

# ACTS AND MONUMENTS

## VOL. 1

*by John Foxe*

**Prophecy Insights Ministries**  
**[www.prophecyinsights.org](http://www.prophecyinsights.org)**  
**Lawton, OK © 2022**

# CONTENTS.

## VOL. 1.

### **LIFE OF FOXE; AND VINDICATION OF THE WORK: -**

Part I. — Life of the Martyrologist.

Part II. — Answers to Objectors.

Appendices to the Life

Foxe's PREFACES: —

Ad Dominum Jesum Christum, Servatorem clementissimum, Eucharisticon  
Johannis Foxi.

To the right virtuous, most excellent, and noble Princess, Queen Elizabeth.

Ad Doctum Lectorem, Johannes Foxus.

To the Persecutors of God's Truth, commonly called Papists.

To the True and Faithful Congregation of Christ's Universal Church  
Utility of this Story.

To all the professed Friends and Followers of the Pope's Proceedings

Four Considerations given out to Christian Protestants, Professors of the  
Gospel; with a brief Exhortation inducing to Reformation of Life..

The KALENDER.

ACTS AND MONUMENTS OF CHRISTIAN MARTYRS, and Matters

Ecclesiastical passed in the Church of Christ, from the primitive  
beginning, to these our days, as well in other countries, as, namely, in  
this realm of England, and also of Scotland, discoursed at large: and  
first, the Difference between the Church of Rome that Now Is, and the  
Ancient Church of Rome that Then Was..

Evidences Proving Ecclesiastical Persons to have been Subject to their  
Magistrates in Causes both Ecclesiastical and Temporal..

The Letter of Gregory to the Patriarch of Alexandria..

The Sum of St. Paul's Doctrine delivered to the Gentiles..

Another brief Recapitulation, reduced to Five Points..

Certain Principles, or general Verities, grounded upon the truth of God's Word..

A Summary Collection of the Errors, Heresies, and Absurdities contained in the Pope's Doctrine, and the First Institution of the Church of Rome; and first, of Faith and Justification..

Of Works of the Law..

Of Sin.

Of Penance, or Repentance. The Difference between the Law and the Gospel.

Of Free-will: of Invocation and Adoration..

Of Sacraments, Baptism, and the Lord's Supper..

Of Matrimony..

Of Magistrates and Civil Governments: Of Purgatory..

A Christian Man, after the Pope's Making, defined..

## BOOK 1.

64 to 78. A Description of the Ten First Persecutions in the Primitive Church, with the Variety of their Torments..

95 to 96. The Second Persecution..

98 to 138. The Third Persecution..

The Epistle of Pliny, the Heathen Philosopher, to Trajan the Emperor..

The Epistle of Trajan to Pliny..

The Letter of Adrian the Emperor to the Proconsul, Minucius Fundamus..

The Epistle of Antoninus Plus to the Commons of Asia.

161 to 180. The Fourth Persecution..

A Letter of the Brethren of France in the Cities of Vienne and Lyons, to the Brethren of Asia and Phrygia...

A Letter of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to the Senate and People of Rome..

197 to 235. The Fifth Persecution..

235 to 250. The Sixth Persecution..

250 to 253. The Seventh Persecution.

257 to 259. The Eighth Persecution..

275 to 284. The Ninth Persecution

303 to 313. The Tenth Persecution..

The Imperial Constitution of Constantine and Licinius, for establishing the free worshipping of God after the Christian Religion..

The most notable Martyrs that suffered in this Tenth Persecution..

The Story of Gordius, a Centurion..

Verses on Cassianus..

The mystical Numbers of the Apocalypse opened..

An Epistle of Constantine sent to his Subjects inhabiting the East..

## BOOK 2.

The Epistle of Eleuthcrius, Bishop of Rome, sent to King A.D. Lucius..

180to449. The Entering and Reigning of the Saxons in the Realm of England..

The Questions of Augustine, Archbishop of Canterbury, sent to Gregory, with the Answer of Gregory to the same..

The Letter of Gregory sent to Augustine into England

The Epistle of Pope Sergius sent to Coelfrid, Abbot of Wiremouth Abbey, requiring Bede to be sent up to him at Rome, for the fame of his worthy learning..

An admonitory Letter of Boniface, Archbishop of Mentz, an Englishman, to Ethelbald, King of Mercia..

A Letter of Charlemagne to King Offa respecting a Treaty of Peace between them.. The Conclusion of the Story precedent; concerning the Seven Kingdoms of the Saxon Kings above-mentioned..

Donations and Privileges given by King Ethelbald to religious men of the Church.. Tables of Saxon Kings, and of Archbishops of Canterbury, etc.

APPENDIX TO VOL. I..

LIFE AND DEFENCE OF

JOHN FOXE,

*etc., etc.*

PART 1.

LIFE OF THE MARTYROLOGIST,

SECTION 1.

**BIRTH, AND EDUCATION, TILL HE WAS EXPELLED FROM  
MAGDALEN COLLEGE.**

**A.D. 1517 To 1545. —Act. 28.**

*Birth And Early Pursuits — Entrance At Oxford — Chamber-Fellow  
With Nowell — Religious Contentions Of The Times — Elected Fellow Of  
Magdalen — English Bibles — State Of Religion On The Continent —  
Learning Of Foxe — Conflicts On The Subject Of Religion — Expulsion  
From College.*

**PICTURE: Portrait of John Foxe**

**PICTURE: Facsimile of Foxes Letter to Magdalen College**

John Foxe, the author of the Acts and Monuments of the Church (the last book which was commanded by the sovereign, sanctioned by the bishops; and ordered by a canon of the Anglican Convocation to be placed in the hall of every episcopal palace in the land); <sup>f1</sup> the most influential preventer of the revival of the papal supremacy over England; one of the most elegant Latin scholars, and irreproachable men of his age, — was born at Boston, in Lincolnshire, in 1517, the year in which Luther published his Theses against the church of Rome. His principal biographer is his son;

and though many interesting circumstances of his more active life, after he left the University, are to be derived, as we shall see, from various sources; it is impossible, at the distance of three centuries, to collect *any* information respecting his early years, but that which his son has recorded. In the Preface to the Reader, prefixed to his account of his Father, his son informs us, that “he had been solicited by many persons to gratify posterity with a history of his father’s life, which he had written thirty years before.” He had, however, continually “to refuse to publish it; and he should have persevered in doing so, if he had not perceived that many who were mere strangers, and utterly ignorant of his conversation, had presumed to write his life.” The deficiencies and inaccuracies of these unauthenticated publications, induced him “to preserve his memory from wrong, and to place it in its true and proper light.” “The importunity of both those who admired, and those who disapproved, also, of his father’s opinions and conduct, were additional reasons,” he informs us, “for writing; “ and he trusts, “that his narrative may be regarded as free from the suspicion of intentional falsehood or partiality, though it was compiled by a son.” He had written it originally “for his own private satisfaction; and it was now given to the world because it was deemed worthy of publication by others rather than by himself.”<sup>f2</sup> None of the spurious works, to which Mr. Foxe here alludes, are known, I believe, to exist at present; and we must consequently be contented with a few brief notices of his early life, till he was expelled the University of Oxford for heresy, as they are related in the memoir by his son.<sup>f3</sup>

The parents of John Foxe were of respectable rank in the town of Boston, in Lincolnshire, “well reputed of, and of good estate.” His father, not being a native of that town, suffered greatly from its extreme humidity, and died while his son was very young. His mother soon married again. The childhood of Foxe was distinguished by his great love of reading. His father-in-law afforded him every encouragement to persevere in his studies; and probably expected that he would become an ornament to the church in its unreformed state, for he was himself a rigid Romanist, and educated Foxe, in the strictest manner, in the established principles and errors. His resources were not ample; and John Foxe seems to have been sent to Oxford at the age of sixteen (A.D. 1633), by friends who approved his “good inclinations and towardness to learning.” He was entered at

Brazennose; and Alexander Nowell, then aged twenty-two, afterwards dean of St. Paul's, was appointed, according to the custom which then prevailed among the poorer students, to be his chamber-fellow and companion. Their tutor was Mr. Hawarden, one of the fellows of the college.

