”

Even in the *pope’s* own Decretals ye shall find it noted thus: *Roma est caput avaritiæ. Ideo omnia ibi venduntur*: “Rome is the *head* of all covetous treachery. And, therefore, all things there are set to sale<sup>64</sup>.”

In sexto: de Elect. et Electi Postest. Fundament. In marg. [ed. Lugd. 1572.]

Yea, Thomas Becket himself, whom a little before ye called a *saint*, when, for his wilful disobedience, and treason committed against his *prince*, he had for aid and succour

<sup>63</sup>[The editor has looked through this work, but has found no clue to the passage.]

<sup>64</sup>[See the note supra vol. vi. 155.]

fled to Rome, and saw that nothing would be wrought there without *money*, thus he wrote thereof to the *bishop of Menz*: *Mater Roma facta est meretrix, et prostituta est pro mercede*: “*Rome, our mother, is become an harlot, and for money and need layeth herself to sale*<sup>64</sup>.” To be short, ye know that our *fathers*, long sithence, were wont to say,

*CURIA ROMANA NON CAPTAT OVEM SINE LANA*:

“The *court of Rome* will not take the sheep without the fleece.”

Therefore, M. Harding, your *poet* concluded in good order, and went not so far besides his rules. For *money* is both the *first*, and the *middle*, and the *last act* of all your *fable*.

Matt. xxi. 12. Christ sometime thrust such buyers, sellers, brokers, and scorsers<sup>65</sup>, out of the *temple*: but, contrariwise, ye have received in buyers and sellers, and thrust out Christ, and so have turned the *house of God* into a *cave of thieves*.

Acts xx. 33. St. Paul saith thus unto the people of Ephesus: *Argentum et aurum nullius concupivi*: “I have desired no man’s gold or silver.” Upon which words, in the Gloss it is noted thus: *Per hoc lupi cognoscuntur, qui talia concupiscunt*: “Hereby, they that desire such things, are known for wolves.” St. Hierom saith: *Quia prophetæ pecuniam accipiebant, prophetia eorum facta est divinatio*: “For that the prophets fell to taking of money, therefore their prophecy was become a soothsaying:” that is to say, it was of the devil, and not of God.

1 quæ. 1.  
Nunquam  
divinatio.

Thus, M. Harding, to conclude, whatsoever fault ye can find with the defender’s *poetry*, verily, by the judgment of your nearest friends, *money was the best part of all your fable*.

### THE RECAPITULATION OF THE APOLOGY.

Thus thou seest, good Christian reader, it is no <sup>[Vol. iv. p. 91.]</sup> new thing, though at this day the religion of Christ be entertained with despites and checks, being but

<sup>65</sup> [Thomas a Becket’s words, as strong.]  
though not exactly these, are quite <sup>65</sup> [To scorse = to exchange.]

In Epistola  
ad Archie-  
piscop. Mo-  
guntinum,  
[Epist. p.  
334.]



lately restored, and, as it were, coming up again anew; forso much as the like hath chanced both to Christ himself, and to his apostles<sup>66</sup>: yet, nevertheless, for fear thou mayest suffer thyself to be led amiss, and to be seduced with these exclamations of our adversaries, we have declared at large unto thee the very whole manner of our religion, what our faith is of *God the Father*, of his only *Son Jesus Christ*, of the *Holy Ghost*<sup>67</sup>, of the *church*<sup>68</sup>, of the *sacraments*<sup>69</sup>, of the *ministry*<sup>70</sup>, of the *scriptures*<sup>71</sup>, of *ceremonies*<sup>72</sup>, and of every part of Christian belief. We have said, that we abandon and detest, as plagues and poisons, all those old *heresies*, which either the sacred scriptures, or the ancient councils, have utterly condemned<sup>73</sup>; that we call home again, as much as in lieth, the right discipline of the church, which our adversaries have quite brought into a poor and weak case<sup>74</sup>: that we punish all licentiousness of life, and unruliness of manners, by the old and long continued laws, and with as much sharpness as is convenient, and lieth in our power<sup>75</sup>: that we maintain still the state of kingdoms, in the same condition and state of honour, wherein we found them, without any diminishing or alteration; reserving unto our princes their majesty and worldly preeminence, safe, and without impairing, to our possible power<sup>76</sup>: that we have so gotten ourselves away from that *church*, which they had made *a den of thieves*, and wherein

<sup>66</sup> [See vol. iv. pp. 6—15.]

<sup>67</sup> [Ibid. pp. 15. 16. In the Latin Apology no words occur here relating to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity.]

<sup>68</sup> [Ibid. pp. 16. 17.]

<sup>69</sup> [Ibid. pp. 21—25.]

<sup>70</sup> [Ibid. pp. 17—20.]

<sup>71</sup> [Ibid. p. 20.]

<sup>72</sup> [Ibid. pp. 25. 26.]

<sup>73</sup> [Ibid. pp. 29. 30.]

<sup>74</sup> [Ibid. p. 35.]

<sup>75</sup> [Ibid. p. 37.]

<sup>76</sup> [Ibid. pp. 39—44.]

nothing was in good frame, or once like to the church of God, and which, by their own confessions, had erred many ways, even as Lot, in times past, gat him out of Sodom, or Abraham out of Chaldee, not upon a desire of contention, but by the warning of God himself<sup>77</sup>: and that we have searched out of the holy Bible, which we are sure cannot deceive us, one sure form of religion, and have returned again unto the *primitive church* of the ancient fathers and apostles, that is to say, to the ground and beginning of things, unto the very foundations and headsprings of Christ's church<sup>78</sup>.

Neither have we tarried in this matter for the authority or consent of the *Tridentine council*, wherein we saw nothing done uprightly, nor by good order: where also everybody was sworn to the maintenance of one man: where *princes' ambassadors* were contemned: where not one of our divines could be heard, and where parts-taking and ambition was openly and earnestly procured and wrought: but as the holy fathers in former time, and as our predecessors have commonly done, we have restored our churches by a *provincial convocation*<sup>79</sup>, and have clean shaken off, as our duty was, the yoke and tyranny of the bishop of Rome, to whom we were not bound: who also had no manner of thing like, neither to *Christ*, nor to *Peter*, nor to an *apostle*, nor yet like to any *bishop* at all<sup>80</sup>. Finally, we say, that we agree amongst ourselves touching the whole

<sup>77</sup> [Vol. iv. pp. 44—53.]

<sup>78</sup> [Ibid. pp. 53—70. Throughout this Recapitulation, Harding interposes his remarks, which bishop Jewel omits, as a mere repe-

tion of statements often refuted before.]

<sup>79</sup> [Vol. iv. pp. 70—87.]

<sup>80</sup> [Ibid. pp. 87—91.]

judgment and chief substance of Christian religion, and with one mouth and with one spirit do worship God, and the *Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*.

Wherefore, O Christian and godly reader, forso-much as thou seest the reasons and causes, both why we have restored religion, and why we have forsaken these men, thou oughtest not to marvel though we have chosen to obey our *master* Christ rather than men. St. Paul hath given us warning, that we should not suffer ourselves to be carried away with such sundry learnings, and to flee their companies, specially such as would sow debate and variance, clean contrary to the doctrine which they had received of Christ and the apostles.

Long sithence have these men's crafts and treacheries decayed, and vanished, and fled away at the sight and light of the gospel, even as the owl doth at the sun-rising. And albeit their trumpery be built up and reared as high as the sky, yea, even in a moment, and as it were of itself, falleth it down again to the ground, and cometh to nought.

For you must not think, that all these things have come to pass by chance, or at adventure: it was God's pleasure, that, against all men's wills wellnigh, the *gospel of Jesus Christ* should be spread abroad throughout the whole world at these days. And therefore men, following God's commandment, have of their own free will resorted unto the doctrine of Jesus Christ.

And, for our parts, truly we have sought hereby neither glory, nor wealth, nor pleasure, nor ease. For there is plenty of all these things with our adversaries.

And when we were of their side, we enjoyed

such worldly commodities much more liberally and bountifully than we do now.

Neither do we eschew *concord and peace*. But to have peace with man, we may not be at war with God. The name of *peace* is a sweet and pleasant thing, saith Hilarius<sup>81</sup>: but yet beware, saith he, "*Peace is one thing, and bondage is another.*" For if it should so be, as they seek to have it, that Christ should be commanded to keep silence, that the truth of the gospel should be betrayed, that horrible errors should be cloked, that Christian men's eyes should be bleared, and that they might be suffered to conspire openly against God: this were not a *peace*, but a most ungodly covenant of servitude. "*There is a peace,*" saith Nazianzen, "*that is unprofitable*<sup>82</sup>: *again, there is a discord,*" saith he, "*that is profitable.*" For we must conditionally desire *peace*, so far as is lawful before God, and so far as we may conveniently. For otherwise Christ himself brought not *peace* into the world, but a *sword*. Wherefore, if the *pope* will have us reconciled to him, his duty is first to be reconciled to God: "*For from thence,*" saith Cyprian, "*spring schisms and sects, because men seek not the head, and have not their recourse to the fountain*" (of the scriptures), "*and keep not the rules given by the heavenly Teacher: for,*" saith he, "*that is not peace, but war: neither is he joined unto the church, which is severed from the gospel*<sup>83</sup>." As for these men, they use to make a merchandise of the name of *peace*. For that *peace*, which they so fain would have, is only a rest of idle

[Contr.  
Arian. sub  
init.]