No other certain events are related of Foxe until the year 1545, being a period of twelve years, than that he took his Bachelor's Degree in 1538, and his Master's Degree in 1543; that he was elected fellow of Magdalen in this latter year; and was expelled for heresy from Magdalen in 1545. The life of Foxe must be unavoidably deficient in interest, when compared with those of other eminent reformers. Luther and Wycliffe took part in the councils of princes, and were involved in the collisions of courts and senates. Cranmer and Ridley were martyrs, and perished, "for the truth's sake," by the noblest death. Foxe was a retired student in his youth; the tutor only of a family in his early manhood; the assistant to a foreign printer in his maturer years; and a secluded clergyman in his more advanced age. No life seems to promise less gratification to a lover of biography, from its commencement to its conclusion. Its principal interest will be found to arise from contemplating the effects of the circumstances and changes of the age in which he lived on an amiable, a gentle, and conscientious mind. He began life, we must believe, as a decided Romanist. His early bias, before he could discern between the truth and falsehood of the propositions which were discussed in the great controversy in which he took eventually so prominent a part, must have been the same as those of his kindred and early preceptors. The few brief notices of his life, prior to his expulsion from Magdalen, relate to the change from Romanism to Anglicanism — from the errors of the catholic church, to the truths of the catholic church.

Alexander Nowell, his chamber-fellow, continued an undergraduate at Brazennose thirteen years. The first degree was not then, as at present, so uniformly, or so generally taken, at the termination of the fourth year of residence in college. The student became a member of the University at an earlier age; and remained, very often, many years an undergraduate before he solicited a degree. This suspension of graduateship did not, however, imply inferiority. It proceeded from diffidence, from convenience, from attention, perhaps, to other studies than those in which proficiency was

required for a degree. Nowell, at the age of twenty, seven years after he was admitted as a student at Brazenose, was a public reader of logic in the University <sup>f4</sup> Nowell left Oxford in 1543, to become second master of Westminster School, where he instructed his pupils in the ancient principles of the true catholic faith, as they were cleared from the papal errors, which had so long been blended with and disfigured them. We may justly infer, therefore, that as Nowell was ten years older than Foxe, learned as a logician, devoted to study, distinguished for his genius, industry, and kindness, he would possess great influence over the mind of his more youthful companion. They would discuss freely all the controversies of the time. Nowell was already favorably disposed to the changes which were commencing; and it is generally supposed that he must have materially biassed the mind of Foxe to the conclusions which he afterwards adopted. I do not believe that the influence of Nowell proceeded to this extent. It seems to me to be more probable, that, as Foxe, at the commencement of his chamber-fellowship with Nowell, was a decided Romanist, the chief advantage which the young student derived from his senior, was the power and the habit of thinking more freely, and inquiring more impartially, than he would have been permitted to do by the zealous partisans of the long-established errors. I infer this from the two facts which are recorded by the biographers of Nowell and Foxe. Nowell left the university in the year 1643, to teach protestantism; or the purer catholicism of antiquity, at Westminster. Foxe was admitted a fellow of Magdalen in that very year; and as he was expelled, two years after, from that society, on account of his supposed heresy, I conclude that he was made a fellow because of his supposed orthodoxy; and that the great change in his opinions, which his son relates, took place between the departure of Nowell from Oxford, and his own expulsion. I am confirmed in this belief, by considering the peculiar circumstances under which he was received into the society of Magdalen. His election gave great offense to the students of that college. They considered themselves aggrieved by the introduction of a stranger. They regarded the preferments of the college as belonging to those who were brought up on the foundation. It is true, that this repugnance to the admission of Foxe among them was greatly softened, by their observance of his patience, kindness, and humility. These overcame their antipathy; and gained, not only their esteem and approbation, but their admiration and their love. Yet we may be assured

that a conviction of his continued attachment to Romanism was added to all these good qualities. They never would have consented to the intrusion of a stranger, whom they expelled two years after on the plea of heresy, if they had not believed that he was attached to the opinions they had themselves preferred. I consider, therefore, that the great value of Nowell's intimacy with John Foxe consisted in teaching him to reason; in guiding his studies, and imbuing him with that mental energy which is the foundation of all decision of character. Both were pious, zealous, and learned; and their friendship, whether at Oxford, in their common exile on the Continent, or on their return to England, continued through life.

But whatever may have been the influence of Nowell on the mind of Foxe, the events of the period which elapsed between his admission into Brazenose, 1633, and his election, ten years after, to his fellowship at Magdalen, unavoidably compelled him to consider deeply and anxiously the great controversy which was convulsing both the Continent and England, as it still continues to do. In these calm and halcyon days, when every man who desires to know the truth, and to live a peaceful life in all godliness and honesty, may live securely, none daring to make him afraid — when toleration has become an unquestioned privilege to the lowliest and the meanest; and one of the principal dangers which agitates society arises from the perversion, and not from the permission of freedom of opinion — we, in these days, can form but a very inadequate notion of the excitement and misery of the time when the mind was compelled, by the incessant restlessness of the most unwearied and fiery discussions, to examine and to decide for itself, at the risk of the burning of the body, either for papistry, or for protestantism. No language can fully describe the anxious misery of the conscientious yet prudent Christian, who desired to arrive at conclusions which were right in religion, that the soul be saved; and at conclusions which should be right also, in law, that the body be not burnt. Even the most careless and indifferent to religion were no less harassed. The church and the king of one year, opposed the church and the king of the year following. The holy Scriptures had been withheld, by severe decrees, from the people, for many years. To desire their perusal had long been considered a proof of heresy. Within the thirty-six years, however, preceding his taking his bachelor's degree by John Foxe, no less than five hundred and sixty-eight editions of the whole, or various parts of

the Bible, had been printed in Hebrew and Latin; and also in English, German, French, Spanish, and other European languages. <sup>f5</sup> England always sympathizes with the Continent, even where it does not follow its example. The learned men at Oxford must have become, more than they had yet been, students of the Bible, from the general attention which was now everywhere paid to the sacred volume; even if they had not been forced to become: so by the enactments of the public law, and by the numerous translations in their own language which were now constantly issuing from the press. In 1633, the king was declared to be the head of the church; and Cranmer was elevated to the see of Canterbury. The convocation of Canterbury petitioned that the Bible be again translated. Translations of various parts of the Scriptures were constantly made and circulated by private persons <sup>f6</sup> There was a general thirst for the streams of the waters of life. In 1635, Coverdale's Bible was completed; and in the following year a royal injunction was issued to the whole clergy of the realm to provide a Bible in each church, and to lay the same in the quire, that all might hear and read. Another translation, Matthews's Bible, was printed abroad, and circulated in England, the editor of which, Rogers of Lancashire, was burnt by Mary. <sup>f7</sup> In 1538, another proclamation was published, commanding the clergy to provide Bibles in all churches, and directing them to read the royal permission, that the people should hear and read it; and "wonderful," says Strype, "was the joy with which this book of God was received by both the learned, the lovers of the reformation, and by the vulgar. Children flocked to hear it read, though, in some instances, the hatred to the Scriptures, or the love of the long-established errors, induced their parents to punish them with merciless severity. <sup>f8</sup> The light was struggling with the darkness. Many of the clergy exerted their apostolical authority to prevent the royal injunctions from being carried into effect. Parsons, vicars, and curates, <sup>f9</sup> read the Bible so that none should understand it;. They bade their parishioners, too (no doubt conscientiously,-for the novelty, because it was novelty, seemed to be heresy), to live as their fathers did; for the old fashion was the best. Cranmer's Bible, and Taverner's Bible, were published in November, 1539. An attempt was made to limit the number of translations; but in the following year <sup>f10</sup> another royal proclamation enforced the former; and even this was confirmed by another in the year ensuing. <sup>f11</sup> These proclamations were partially, sullenly, and reluctantly obeyed by many of