[Greg. Naz.  
tom. i. 203.]

Matt. x. 34.

[Ad Florent.  
Pupianum,  
p. 122. ad  
Pomp. p.  
141.]

[De lapsis,  
p. 186.]

<sup>81</sup> [Hilarius: the first part of this quotation will be found according to the marginal reference: "Speciosum quidem nomen est "pacis . . . ."]

<sup>82</sup> [Nazianz. Orat. 12. οἶδα γὰρ ὡς περ στάσι τινὰ βελτίστην, οὐτῶ καὶ βλαβερωτάτην ὁμόνοιαν.]

<sup>83</sup> [This quotation is made up from several distinct passages.]

bellies. They and we might easily be brought to atonement<sup>84</sup> touching all these matters, were it not that ambition, gluttony, and excess doth let it. Hence cometh their whining: their heart is on their halfpenny<sup>85</sup>. Out of doubt, their clamours and stirs be to none other end, but to maintain more shamefully and naughtily ill-gotten goods.

Now-a-days the *pardoners* complain of us, the *dataries*, the *pope's collectors*, the *bawds*, and others which think gain to be godliness, and serve not Jesus Christ, 1 Tim. vi. 5. but their own bellies. Many a day ago, and in the old world, a wonderful great advantage grew hereby to these kinds of people. But now they reckon all is lost unto them that Christ gaineth. The *pope* himself maketh a great complaint at this present, that charity in people is waxen cold. And why so, trow ye? Forsooth, because his profits decay more and more. And for this cause doth he hale us into hatred, all that ever he may, laying load upon us with despiteful railings, and condemning us for *heretics*, to the end they that understand not the matter may think there be no worse men upon earth than we be. Notwithstanding, in the mean season, we are not ashamed in this behalf: neither ought we to be ashamed of the *gospel*. For we set more by the glory of God than we do by the estimation of men. We are sure, all is true that we teach, and we may not either go against our own conscience, or bear any witness against God. For if we deny any part of the *gospel of Jesus Christ* before men, he, on the other side, will deny us before his *Father*. And if there be any, that will still be offended, and

<sup>84</sup> [at-onement = reconciliation.]

<sup>85</sup> [Apol. Lat. "animus est in patinis."]

cannot endure *Christ's doctrine*, such, say we, be blind, and leaders of the blind: the truth, nevertheless, must be preached and preferred above all: and we must with patience wait for God's judgment<sup>86</sup>:

Let these folk, in the mean time, take good heed what they do, and let them be well advised of their own salvation, and cease to hate and persecute the *gospel of the Son of God*, for fear lest they feel him once a redresser and revenger of his own cause. God will not suffer himself to be made a mocking-stock. The world espieth, a good while ago, what there is adoin'g abroad. This flame, the more it is kept down, so much the more, with greater force and strength, doth it break out and fly abroad. The unfaithfulness of men shall not disappoint God's faithful promise. And if they shall refuse to lay away this their hardness of heart, and to receive the *gospel of Christ*, then shall *publicans* and sinners go before them into the kingdom of heaven.

God, and the *Father* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*, open the eyes of them all, that they may be able to see that blessed hope, whereunto they have been called: so as we may altogether in one glorify him alone, who is the true God, and also that same *Jesus Christ*, whom he sent down to us from heaven: unto whom, with the *Father* and the *Holy Ghost*, be given all honour and glory everlastingly. So be it.

<sup>86</sup> [Harding here alludes to Foxe's "Acts and Monuments," as "a donghill of lyes."]

## TO M. HARDING.

---

IT appeareth, M. Harding, by that ye have lately sent us over<sup>68</sup>, and specially by the unpleasant verdure of your speech, that my Replie hath somewhat disordered your quiet mind. Which thing notwithstanding, I might easily have guessed, was not unlikely to come to pass, specially being before not utterly unskilful of your affections: yet as I have never sought to write any thing that of purpose and justly might offend you, (the right of the cause and defence of the truth evermore foreprised,) even so am I now right sorry to see you so unable to master your passions, and so unadvisedly to make them open to so many. If it grieve you in respect of your credit, for that I have thus discovered your errors; that was your fault, it was not mine. If ye had not made your errors known, they should never of my part have been discovered. If you knew how sorry I am in your behalf, ye would not so impatiently be offended.

It misliketh you that I have alleged so many doctors and councils, and, as you say, have so ambitiously painted my margin with so many authorities, both Greek and Latin. Yet you, for your part, have not spared, over and

<sup>68</sup> [This alludes to Harding's "Rejoinder" to "the Replie;" published A. D. 1566, the year before the publication of the "Defence of the Apology." It should be borne in mind, that the

two controversies, the one on the Challenge, and the other on the Apology, were carried on simultaneously. The several dates of the works which appeared will be noticed in the Preface.]

besides these two tongues, to paint your margin, for a surcharge, with words in Hebrew: besides other such ranks of your English scholies, so many, so thick, and so close together, that it were a hard matter to force in one word of truth to stand amongst them. It is no courteous dealing, M. Harding, to reprove that in others, that you so commonly do yourself.

If the number of doctors have offended you, I do not marvel: a cowardly challenger would always wish the defendant to come unarmed unto the fight. If I had alleged either no doctors at all, or nothing to purpose, as your wont commonly is to do, ye would have borne it a great deal better. Howbeit, my authorities of doctors and councils, be they never so many, yet, as you have used them, are few enow. For of the whole number, by your good skill, more than three parts are left untouched. And indeed this was the wisest way. Children, where they cannot read, think it best to skip over.

Whereas I examine and lay abroad all the parts and branches of your arguments, and show how directly ye grow to your conclusions, that your reader may see by what weapons ye seek to master him; this, you say, is a kind of scoffing. Ye tell me, I rack, and alter, and abuse your arguments, and play with shadows of mine own. But, M. Harding, if ye will have your arguments to pass smoothly without controlment, then learn henceforth to make them better. Ye are over-tender, if ye look to speak what ye list, and yet to hear nothing but to your liking: and to send abroad such simple wares to serve the people, and yet may suffer no man to tell you of it. Verily, where ye say I have of purpose changed your arguments, if ye make them otherwise than I have made them, having always an eye unto your conclusion, ye shall be forced to make them worse. Touching the scoffs wherewith ye find yourself so much aggrieved, doubtless whoso had that grace that is in you, as may well appear throughout all your books, might soon deserve to be called a scoffer.

Where ye say, you and your fellows have espied a thou-



sand foul great lies in my writings; had not one of you been a great father of lies, ye could never have hit so readily upon the number. Such an auditor, I trow, was he that found us out eleven thousand lies in Sleidan's story. The very true multitude hereof, and the hugeness of the heap, as it bewrayeth well your stomach, so in any indifferent judgment, it decayeth the credit of your reckoning. A man may reasonably think it is as possible to find two hundred and fifty untruths in your book, as in mine to find a thousand. Verily, as I never minded to defend any thing whatsoever that in any my writings shall be found amiss, so I see by the view of your accounts it were no hard matter with your eyes to find untruths in the gospel. For whatsoever I say, be it never so true, yet, if it like not your taste, it is a lie. Whatsoever I allege or translate, it is corrupted. So evil is my luck; I can touch nothing, but it is either too much or too little, or too short or too long, or too black or too white; or one way or other it standeth awry. If I translate *nonnulli sacerdotes*, "sundry priests," ye cry out, "a corrupter, a falsary." I should have said *certain priests*, or *some priests*; but I should not in any wise have said *sundry priests*, for that were an heresy.

Laurent. Surian. in Præfat. in Nauclerum.

M. Harding, Rejoinder, fol. 203. b.

If I translate *ὁμοτρόφους*, *una nutritos*, "fed together," ye tell the world, it is falsehood, it is foul corruption. Thus ye say I should have translated it *eodem cibo alitos*: "fed with one kind of meat:" as if *ὁμοῦ* in Greek were not *una* in Latin, or had not relation to the place. Deal herein with your friends, M. Harding, as you may: the Greek reader will allow you no such translations. If I happen to say, "*M. Harding saith, The thing that we receive in the sacrament is no bread,*" ye cry *Alarma*; "*Look,*" ye say, "*in my book, reader: M. Jewel is an untrue man: here he is taken with a lie: mark well: I say, It is not bread: I say not, It is no bread.*" Not bread, ye say; *no bread*, ye say not. As if there were so many miles distance between *no* and *not*.