the bishops and clergy. The immediate effect of the new indulgence appeared to justify all the evil predictions of the enemies of the scriptural knowledge of the common people. Faction and party spirit were affirmed to be increased by the new knowledge. The common people disputed in taverns and alehouses. They bandied about the words papist and heretic; as they will ever do, till the usurpers of dominion over conscience by authority alone, cease to withhold the Scriptures, and until the people themselves conform to the instructions of Scripture. In the year 1542, the chief bishop of the Anglican church requested his brother bishops, in full convocation, to revise the translation in use. One of them, Gardiner of Winchester, proposed to render the version obscure by retaining a certain number of untranslated words; and Cranmer united with the king in referring the decision to the universities. To this the bishops objected, because young men, the junior masters of arts (among whom must be reckoned Nowell and Foxe), whose judgments they said were not to be relied on, decided on the questions submitted to them. And yet, after all these efforts to give the free use of the Scriptures to the people, the Romish party so prevailed in the parliament which met at the commencement of 1543 — the year in which Foxe was elected fellow of Magdalen — that an act was passed, ordering, “that all manner of books of the Old and New Testament in English, of Tyndale’s translation, should be utterly abolished, extinguished, and forbidden to be kept and used.” Other translations might be kept, provided the annotations or preambles were cut out. None were to read the Bible in the churches without a license. All, of any rank, from the chancellor to the merchant, might read the Bible: but no women, except noblewomen and gentlewomen; nor artificers, prentices, journeymen, nor laborers. If they did so, they were to recant for the first offense; bear a faggot for the second; and be burnt for the third. Such were the variations in legislation within these ten years, respecting the Scriptures. But the waters had broken forth, and were streaming in the desert; and though in the last year of the reign of Henry, Coverdale’s Bible, as well as Tyndale’s, was prohibited, and the zeal of the king for the reformation declined, and the power of the enemies of the free use of the Scriptures increased, we may justly doubt whether any enactment of the crown and convocation united would have now wrested the book of God from the people. The prohibition that neither women, mechanics, nor peasants, should read the Scriptures, was framed in the very papal temper

which is most opposed to the design of the Giver of revelation. There is no sex in souls, that women should be excluded from the waters of life; and the gospel of God is preached, and the Scriptures of God are granted, more especially to the poorest, the vilest, the meanest, most ignorant, and the most abject, to comfort them in their sorrows, and to direct them to a better state. Revelation appeals to the hearts of the poor, rather than to the heads of the rich. To the poor, more than to the rich, the gospel was always preached. The Creator esteems the soul of the poor mechanic and the lowly peasant to be of the same value as the soul of the monarch and of the bishop, of the emperor and of the pope; and we who affirm the undoubted privilege of the humblest to possess the volume of God's truth, are the true friends of the catholic church, and of the souls of men. All are equal before God, and he gives the same bread of life for their souls, as he gives them the same air to breathe, and the same sun to enlighten them. The mechanic and the peasant are as much entitled to the open pages of revelation as they are to the free light of the sun, and the vital nourishment of the air.

One instant effect of this universal desire to read the Scriptures appeared in the disregard which began to be paid to the schoolmen. Nowell and John Foxe were, possibly, a part of that assemblage of young men, of whom, in the year 1535, the king's commissioners wrote to lord Cromwell — “ We have set Duns in Bocardo, and have utterly banished him Oxford for ever, with all his blind glosses. The second time we came to New College, after we had declared our injunctions, we found all the great quadrant court full of the leaves of Duns (Johannes Duns Scotus), the wind blowing them into every corner.” The works of the other schoolmen no doubt shared the same fate; those of Thomas Aquinas, perhaps, excepted, as he was the king's favourite author. <sup>f12</sup>

But these were not all the events of the ten years which compelled the learned and the studious to ponder deeply the controversies of the day. The claims of the pope to rule the church — the resistance of the king to the papal supremacy — the utter contempt with which his majesty treated the summons of Clement VII., citing him to appear, personally or by proxy, at Rome, A.D. 1532 — the decision of the long-litigated question of the divorce, 1533 — the abolition of the papal supremacy, 1534; with the recognition by the bishops and clergy, in their convocation, of the royal

title of head of the church — the oath of allegiance to the king, under this title, taken by Gardiner, Tonstal, Bonner, Stokesley, and generally by all the bishops; by the convocation, and by the universities — the refusal to take the oath by More and Fisher; and their subsequent inhuman execution, A.D. 1535 — the insurrection in Lincolnshire, Foxe's native county, 1537 — the overthrow of monasteries and mitred abbots, by which the number of the spiritual peers was reduced below that of the lay peers in the House of Lords — the passing of the Six Acts, A.D. 1540 — and above all, the mutual and bitter exasperations which, every year, marked the two parties — these things convulsed and agitated the public mind beyond all that can be imagined in the present comparatively calm and tranquil days; and contributed to the state of depression which the son of Foxe describes of his father.: Neither was this all.: Not only did the cruel burnings, which were alike inflicted upon the scholar who could reason and discuss, as Tyndale, Frith, and Bilney, and upon the heart-broken maniac, the poor idiot, or the thoughtless jester, compel an amiable and reflecting mind to question the moral justice of the painful executions of the day; but the events on the Continent confirmed the propriety of the doubts of the future martyrologist, by the sympathy of thousands in the Anglican resistance to the papal supremacy.

A few years before this time, the Institutes of Calvin had been published, A.D. 1535. Zwinglius had taught at Zurich. The confession of Augsburg had been promulgated 1530; and the articles of Smalcald, 1537, drawn up. Episcopacy itself, the ordinance of Christ, had unfortunately become odious to many in consequence of the active prosecutions of various adherents to the new teachers, by many of the bishops, during a century and a half; and especially within the few last years. The mind was painfully harassed by the dissensions among the reformers themselves, as well as by their opposition to the principles of the church of Rome. Every man deemed that opinion which he himself disapproved, to be an heresy; and the heretic was regarded as worthy of punishment, "even to death," by the opponents, as well as the advocates of Rome. Such were the agitations of the public mind at the period when John Foxe, in common with many of his countrymen, was led to doubt the truth and certainty of the conclusions to which he was originally so much attached.

It is much to be lamented that the Memoir of Foxe is written without any proper attention to dates. The writer mentions only in very general terms his learning and his piety; his doubts of the tenableness of his Romanist opinions; and his eventual decision to renounce them. At the same time, it is quite absurd to try this document by modern rules of criticism; and to require a degree of knowledge and exactness of detail which the writer could not possess. Both of Foxe's sons were unborn during the earlier periods of his active manhood, and in infancy while the great affair of his life was transacting. Of his persecutions, exile, and lengthened labors in the preparation of his great work, they could know nothing save by after-narration. There is no reason to suppose that Foxe left the least record of his own labors. If the *Life*, published in 1641, was written, as it seems to purport to have been, thirty years before that date, then it must have been written about 1610, which was twenty-three years after the Martyrologist's own death. His eldest son, then, if we suppose him to have been the biographer, loses his parent by death in 1587, being himself twenty-seven years of age. He had then enjoyed some opportunities of converse with him, during a few years of manhood, in the intervals of college-life and other engagements. The leading facts gleaned from his father's conversation, he sits down, *twenty-three years after*, to commit to paper. What could be expected from such a narrative, but precisely what it appears to be? — a loose and vague tradition, often, doubtless, falling into positive error; and yet, being a son's recollection of his father's narrations, possessing greater authority and value than any other document can claim. We shall, therefore, continue to refer to it only for such glimpses of fact as it continually affords.

Foxe's early love of learning, which induced his friends to send him to Oxford, his intimacy with Nowell, and the events to which I have referred, were all pledges that he would continue his researches until he had obtained satisfaction on the controverted points; and until he had decided, whether the principles of the Romanists were defensible from the Scripture, and identified with primitive Christianity. To arrive at right conclusions, he made himself master of the different controversies which had divided the church. He applied himself to the study of ecclesiastical history, both ancient and modern. He learned the beginning of the church; by what arts it flourished, and by what errors it began to decline. He

ascertained the causes of those controversies and dissensions which had arisen in it; and weighed attentively of what moment they were to religion. His application, says his son, was great; and before he was thirty years of age he had read over all that either the Greek or Latin fathers had left in their writings; the schoolmen in their disputations; the councils in their acts; or the consistories in their decrees. His acquaintance with the Jewish and rabbinical literature was not so extensive or profound, as with the annals and erudition of christian churches. Still, he had so competent a skill in the Hebrew language as to become thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures in the original. Henry VIII. had established both a Greek and Hebrew professorship, A.D. 1530, at Oxford; and as Foxe appears to have constantly resided there many years, and to have wholly devoted himself to study, there is nothing improbable in this statement.<sup>f13</sup> Thus he continued to study till he was made fellow of Magdalen, A.D. 1543.

I have already mentioned the reasons which compel me to believe that he had not at this time forsaken the principles in which he had been educated. In the same proportion, however, in which he studied, he became gradually convinced of the necessity of adhering to that purer, and more ancient mode of catholicism, which the church of Rome had so long defaced by its novelties; but his doubts, or the difficulty of decision, or his unwillingness to break the ties which bound him to his family and his college, or the contending weakness and strength of his resolutions, produced that internal conflict which those alone can understand who love the kindred from whom they see reason to differ; yet believe: that they shall not be deemed worthy of the crown, if they take not up the cross, and forsake friend and kindred, for Christ and truth. His demeanor began to change. He was reported, says his son, by some of his fellow-students, to have bestowed, over and above his day's exercise, whole nights at his studies, or not to have betaken himself to rest till very late. Then it was that he read the Scriptures in their original language, and poured out the supplications of his soul before the throne of God; asking, as did Solomon, for an understanding heart, that he might discern between good and bad; and by comparing spiritual things with spiritual, might arrive at the knowledge of the truth, as it is in Jesus. "He would leave his study or his bed, and retire to a neighbouring grove, where the students delighted to walk, and spend some hours of recreation; and there, amid darkness and solitude, ponder

deeply over what he had been reading, so that he might confirm his mind in the truths he had embraced.” “How many nights,” his son proceeds, “he watched in these solitary walks; what combats and wrestlings he suffered within himself; how many heavy sighs, and sobs, and tears he poured forth with his prayers to Almighty God! I had rather I might be spared from this discourse, than touched with any show of ostentation; but it was necessary to be mentioned, because from hence sprung the first suspicions of his alienated affections.” Some of those, at length, with whom he was intimate, and to whom these extraordinary exercises of mind were known, reported him to the heads of the college, as an abettor of the new faith. This caused some to be employed as spies, to watch him narrowly, while they admonished him, as his friends, that these nightly walks might render him suspected; and thus they were able to pry more into his words and actions. At length his conscience constrained him to cease from attendance not only at the college chapel, but also at the university church, except upon necessary and official occasions. This enabled his opponents to compare “his customs formerly used, with the present course he now took; and they, with more bitterness aggravated the fact. Why, said they, should he not come to church so often as in former times he was accustomed? Why should he shun the company of his equals, and refuse to recreate himself after his wonted manner, unless he had felt in his mind some sudden alteration? And, if that alteration be for the better, why should he conceal it? “

Being thus suspected and defamed, surrounded by spies and treacherous companions, he was at last openly accused of heresy; brought before the heads of the college to answer the accusation; convicted of the crime; and expelled. He was commanded to leave the city and county of Oxford without delay; and to be thankful that his judges had been so merciful to him, seeing that the sentence was far below his apostasy. This took place in the year 1545; the same year in which the council of Trent met. He was then twenty-eight years of age; and had been a fellow of Magdalen only two years. I have partly copied the quaint language of his son. It graphically describes the common case. Those who regard that spiritual religion which considers all churches, priests, authority, and ministrations, as merely the divinely-appointed subsidiaries to our progress in a holy, life — those who believe, that, if even a divinely-commissioned priesthood

superadd to scriptural truth erroneous doctrines, which neither Christ nor his apostles have taught, such doctrines must be rejected by the Christian; but who have been also brought up as Foxe had been, to love, venerate, and admire those very doctrines as a part of the holy faith which had been given to the catholic church — those who believe that they must love God and truth above all things, if they would obtain the promises — those persons will ever be compelled to undergo the bitter inward conflict which Foxe experienced before he could decide to forsake the communion of Rome. The world despises this contest. It receiveth not these things of God; neither can it know them. They are spiritually discerned. They can no more comprehend the source of the prayers, and tears, and sobbings of John Foxe, when he was about to forsake the errors of the church of Rome, than a man blind from his birth can comprehend the nature of light; or a man deaf from his birth, the magnificence of the Messiah of Handel, or the warbling of the Italian operatist. To these persons such emotions are nonsense, enthusiasm, or folly. It was a severe and fearful trial. On one side were the literary leisure; the faithful friend; honor and wealth; reputation and advancement; the gratification of ambition in the prospect of the rewards of his deep learning; and all that is captivating to the heart of man. On the other side were contumely and disgrace; alienation of friends; the loss of all things; poverty, exile, and obscurity; with the probability of the most agonizing death, amidst contempt, reproach, and insult. He reflected. He decided. He resolved to endure the loss of all things; and to count all that ambition could desire, and avarice covet, as less than nothing and vanity, so that he might finish his course with joy. His patience — his heroic fortitude — “the better martyrdom,” was esteemed and appreciated by our fathers. With us, their degenerate sons, it is now required to “remain unsung.” popery will ever unite with infidelity, and infidelity with popery, to destroy spiritual religion; as Herod and Pilate — the nominal Jew, and the liberal Gentile — were united to destroy Christ. They are joined together with one accord, in the present day, to effect the same treason; and similar conduct to this of John Foxe will alone save us from the double tyranny. Learning, humility, and inquiry, with fervent prayers, and committal of our cause to Him that judgeth righteously, must all be united in that Christian who would strengthen the true church of God — forsake the plausibilities of error —

conquer the power of temptation — instruct others — and save his own soul.

## SECTION 2.

### FROM HIS LEAVING OXFORD, TILL HE WENT ABROAD,

**A.D. 1546 To 1554.**

*His Distress On His Expulsion From Oxford — Engagement As A Tutor — Marriage — Leaves Charlecote — Arrives In London — His Great Distress — Succour Mysteriously Bestowed — His Second Tutorship — Ordination — Officiates At Reigate — Leaves England — His First Publications.*

The great and good men who “hazarded their lives unto the death,” at the period of the Reformation, in defense of religious truth, and their noble successors at the Revolution, have so well performed their work, that we have long been ignorant of arbitrary and irresponsible power. Neither the civil magistrates in the state, nor the ecclesiastical magistrates in the church, have exercised the uncontrolled, unlimited authority, which, at the time of the expulsion of John Foxe from Oxford, degraded and dishonored both the church and state, and rendered every subject who questioned the truth of the king’s opinions, even in the most controverted and doubtful points of religion, in danger of the most cruel form of death. Henry VIII. had been rendered, at this time, a God over faith — a Pope over the church — a Caesar over the realm. He could decree articles of belief; dispense with the canons of the church; and enact laws for the state. <sup>f14</sup> The two parties of Reformers and Romanists were so equally balanced in England, that the king became despotic over both. Notwithstanding the murderous tyranny which had condemned the poor schoolmaster, Lambert, to the flames for discussing theological questions with the royal disputant at his own command notwithstanding his sublime, though now, I mourn to say, despised ejaculations, “None but Christ! none but Christ!” when his half-consumed body was lifted on the halberts of the bystanders, to be more speedily consumed in the declining fire — notwithstanding, too, all the other caprices and follies of that “ruthless, jealous tyrant,” <sup>f15</sup> — the chief men of England vied with each other in tendering him the most fulsome and contemptible flattery.

The king's heart was corrupted, and the king's head was weakened, by believing their hyperbolic praise. Cromwell had declared, that all men were unable to describe the unutterable qualities of the royal mind, and the sublime virtues of the royal heart. Rich told him, that he was equal in wisdom to Solomon; in strength and courage to Samson; in beauty and address to Absalom. Audley declared before his face, "that God had anointed him with the oil of wisdom above his fellows — above the other kings of the earth — above all his predecessors; had given him a perfect knowledge of the Scriptures, with which he had prostrated the Roman Goliath; a perfect knowledge of the art of war, by which he had gained the most brilliant victories at the same time in remote places; and a perfect knowledge of the art of government, by which he had, for thirty years, secured to his own realm the blessings of peace, while all the other nations of Europe suffered the calamities of war."

During these harangues, as often as the words "most sacred majesty" were repeated, or any emphatic expression was pronounced, the lords rose, and the whole assembly, in token of respect and assent, bowed profoundly to the demigod on the throne. Henry affected to hear such fulsome adulation with indifference. His answer was invariably the same — that he laid no claim to superior excellence; but that, if he did possess it, he gave the glory to God, the author of all good gifts; it was, however, a pleasure to him to witness the affections of his subjects, and to learn that they were not insensible of the blessings which they enjoyed under his government.