M. Harding, Rejoinder, fol. 163. b.

These, and such like, be the shameful untruths and horrible lies that you and your fellows, with great seeking

and diligence, have espied. And thus if a man happen to use *ensis* for *gladius*, or *nam* for *enim*, or *que* for *et*, ye think it cause sufficient to make a tragedy. Howbeit, I doubt not but in my Replie, being so long, and so full of necessary allegations, ye may happen to find some oversights of greater importance. And in acknowledging and reforming of the same, ye shall find me as sharp and eager as yourself. But these few examples I have touched by the way, that it might appear how inquisitive and fierce ye are to seek occasions: and that your reader may see ye hunt wantonly, and run riot, and open oftentimes without a cause. Yet notwithstanding, if ye can tell us sadly, as your manner is, that M. Jewel bringeth trifling objections, and trash, and pelf, and nothing to purpose, without learning, without reason, without wit; that he racketh, that he stretcheth, that he wringeth, that he wresteth, that he nippeth and clippeth the doctors and councils: (for these be the words whereby ye thought ye might best utter your pretty fancies:) if ye can cry out *false parts, false reports, false dealings, false merchants, false balance, false dice, and all is false*: if ye can say, *Lo, sir defender, ye wrangle, ye trifle, ye are taken tardy, ye have proved nothing, ye have nothing to answer*: if ye can thus say, and say it boldly, it shall be sufficient, all is safe: your friends will think ye have said somewhat, and that ye would never have framed such a countenance to say nothing.

Ye tell us full often, we are no bishops. I trow, for that we have not sworn our obedience to the *pope*. And therefore ye give the world to understand, we can consecrate no ministers, we can hold no synods, we can do nothing. Even so certain your forefathers in old times told St. Paul he was no *apostle*; and others afterward, by like authority, told St. Basil and St. Hilary they were no *bishops*. But, M. Harding, they were *false apostles*, they were *Arian heretics* that so told them. It booteth not to try our titles before you. We will only say with St. Paul: *1 Cor. xv. 10.* "*By the grace of God we are that we are.*" And we trust we have not his grace in vain.

But specially, and above all other things, and that

throughout all your three books<sup>69</sup>, ye say, that *sir defender* is unlearned: that his best skill is in a few figures of rhetoric: that he hath neither Greek, nor logic, nor philosophy, nor divinity: that he hath read no kind of doctors, nor new, nor old, nor of his own, nor of others: that all the furniture of his book was brought to his hand, some by Greek readers, some by schoolmasters, some by civilians, some by canonists, some by summists, some by glossers, some by others: that he hath nothing else but patched note-books, huddled together by snaps and pieces. Some part hereof, or rather the whole altogether, without exception, to do you pleasure, I would easily have granted you, M. Harding, upon small suit, with more favour and less ado. Take from me what learning ye list; distrain it and pound it at your pleasure; I will never trouble you with replevin. Howbeit, if ye utter all this of your indifferent judgment and certain knowledge, yet is it impertinent; for we pleaded of faith, and not of learning: if otherwise ye speak it of heat of mind, and abundance of choler, and thereupon thus proclaim it to the world, it is great folly. Truly ye never saw *sir defender's* books, nor never set your foot within his study. A wise judge will seldom pronounce before he know. If it shall please you, for trial hereof, to send your friend, he may haply see that *sir defender* hath all these *summists*, and *canonists*, and *Greek readers*, and *schoolmasters* of his own.

Notwithstanding, it may become us both to say, as a heathen wise man sometime said: "*This only thing we know, that we know nothing.*" God's truth dependeth not of our knowledge. Our tongues shall cease, and our knowledge shall fail: but the *glory of God* shall stand for ever. For my part, I will say to you, with St. Augustine: *Quære doctiores: sed cave præsumptores: "Seek others of more learning: but beware of them that presume of learning."* If any praise fall out in this respect, bestow it

<sup>69</sup> [The "three books" alluded to are Harding's Answer to the Challenge, 1563, his Rejoinder to Jewel's Replie, 1566; and his Confutation of the Apology, which appeared between the two others in 1565.]

M. Harding,  
Confutat.  
214. a. and  
259. a. And  
commonly in  
other places.

freely upon your Greek readers and schoolmasters, who in your judgment have best deserved it. It shall be sufficient for me to have said the truth; which, though it appear never so simple, yet is able to remove a mountain of learning. But happy are your *brethren of Louvain*, that are so speedily grown learned upon the sudden, not by great study, I trow, but rather by destiny. As soon as they had once savoured the soil of that country, they

Extra. lib. 5. looked only upon two poor titles of the *law*, *De maledicis*, and *De clerico promotus per saltum*: and suddenly they were transformed, and now go for *doctors*.