This language was held alike by Romanists and Reformers, who seemed, as it were, spell-bound, and altogether incapable of being actuated by any other influence than by the royal will. This alone was to be studied, anticipated, and executed with subserviency beyond any former precedent. Both parties had been long accustomed to submission to the most arbitrary power. The Reformers, or those of the people who desired great changes, could not be expected to anticipate the purer philosophy, which gives as much authority only to the government, which is the power ordained by God, as God himself intended should be possessed; that is, as much as would benefit the people. Their ignorance is derided by the historian, who seems to advocate the opposite folly of the Romanist, while he scoffs at the folly of the Reformed. The arguments, he observes, by which the transferring to the king the authority hitherto exercised by the pontiff,

were defended, “debased the spirit of the people, and tended to exalt the royal prerogative above law and equity.” “When the adversaries of the supremacy asked in what passage of the sacred writings the government of the church was given to a layman, its advocates boldly appealed to those texts which prescribe obedience to the established authorities. The king, they maintained, was the image of God upon earth; to disobey his commands was to disobey God himself; to limit his authority, when no limit was laid down, was an offense against the sovereign; and to make distinctions, when the Scripture made none, was an impiety against God. It was, indeed, acknowledged, that this supreme authority might be employed unreasonably and unjustly; but, even then, to resist was a crime. It became the duty of the sufferer to submit; and his only resource was to pray that the heart of his oppressor might be changed; his only consolation to reflect, that the king himself would be summoned to answer for his conduct before an unerring tribunal. Henry became a sincere believer in a doctrine so flattering to his pride; and easily persuaded himself that he did no more than his duty in punishing with severity the least opposition to his will. To impress this doctrine on the minds of the people, it was perpetually inculcated from the pulpit; it was enforced in books of controversy and instruction; it was promulgated with authority in the ‘Institution,’ and afterwards in the ‘Erudition of a Christian Man.’ From that period the doctrine of passive obedience formed a leading trait in the orthodox creed.”<sup>F16</sup> True as these remarks may be, the historian has omitted to state, that the pope and the king were alike tyrants; and the question was, to which tyrant the people should submit — to the native regal tyrant, who gave them a creed, and burnt the rejecters of his infallibility; or to the foreign tyrant who inflicted the same merciless severity, and taught even more, and greater absurdities. There was some hope of a change for the better, if they obeyed the king; there was none, if they continued their allegiance to the pope.

Such was the state of the people of England when John Foxe was expelled from Oxford. He has not recorded, and his son has omitted to relate, the suppressed and burning indignation with which the inquiring student must have contemplated this debasement of his free and religious nation; or what the difficulties might have been which prevented him, in that age of deficient political knowledge, from being contented with rejecting error,

without daring to submit to the public, the opinions he might himself have formed. Neither do we know to what part of England he directed his footsteps on his leaving college. <sup>F17</sup> That he was in danger of being apprehended, and committed to prison, and perhaps burnt as a heretic, was evident from the indictment of Athee, under the king's writ, on the usual charge of speaking words against transubstantiation. He declared that he believed only in the God that was in heaven; and not in the god that the priest sold, and the baker's wife made. Like many others, however, who speak with flippancy of the errors which are believed with sincerity, and which are but the perversions of truth, he recanted, and was pardoned. <sup>F18</sup> We cannot tell to what extent a change of opinion had now taken place in the mind of Foxe. Not only did the pope, the universities, the king, and those followers of their authority who newer dreamed of forming their own opinions, still receive the doctrine of transubstantiation, but many persons who were devotedly attached to the study of the Scriptures, still believed in the necessity of maintaining this doctrine among the articles of their creed. If Foxe had begun to waver on this point, and had expressed his doubts at Oxford, the danger of arrest and martyrdom was most certain. In the year preceding his expulsion, three victims, Pearson, Testwood, and Filmer, on this account, had been burnt at Windsor. The distress of Foxe, who, by losing his fellowship, lost his principal means of support, was increased by the conduct of his father-in-law in refusing him any further aid. Notwithstanding the numerous changes in religion which had now taken place, heresy was still regarded by all as a fearful crime, which no Christian was justified in tolerating, and which every magistrate was required to punish. The heretic, whether he was brought to trial or not, was hateful. He was the outcast of society. He was deemed unworthy of the usual courtesies of life. He was unfit to become possessed of property. He was rendered incapable of enjoying patrimony. The influence of the ancient canon law which decreed these severe enactments against heresy and heretics still remained, even among those who would not, perhaps, have proceeded to the extremity of putting those canons in force. Indeed a mitigation of the rigour of the act which had been passed in 1540, for the suppression of diversity of opinion in religion, took place the same year in which John Foxe was expelled from Oxford. A statute was enacted which granted permission to private families to read the Bible in their own houses; and moreover, that none of the clergy were to be burnt for heresy

till the third offense. Also, that the former punishment of burning the laity should be commuted to imprisonment for life, and forfeiture of all their estates and goods. But the six special laws stilt remained unrepealed, by which the former severities might be inflicted on offenders at the discretion of the magistrates, and as the royal will might dictate; so that the melioration was rather nominal than real. Audley had died in 1644; and his successor in the chancellorship, Wriothesley, a zealous opponent of the Reform party, endeavored to effect the ruin of Cranmer; but the king refused to listen to the treacherous designs of those partizans who were opposed to the archbishop. The influence, however, of Wriothesley, and Gardiner, and their party, was strengthened as well by the death of the duke of Suffolk, the king's brother-in-law, as by that of lord Audley, both of whom had given constant support to the interests of the reformers. The ascendancy of the papal party at court was immediately prior to the degradation of Foxe. It is also to be observed, that he was desired to quit the university and the county without delay, on his expulsion. His enemies declared, also, that the sentence was too favorable, and that he ought to have been dealt with more severely. All these circumstances concurred, no doubt, to alienate more effectually the friends of his earlier days. His father-in-law, who had labored to train him in the principles of Romanism, had thus a sufficient plea, as he would believe, to withhold from him his little patrimony on account of the apostasy and heresy, which had deprived him of his fellowship. The ministerial changes which had also just taken place would lead many to imagine that the restoration of papal authority and papal principles was on the eve of being effected. Foxe, therefore, had to contend against the worst enmities of the world, in a state of utter destitution.

From his expulsion, then, from Magdalen, July 22d, 1545, we have no dates to guide us to any of his occupations or wanderings with any certainty, until his appointment as tutor to the children of the earl of Surrey, after the attainder of the earl and his father for high treason, who were both sent to the Tower, December 12th, 1546. The earl was executed on the 19th of January, 1547. His children were committed to the guardianship of the duchess of Richmond, widow to the natural son of the king, and sister to the earl of Surrey. Foxe was engaged as tutor to the children before the death of Henry VIII., which took place January 28th,

1547. As we have only these two dates of his expulsion from Oxford, and of his engagement as tutor, to guide us, some difficulty has arisen in making the account of Foxe's life, by his son, consistent with itself. Soon after, perhaps immediately after, his expulsion from Oxford, as we may infer from his son's account, he obtained the situation of tutor in the family of sir Thomas Lucy, <sup>f19</sup> of Charlecote, in Warwickshire. He is said, by his son, to have remained there till his pupils no longer required instruction. <sup>F20</sup> This expression has been generally supposed to mean that his pupils at Charlecote remained under his protection many years — a supposition which these dates prove to be incorrect. At Charlecote, also, he married a visitor in the house; <sup>f21</sup> and as the distinctions of rank were strictly observed at this period, we may believe that the daughter of the citizen of Coventry, who was received as a visitor in the family of sir Thomas Lucy, would be worthy of the attentions of the persecuted and learned tutor. Of these events we possess but this scanty information. The engagement with sir Thomas Lucy could not have lasted for any long period; and it probably terminated either in consequence of his marriage, or on account of the search which was now being made for heretics, or for all who were suspected of heresy, both publicly and in private houses. It is probable that Foxe left Charlecote after a residence of little more than a year. The matter must be left in doubt. It is impossible, at this distance of time, to reconcile the discrepancies in the narration by his son. He has given us no references. He writes verbosely and generally; and it is difficult to read his history with patience. Is it impossible that Foxe was tutor at Charlecote before his election as a fellow of Magdalen, and consequently, before his expulsion; that he visited there subsequently to that event; and that the grief which his son describes him to have felt on the conclusion of his tutorial engagement at Charlecote was, in truth, the grief that he experienced on being compelled to leave his hospitable friends in consequence of his danger of arrest as a heretic? If this could be proved, all difficulties would be removed.

His marriage with a daughter of a citizen of Coventry reminds me of the internal evidence afforded by many of Foxe's narratives, that he recorded a great number of the executions from the testimony of eye-witnesses. In the year 1519, seven persons were burnt at Coventry, for teaching their children and family the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, in

their own language. The story is found in its proper place and date in the Acts and Monuments (1519). One of them, named Smythe, a widow, who had been permitted to return home after receiving a reprimand from prior Stafford, was attended by the bishop's sumner. On their way the officer heard the rustling of parchment in the sleeve of her gown, and demanded it from her. It contained the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in English. The result of the discovery was, his compelling the poor victim to return to the bishop; and she was condemned, and burnt with the six men.<sup>f22</sup> Much dissatisfaction was expressed at this cruelty. The bishop, therefore, and his servant caused a report to be circulated, that their victims had not been burnt for the lesser wickedness of possessing and teaching the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Commandments in English; but for the greater crime of eating flesh on Fridays and other fast-days. This allegation, says Foxe, could not be proved either before or after; neither was it objected to them in their examinations. The witnesses of the history, he adds, are still alive which saw them and knew them. One of them is named Hall, and lives at Bagington, two miles from Coventry. These witnesses, also, testify of them, that they were not only different from the rest of their fellow-citizens in exemplariness of life, but that their devotion at the sacrament was greater than that of others. So indeed it was generally. The doctrine of Transubstantiation was then, what Dr. Wiseman still affirms it to be the touchstone of that which the bishops and priests of the church of Rome, and of the Anglican church, also, of the preceding age, denominated Christianity. In the Latin editions of his work, Foxe expressed the wish, that the writers of history would record such events as these, as well as the wars, battles, and affairs of courts and kings;<sup>f23</sup> and the time will yet arrive, when this wish of John Foxe will be accomplished; and when the histories of the patience of the Saints will be more interesting than all the details of battles. The lessons which instruct mankind will be again as certainly taken from the sufferings of the martyrs for christian truth and christian liberty, as the four gospels are more influential among the civilized world than the acts of the Roman senate, of the consuls, or of the Caesars; or, as the narrative of the Crucifixion is more intensely interesting than the combats of Actium and Pharsalia. One generation passeth away, and another cometh. The generation of the pagan empire — of the crusades — of the papal empire — of the French revolution — and of other great

agitations, which successively occupy all thoughts, and employ all tongues, sometimes for centuries together—all pass away. The despised word of God alone endureth — and endureth for ever; and the memorials of the witnesses to its truth shall be spoken of through the whole world, wherever that gospel is preached.

On leaving Charlecote, before he obtained the tutorship of the children of the murdered earl of Surrey, Foxe was again reduced to great distress. He had remained at Coventry with his wife's father, as long as he could do so with safety. From Coventry he wrote to his step-father, at Boston, to inquire if he could be sheltered there. He received for answer, "That it seemed to his step-father a hard condition to take into his house one whom he knew to be guilty of, and condemned for, a capital offense; neither was he ignorant what hazard he should undergo in so doing: nevertheless, he would show himself a kinsman, and for that cause, neglect his own danger. If he would alter his mind, he might come, on condition, to stay as long as himself desired; but if he could not be persuaded to that, he should content himself with the shorter tarrance, and not bring him and his mother into hazard of their lives and fortunes, who were ready to do any thing for his sake." <sup>F24</sup>

The condition attached to this offer of protection, was such as John Foxe could not possibly long observe. Yet his necessities were very great; and he visited his mother, who is said to have urged him privately to do so. The time of his continuance at Boston must remain uncertain. From the means however of judging which all circumstances furnish, his stay could only have been short. Finding no hopes of his father-in-law being brought to such terms as would alleviate his wants, without a sacrifice of his principles, every interview would but serve to excite, both in him and his wife, feelings which may be imagined better than described, and which would certainly disincline them to prolong their stay unnecessarily. The imputed crime of heresy; the disgrace of being pointed at in his native town as one who, by apostasy, had disappointed the high anticipations of his friends, in being expelled from the society which had voluntarily placed him' in the highway to emoluments, patronage, and renown, were all reasons that would cause his continuance in a small town to become more and more irksome, as well as dangerous to his personal safety; while it may be presumed, an affectionate wife would urge every persuasion to

secure him from the dangers of the times. Great cities are great solitudes. He would be less observed, and obtain a livelihood more easily. His life would be more safe from spies and informers. Prudence demanded instant concealment. The usual result of such reasoning followed; and Foxe repaired to London for greater safety, and his daily bread.

Nothing is known of his trials and mode of life, in the interval from his thus leaving the country till his engagement as tutor to the orphans of the earl of Surrey. He always forebore, says his son, to speak of that part of iris story, “lest where he had deserved so much he might by extolling a small courtesy, seem rather to upbraid the slenderness of the requital than to shew himself thankful concerning it.” The expression is unintelligible to us. It may possibly refer to the ungracious treatment he received from his father-in-law.

From considering all the circumstances, we may reasonably conclude, that, a short time, probably a few months only, prior to the death of the king, Foxe was seeking employment in London. Events both abroad and at home — the jealousy of Charles V. as to the progress of church affairs, and the supremacy of the king — the more decided, yet smothered hostility of France — the disturbed state of Scotland, all tended to afford some respite from the rage of persecution towards the close of Henry’s reign. The declining health of the king permitted the influence of the Queen and of Cranmer to be more freely exercised. These favorable moments allowed Foxe to appear in places of public resort; and his biographer, from this time, pursues his narrative with somewhat less interruption, after relating the following interesting incident.

“As Master Foxe one day sate in St. Paul’s church, spent with long fasting, his countenance thin, and eyes hollow, after the ghastly manner of dying men, every one shunning a spectacle of so much horror, there came to him one whom he never remembered to have seen before, who, sitting down by him, and saluting him with much familiarity, thrust an untold sum of money into his hand, bidding him be of good cheer, adding withal, that he knew not how great the misfortunes were which oppressed him, but supposed it was no light calamity; that he should, therefore, accept in good part that small gift from his countryman which common courtesy had forced him to offer; that he should go and take care of himself, and take all

occasions to prolong his life; adding, that within a few days new hopes were at hand, and a more certain condition of livelihood.” Foxe could never learn to whom he was indebted for this seasonable bounty, though he used every endeavor to find out the person. “*Some* who looked further into the event by which that prophecy became fulfilled, believed that the friend who performed the kindness came not of his own accord, but was employed by others who were deeply concerned for Mr. Foxe’s safety; and that it might possibly be through the negligence of the servant, or person commissioned, that he had endured so much misery before the means of relief were afforded him. Certain it is, however, that within three days after the transaction, the presage was made good. Some one waited upon him from the duchess of Richmond, who invited him, upon fair terms,” says the writer, “into her service. It had so fallen out, not long before, that the duke of Norfolk, the most renowned general of his time, together with his son, the earl of Surrey, a man as far as may be imagined, of sincere meaning and sharp understanding, were committed to custody in the Tower of London, for what crime is uncertain. While they were in prison, the earl’s children were sent to the aforesaid duchess, their aunt, to be brought up and educated. Thomas, <sup>f25</sup> who succeeded in the dukedom; Henry, <sup>f26</sup> afterwards earl of Northampton; and Jane, <sup>f27</sup> wife of Charles, the last Neville, earl of Westmoreland, afterwards countess of Westmoreland.”