As for your learning, M. Harding, we never reprov'd it. Howbeit, greatly to fear it we have no cause. God give you grace ye may wholly turn it to his glory; lest in the day of the Lord it be laid against you. He is over well learned, that bendeth his learning against God. But if we be so utterly void of all manner of learning, painting, as you say, our books and margins with the names and authorities of so many *doctors*, what may your friends then think of you, that, standing so long in the defence of your *private mass*, are not yet able to allege one *doctor*, nor *Greek*, nor *Latin*, nor one nor other? It seemeth great marvel ye should have such abundance of *doctors*, and shew so few, specially where it standeth you so much upon to open your store. Consider, I beseech you, your late Rejoinder; wherein, as it is thought, nothing of your part is left untouched. Of the seven and twenty articles contained in my Replie, ye have taken upon you only to answer one. And yet of the same one, ye have scarcely touched the tenth part. Your purpose should have been herein, by evident *examples* and good *authorities*, substantially to have proved your *private mass*.

Now consider the order and plainness of your dealing. Ye bestow wellnear the third part of your book about the *sacrifice*: as though there were no sacrifice without *private mass*. All the rest ye consume in idle discourses, and needless talks, of *consecration*, of the *intention of the priest*, of *mingling the water with the wine*, of the *name of the mass*, of *transubstantiation*, of *real presence*, of *church*

*feasts*, (which in old time were called *agapæ*,) of *singular communion*, of *communion of faith*, of our *union with Christ*, of sending abroad the *sacrament*, of *priests' wives*, of *vows*, of *bigamy*, of *good works*, of *only faith*, of *public prayer in a tongue unknown*, of *ceremonies*, of *forms*, of *accidents*, of the *epistles decretal*, of *Clemens*, *Cletus*, *Anacletus*, *Abdias*, *Leontius*, &c. Hereof ye have told us such things as perhaps we knew before, and were not hard to be known, and pertained full little to the purpose. Ye should rather have proved, that within the first six hundred years after Christ some one or other of the holy *learned catholic fathers ministered the holy communion openly in the church, and received the sacrament alone, not dividing the same to any other, the whole multitude of the people sitting or standing by and looking on him*. This was the matter that lay between us. Hereunto ye should have laid your force. This was it ye should have proved. For proof of such things as needed no proof, ye have brought forth great shows of learning. But as touching your *private mass*, which only ye had taken in hand to prove, ye have hitherto proved nothing. Your reader, M. Harding, can never be neither so simple nor so partial, but he must needs have an eye unto your issue, and remember what ye had in hand. If amongst so many and so learned words, he find not one word of that he sought for, may not he think he hath lost his labour, and that there is some folly in your fardle? May he not say with himself: *Quo nunc se proripit iste?* What shall I make of these vagaries? What meaneth this man to shoot so fair beside the mark? He must needs perceive by your silence, that notwithstanding your so many fair and liberal promises, yet the thing he sought for cannot be found. Nay, you yourself, for excuse hereof, by express words, have told us plainly, "*It might be, that none received the sacrament with the priest.*" And again: "*Whether the priest had always a company to receive with him, or sometimes received alone, that is a circumstance of a fact: the proof whereof, by manifest testimonies, cannot with reason be demanded.*" Again: "*It is contentious to put us to*

M. Harding,  
Rejoinder,  
fol. 281. a.  
and fol. 88. a.

M. Harding, in his Rejoinder, in the preface to the reader, &c.

In the same preface, and li.

M. Harding, Rejoinder, fol. 210. a. Rejoinder, 219. a.

*proof of the circumstance.*" Again: "*It forceth not, whether we bring forth testimonies of the six hundred years, or no.*" Again: "*Whether I can shew, that a mass was said without company present to receive with the priest that said it, or no, what skilleth it?*" Again: "*I must tell you, that I seek not for private mass, which to find, your scoffing pretendeth me to be desirous. I seek not for that which I acknowledge not.*" And again: "*It forceth not greatly, whether it may be proved or no.*" Which is as much as if ye had told us in plainer wise, that for the space of six hundred years after Christ, ye can hear no tidings in any *doctor* or *council*, of your *private mass*. Which thing thus of your part confessed, to our purpose is sufficient.

M. Harding, in his Answer, fol. 29. a.

Rejoinder, fol. 267. b.