These events fix the time of Foxe’s residence in London. The dukedom of Norfolk had been conferred by Richard III., in the beginning of his reign, upon John, lord Howard, <sup>f28</sup> as a reward for the assistance he had rendered to the king in obtaining the throne. At the same time, A.D. 1483, his son, sir Thomas Howard, was created earl of Surrey. The duke was killed at the battle of Bosworth. His son would have succeeded to the honors and title, but Henry VII. proceeded against the deceased duke to procure from parliament a bill of attainder, and to deprive his family of the title, to avenge the part he had taken in favor of Richard. The earl of Surrey, although he conformed to the terms of the proclamation, offering pardon to those who submitted before a specified time, was imprisoned in 1485, for three years. He was then restored to his title of earl; but not to the title of his father. Himself and his son, <sup>f29</sup> however, were promoted to situations of the highest trust and authority by Henry VII. <sup>F30</sup> From this time, till

Henry VIII. restored the title in 1514, it was in abeyance. It was then granted to the earl of Surrey for his victory at Flodden Field. This earl died in 1524, and was succeeded by his son Thomas, the grandfather of the children to whom Foxe was appointed tutor, and the third duke of Norfolk. He, together with his son, the earl of Surrey, was imprisoned upon suspicion of treason, December 12th, 1546. <sup>F31</sup> The cause of their apprehension seems very obscure. The most probable solution is — that Henry, knowing the hatred of the Romanists to the changes already effected, and more particularly, Norfolk's dislike to his favorite Cranmer; <sup>f32</sup> fearing, too, lest his son should be embroiled with the Romanists, of whom the duke was one of the chief; believing too that, though the duke was the opponent of the bishop of Rome, he was no less hostile to his own measures — willingly gave ear to the representations of those who were enemies of Norfolk. He considered him as a personal rival, because his son had quartered the arms of the Confessor with his own. The earl was unjustly executed, and the title again forfeited. The duke remained in prison through the whole reign of Edward, and was liberated only on the accession of Mary. The attainder, though it had passed the parliament, was declared null and void; because, among other informalities, no special matter had been alleged against him, except his wearing the coat of arms which his illustrious ancestors had used from time immemorial. All this detail, even of this noble family, would be uninteresting, and out of place, if it did not illustrate the personal history of the poor scholar, whose influence upon his countrymen has been greater than the noblest branch, either of the noble house of Howard, or of any other of our magnificent aristocracy. The duke enjoyed his restoration but a short time. He died the following year, and was succeeded by the pupil of John Foxe, his grandson, who was executed, in the year 1572, for his attempt to form an alliance with the unworthy, though beautiful, queen of Scots, the head of the Romanist party.

I subjoin some curious information respecting the father of Foxe's pupils.  
<sup>F33</sup>

The earl of Surrey was summoned April 1st, 1543, before the council, some time before his imprisonment in the Tower, to answer two charges. To the one, that of eating flesh in Lent, he replied by alleging a license; but confessed that he had not observed the secrecy he ought to have done. To

the other, namely, having walked at night in an unseemly and disorderly manner through the streets of London, breaking windows with a cross-bow, he pleaded guilty; but besought the council not to attribute it to a light and disorderly turn of mind, such as would disgrace him at his years, and be unworthy of his rank and station in life. "My motive," he said, "was a religious one; though I confess it lies open to misconstruction. It grieved me, my lords, to see the licentious manners of the citizens of London. They resembled the manners of papal Rome in her corruptest state; and not those of a christian communion. Was I to suffer these unhappy men to perish without warning? That — common charity forbade. The remonstrances of their spiritual pastors had been urged, I knew, in vain. I, therefore, went at midnight through the streets, and shot from my cross-bow at their windows, that the stones passing noiseless through the air, and breaking in suddenly upon their guilty secrecy, might remind them of the suddenness of that punishment which the Scriptures tell us divine justice will inflict on impenitent sinners; and so lead them to a reformation of manners."

The above circumstance gave rise to a poem, entitled "A Satire against the Citizens of London," in which he writes the same opinions as those put forward in the above defense. After noticing the dissoluteness of their manners, he proceeds —

*In secret silence of the night,  
This made me, with a reckless breast,  
To wake the sluggards with my bow;  
A figure of the Lord's behest,  
Whose scourge for sin the Scriptures show.  
That as the fearful thunder-clap  
By sudden flame at hand we know;  
Of pebble stones the soundless rap,  
The dreadful plague might make thee see,  
Of God's wrath, that doth thee enwrap.*

Then describing the manner of their lives and conversation, he says,

*O, member of false Babylon!  
Thy dreadful doom draws fast thee on!*

From the application of the word Babylon, which he here uses in reference, it is thought, to the erroneous doctrines held in London, but

proceeding from Rome, he is judged to have been favorable to the changes in religion, which were now in progress.

The hatred of Henry to the earl of Surrey was imputed by the earl to the displeasure arising from his unsuccessful expedition against Boulogne. This might possibly be the commencement of the king's anger; but the most likely reason was the hatred, ambition, and jealousy of the earl of Hertford, who had obtained great influence with the king, and was fearful of the power of the Howards. This feeling was probably exasperated by the refusal of Surrey to sanction the marriage of his sister, the duchess of Richmond, with sir Thomas Seymour, Hertford's brother; <sup>f34</sup> especially as the alliance had been sought by her father. When Surrey was removed from the command at Boulogne, he was succeeded by Hertford; and the haughty earl could not brook the refusal of Surrey to solicit an appointment under him. Surrey, upon finding that another (lord Gray) was sent, expressed himself in unguarded and hasty language, which was reported to Hertford; and by him carried, in its worst construction, to the king. The misrepresentation and jealousy of Hertford were, no doubt, the principal cause of Surrey's downfall and death.

The other two reasons, viz. of aspiring to the hand of the princess Mary, <sup>f35</sup> and wearing the arms of Edward the Confessor, must be void of foundation. Surrey was then, and had been for eleven years, married. His wife was living; and the tenor of his life, and his high principles, gave no reason for the suspicion of disloyalty. As to his quartering the arms of Edward the Confessor with his own, he proved that he had the authority of the heralds for so doing. He alleged that his ancestors had constantly worn them, as well within the kingdom as without; and that they had been as constantly borne by himself, in Henry's presence, and by others of his family in the presence of the several kings, Henry's predecessors. This he was authorised to do by the patent of Richard II.; in the twentieth year of his reign, A.D. 1397, given to Thomas Mowbray and his descendants. Notwithstanding all these proofs of innocence, he was found guilty.

As the engagement of Foxe to be tutor to the sons of the earl of Surrey took place at the end of the reign of Henry VIII.; and as he seems to have been in the deepest distress immediately prior to that time, we are compelled to infer that the "golden days of felicity," in the last year of the

reign of Henry, mentioned by Foxe's son, must have been of very short duration. However this may have been, we must believe that the duchess of Richmond placed the greatest dependance upon the learning and talents, and approved also of the principles of Foxe, as the rejecter of the papal creed. The duchess of Richmond was known to have been a favorer of the reformation. Yet much difficulty exists in the whole story of the causes of the appointment of Foxe to the office of tutor to the sons of the earl of Surrey. If the children were made wards in chancery, why did not the chancellor, Wriothesley, appoint a tutor of the severest orthodoxy, as he understood the meaning of that ill-used word? If they were not, why did the countess of Surrey give up the care of her own children? Why was the duchess of Richmond not only appointed their guardian, but permitted, without remonstrance, to select the future martyrologist as their director? To these questions no satisfactory reply can be given. Their father had been executed for alleged treason, nine days only before the death of the king. Foxe was probably appointed, therefore, immediately on the accession of Edward. This event was the commencement of a general change in the national councils. As the duke, their grandfather, was attainted for treason, and in close imprisonment, the children are believed to have been left at the disposal of the government. The plea of loyalty set up in favor of the duchess of Richmond, can scarcely be defended. The most probable reason of their being placed under her care, as wards of the state, would seem to be, that as the reformation-principles were gaining ground, the rulers of the nation might think it would be desirable to instil into the mind of the heir to the dukedom, and the representative of one of the most powerful families in England, the tenets of the reformation; and they resolved, therefore, upon entrusting the superintendence of their education to their aunt, who was known to be of the reformed religion.