Now touching the authority of your Amphilochius, not long sithence ye thought his force had been invincible. And therefore ye stood up aloft, and brayed aloud: "*Now M. Jewel and his consacramentaries do stagger, I doubt not.*" And for that cause, as if it had been some great worthy *author*, ye alleged him seven times, with special reverence in your book. And yet now at the last ye are content for shame to turn him over, and to let him go. Perhaps ye thought for the while a weak thread was sufficient to lead the people; and that, as folks use sometimes to please children, ye might quench their thirst with an empty cup. Thus much hitherto touching some parts of your *Rejoinder*.

M. Harding, Confut. fol. 162. b.

Confut. fol. 162. a.

Concerning your *former book*, which ye have entituled *A Confutation*, I need to say nothing. By the judgment of the wise it saith sufficiently of itself. But what meant you, M. Harding, therein to make so large discourse, I will not say in the defence, (for that word your friends may not bear,) but at the least in the favour of *open stews*, and to call the same *malum necessarium*, that is to say, although an ill thing, yet such a thing as no good commonweal may be without it? What meant you, to that purpose, to show us the name and authority of St. Augustine? Must we think that St. Augustine was a proctor or patron for your *stews*? What meant you thus to upbraid

us in the end, "*In good sooth, masters, ye are too young to control the city of Rome in her doings?*" What needed you to bestow so fine eloquence in so foul a cause? Is vice grown so cold in Louvain, that it must now be inflamed and authorized by open writing? What meant you to allege the *prophet David*, the *evangelist St. Matthew*, and *St. Paul the apostle*, for proof of your *pardons*? Will ye tell us, that *David*, *Matthew*, and *Paul* were *pardoners*? Or if ye dare to tell us so, must we believe you? If you so manifestly mock us with open follies, how may we trust you in higher mysteries? St. Paul saith; "Though our outward man be corrupted, yet our inward man is renewed day by day." Here ye tell us in great sooth, that these words undoubtedly serve to prove *purgatory*. Christ saith unto Peter, "*I have prayed for thee, &c.*" Therefore ye say, *Christ now requireth us, not to be obedient to Peter or Paul, but to the pope that sitteth in their chair*. Christ saith; "*The Son of man came not to destroy, but to save:*" *Ergo*, say you, *The bread and wine in the sacrament lose no part of their former virtues: but remain, in forms and accidents, even as they were before:* as if the Son of God had come down from heaven to save *accidents*.

M. Harding,  
Confut. fol.  
163. b.

Confut. 251.  
a. et delin-  
ceps.

2 Cor. iv. 16.

M. Harding,  
Confut. fol.  
117. a.

Luke xxii.  
M. Harding,  
Confut. fol.  
192 b.  
M. Harding,  
Confut. fol.  
99. a.

Thus ye nip off the sense and meaning of the holy *scriptures*, and feed us only with empty words, as if ye would pick away the corn, and give us the chaff: or convey away the jewels, and throw us the bag. O, M. Harding, be not wilful: let your own conscience lead you. Was this the meaning of St. Paul? Was this the coming of Christ into the world? Was this the sense of the Holy Ghost? I will not say, what *old doctor* or *ancient father*, but what *summist*, what *canonist*, what *child*, what *heretic*, ever either so indiscreetly or so unreverently used the *word of God*?

I leave the misconstruing and falsifying of so many *fathers*: the allowing and soothing of manifest forgeries: the upholding of abuses and open errors: your weak proofs: your silly conjectures: your simple guesses: your great oversights: your bold affirmations; your heaps of untruths; your disdainful scorns; your immoderate scoffs;

Confut. 318. your ungentle and uncivil words; as for example, *villains,*  
 b. *thieves, fools, disards, lourdaines*<sup>70</sup>, &c. I leave other your  
 Confut. 250. unmannerly and uncleanly speeches; *Hungry dogs eat*  
 b. *dirty puddings: As common as lice with beggars: They*  
*serve the belly, and the things beneath the belly.* These be  
 your words, M. Harding; you may not deny them. These  
 be the flowers and ornaments of your books.

But was this a present, M. Harding, meet either for the  
 modesty of a *virgin*, or for the *majesty* of a *prince*:  
 specially such a *virgin*, and such a *prince*, so chaste, so  
 grave, so learned, so wise, so virtuous, so godly, as  
 Christendom seldom hath seen the like? What! thought  
 you, that either her wisdom could not espy your frauds  
 and mockeries, or that her chaste ears could quietly bear  
 your loathsome talk? Or thought you by the weight of  
 such reasons to move mountains, and to work wonders,  
 and to force her *majesty* to leave *Christ* and his *gospel*, and  
 come to Louvain to follow you?

Ye threape<sup>71</sup> her *majesty* fondly with kindness, and, as  
 ye would have the world imagine, with good liking and  
 favouring of your side; as if her *majesty* having been  
 brought up from her cradle in the knowledge and fear of  
 God, and through God's great mercy, and according to his  
 known will, by the good advice and counsel of the states  
 of her *realm*, having reformed the *house of God*, from the  
 filth and soil of your devices, she stood now in a mam-  
 mering<sup>72</sup>, and were not able to discern either *falsehood* from  
*truth*, or *darkness* from *light*; or as if your errors were  
 not so gross, that a blind man may grope them with his  
 fingers.

Confut. fol.  
 42. a. and so  
 throughout  
 the whole  
 book.

Confut. fol.  
 5. a. 15. a.  
 38. a. 49. and  
 so through  
 the whole.

Ye tell her *majesty*, she hath neither *parliament*, nor  
*law*, nor *church*, nor *clergy*: the church of England ye  
 commonly call the *tower of Babylon*, the *synagogue of*  
*Antichrist*, and the *school of Satan*: ye charge her *majesty*  
 with disordered proceedings, with maintenance of infidel-  
 ity, of sacrilege, of schism, of heresy; for your possible  
 power, ye dishonour her *majesty* both abroad and at home;

<sup>70</sup> [Disard, or dizzard = One stupified: lourdaine = a worthless per-  
 son.] <sup>71</sup> [To threa to urge.] <sup>72</sup> [In suspense.]



where ye may get credit to your follies, ye slander the government; ye disquiet her majesty's loving subjects; ye breed seditions; ye procure rebellions; ye hazard her estate. And yet dare ye to powder all this poison with a few dissembled and sugared words, and to offer the same unto her majesty for a present? Well, M. Harding, if ye had foreseen the thanks that her majesty most justly yielded you for your travails, ye would not have been so bold, so rudely to press into her presence. It behoved you to be advised, not only what ye wrote, but also what personage should view your writings.

If ye shall happen to write hereafter, send us fewer words and more learning. If ye shall devise to talk any more of your private mass, leave your vagaries, and go directly to the purpose. Tell us no more such long tales, either of the sacrifice, or of other matters so far from the question. It is no good logic to shift off the thing ye have in hand, and to mock your poor reader with another. Tread not so nicely and so gingerly, M. Harding; say not your mass is a circumstance, and a matter of fact, and standeth only upon supposals and guesses, and therefore needeth no further proof. Why should ye so trifle with the simple? This is the issue that falleth out between us; *Whether any one of the ancient learned fathers, &c. ever said your private mass, &c.* This is it that is denied. If ye prove not this, whatsoever ye prove, ye prove nothing. Bring out some learned *father*: shew some *catholic doctor*: keep them no longer forthcoming. The world looketh ye should deal plainly.

Deny no more the manifest truth: avouch no more the open falsehood: let there be some probability and likelihood in your sayings. Leave your immoderate and uncourteous talks. They are tokens of stomach, and not of learning. Therein ye have deserved the honour above all others. In such kind of eloquence no man can match you, but yourself. A good cause might have been pleaded with better words. The more untemperate and fiery ye shew yourself without cause, the more in the end will appear your folly. If ye have hitherto taken any pleasure in

Rejoyn. 232.  
b. 233. a.

speaking ill, at my hand, by hearing ill, ye shall not lose it. If ye bring us mo fables of your *pardons* and *purgatories*: if ye feed us as ye have done with *untruths*: if ye deprave the *scriptures*: if ye falsify the *doctors*: if ye conclude without *premises*: if ye place your *antecedent at Rome*, and your *consequent at Louvain*: if ye stuff so much paper, and blot so many leaves, and shew us nothing; briefly, if ye write none otherwise than ye have done hitherto, no wise man will greatly fear your force.

Deceive not the simple. They are bought with price. They are the people of God, for whom *Christ* hath shed his *blood*. Your shifts be miserable. Ye trouble yourself as a bird in the lime. The more ye stir, the faster ye cleave; the longer ye strive, the weaker ye are. Ye cannot bridle the flowing seas; ye cannot blind the sunbeams. Kick not still against the spur; give place unto the glory of God. Will ye, nill ye, the *truth* will conquer. God give us both humble hearts, and the people eyes to see; that all flesh may be obedient to his will. Amen.

JOHN SALISBURY.

From London, October 27, 1567.

END OF VOL. VI.