This Opinion is corroborated both by Nott, and the "Howard Memorials." The children were entrusted to their aunt's care, with an allowance of 100*l.* a-year for their maintenance. These authorities merely observe that the countess, being out of favor at court, did not think it prudent to put in a claim to the guardianship of her children; and we do not hear of any proofs of the countess<sup>f36</sup> objecting to their being entrusted to their aunt, or of her having expressed any scruple of the duchess treating them with affection, though her conduct to their father had been so reverse to that of sisterly

regard. Admitting the tuition of his three noble pupils to be commenced by Foxe in the first year of Edward VI., Thomas, who succeeded to the dukedom, would then be in the eleventh year of his age; Jane, who by her marriage became countess of Westmoreland, would be in her tenth year; and Henry, afterwards earl of Northampton, would be in his eighth. It is ascertained that the tutor continued his instructions till he left the family to escape from the perils of Mary's reign, which did not begin to appear till more than twelve months after her accession, so that the benefit of his tuition may be fairly calculated to have been constant for about six years; and as some test of the efficiency of his labors, it is affirmed, that the lady Jane, countess of Westmoreland, was one of the most learned ladies of a learned age, when knowledge was deemed essential to the female character. She made great progress both in Greek and Latin. Her preceptor, Foxe, indeed, says of her, "That she might well stand in competition with the most learned men of that time, for the praise of elegancy in both." The two sons, also, "grew to that height of proficiency in polite literature, that building in their riper years upon this foundation, the elder, Thomas, seemed to deserve more than the kingdom could bestow upon him; and the younger, Henry, came to such affluence, that he was able to measure his fortunes, not by the opinion of others, but by his own wishes." That Foxe gained, at the same time, the affection of his pupils, is sufficiently proved by their subsequent solicitude for his safety, by their attentions, and their bounty. There can be no doubt that their decided and-Roman tutor would assiduously labor to impress the principles of the reformation on their minds. The permanent success of his instructions on the eldest may be said to have appeared in his exemplary character, in the attachment of the people to his person, and in his dying declarations on the scaffold. Though he was found guilty of aspiring to the hand of the queen of Scots, he never wavered in his attachment to the principles in which John Foxe had instructed him. "I have not been popishly inclined," said this illustrious man on the scaffold, "ever since I had any taste of religion; but was always averse to the popish doctrine, and embraced the true religion of Jesus Christ, and put my whole trust in the blood of Christ, my blessed Redeemer and Savior. Yet, I must own, that some of my servants and acquaintance were addicted to the Romish religion. If, in this, I have offended either God, the church, or the protestants, I pray God and them to forgive me." Then, after reading a psalm or two, he said, with a loud

voice, "Lord, into thy hands I commend my spirit." After this he embraced Sir Henry Leigh, and whispered something to him, and to dean Nowel; who turning to the people, said, "The duke desires you would all of you pray to God to have mercy on him; and withal keep silence, that his mind may not be disturbed." The executioner asked him forgiveness, and had it granted. One offering him a handkerchief to cover his eyes, he refused it, saying, "I am not in the least afraid of death." Then falling on his knees, he lay prostrate with his mind fixed upon God; and dean Nowel prayed with him. Presently after, he stretched his neck upon the block, and his head was immediately cut off at one blow, and showed by the executioner as a doleful sight for the sorrowful and weeping multitude.

Camden gives this further account of him. "It is incredible how dearly the people loved him; whose goodwill he had maintained by a munificence and extraordinary affability suitable to so great a prince." <sup>F37</sup>

The same adherence to the principles of Foxe distinguished the brother and sister; <sup>f38</sup> though all were removed from his charge at the accession of Mary, when the duke of Norfolk, their grandfather, was liberated from the tower. They were then respectively seventeen, sixteen, and fourteen years of age, and were placed under the care of White, bishop of Lincoln. A letter of the earl of Arundel, dated 1620, informs us that both Thomas and Henry were made pages to the bishop, according to the usual custom of so training the patrician youth. The instructions of Foxe, however, were not obliterated, as might have been hoped and intended by this arrangement. The duke, as we have seen, continued stedfast in his attachment to the primitive faith, as it was again taught by the reformers. His sister, the countess of Westmoreland, embraced the same principles through life. The same stedfast adherence has, it is true, been considered somewhat less certain with regard to lord Henry, the earl of Northampton. From an expression which he is alleged to have used in his latter moments — "that he died in the religion in which he was born" — it has been supposed by some that he was unfriendly to protestantism. But he was born at a time when the papal supremacy was overthrown, and when the Bible was given to the people; and there is nothing to make it improbable that his expression applied to the state of religion at the commencement of the great changes, rather than to the old superstitions.

Foxe remained at Reigate with his pupils throughout the whole reign of Edward. I am unable, therefore, from comparing the dates, to believe that Anthony Wood has reported accurately respecting the restoration of Foxe to his fellowship. His name is not found in the president's book from the date of his expulsion to the accession of Elizabeth. The time that elapsed between his expulsion and marriage could not have exceeded twelve months; and that was spent in, at least, three several places — -the greater portion at sir Thomas Lucy's; some time with his wife's father; and some time, also, with his mother and step-father. His marriage, too, would have presented a complete bar to his being replaced in his fellowship. As he continued at Reigate, also, till the accession of Mary, soon after which he fled to the continent, we are compelled to believe that, in this instance, Wood was mistaken, and that Foxe was never restored to his fellowship at Magdalen.

During his residence at Reigate, three years after he had accepted the appointment of tutor to the grandchildren of the duke of Norfolk, Foxe was ordained deacon by Ridley, bishop of London. The inaccurate manner in which his life has hitherto been written, and the exceeding difficulty of procuring the requisite details which can possibly render his biography interesting to the general reader, appears from the singular fact, that the date of his ordination is not noticed even by his son; neither is the circumstance of his ordination mentioned by Anthony Wood; though the latter informs us that "he was the first man, as 'tis said, that ever preached the Gospel in that place, when the Roman Catholic religion was in great strength." The christianity hitherto taught at Reigate, had been that compound of ancient truth, and accumulated novelties added to it, which we call popery. Foxe, no doubt, taught the people that the novelties of the last few hundred years, which had preceded him, were not primitive christianity; and he thus taught the principles of the Reformation. He was first to teach this truth at Reigate, though he was not the incumbent there. This appears from the testimony of Richard Daye, in his Epistle Dedicatory of one of Foxe's Works, to William, lord Howard of Effingham. Daye was the first protestant incumbent of Reigate, the son of the printer of Foxe's works. He speaks of Foxe as the first preacher, but not as the first protestant incumbent of Reigate. He affirms that he preached the Gospel there, and was instrumental in removing the popish

idolatrics of the place. By preaching the Gospel, he meant, that he laid before the people the doctrine of justification by faith, as the foundation of that love of God which leads to holiness and to virtue — the only preaching which ever did, does, or can benefit the spirit of man. By idolatrics, he meant, not merely the worship of images, and the adoration of saints and the Virgin, but any substitution of external observance for the inward spirituality of which those external observances are, at once, the emblem, the assistant, and the means.

The brief information of Daye deserves more attention than it might otherwise have received, on account of the great regard he manifested for the writings of Foxe; and his respect for him as his predecessor. He translated the work of Foxe entitled “Christ Triumphant,” and dedicated it to their common patron, the earl of Effingham. Whether Foxe taught the people of Reigate, either with or without a license, before his ordination, is uncertain. His extensive knowledge of antiquity must have convinced him that he was required to exercise the office of preacher only with authority. It is possible, however, that he might have preached at Reigate before his ordination, from the conviction of the absolute necessity of endeavoring to check the immorality and irreligion of the place, as well as to recal the people from their gross idolatry; <sup>f39</sup> and that he found it difficult at first to obtain episcopal ordination in consequence of his principles. Some of his biographers believe that he had been already ordained deacon, which, however, did not take place till 1550. Others think that he had obtained a license to preach prior to ordination: but much obscurity rests upon these circumstances of his life. Gardiner, the bishop of the diocese, would scarcely have granted a license to preach; or have conferred orders upon a heretical reformer, knowing his opinions. Gardiner, however, had been committed a prisoner to the Fleet in 1547, for non-obedience to the newly-appointed ecclesiastical visitors; and the year following, in June, he was sent to the Tower, for his sermon at St. Paul’s Cross on St. Peter’s day. <sup>F40</sup> He was kept a prisoner there till the beginning of the reign of Mary; and in February, 1550, because he would not conform, he was deprived of his bishopric. We have no means of knowing whether Foxe had a license or not from Gardiner before his deprivation. If, therefore, Foxe preached at Reigate during the earlier part of king Edward’s reign, his labors would have been those of a residing missionary, rather than of a canonically-

appointed minister, until his ordination by bishop Ridley. Neither, indeed, if he had labored for a time without ordination, ought we to be surprised. It is certain, that no man unordained, however gifted, should presume to take upon himself the office of preacher. Yet not only had John Calvin, fifteen years before, *A.D. 1535*, published his celebrated “*Institutes*,” and taught the reformers, most unfortunately for the true catholic church of Christ, that other systems of discipline than those which had been sanctioned by the universal church, before the papal policy had superseded the supremacy of primitive episcopacy, might be rightly adopted; but many, very many, who had rejected the doctrines of the church of Rome, had proceeded to the opposite extreme, and embraced the opinions of Zwinglius, and of Calvin, in their contempt of antiquity, and the dispensableness of episcopal ordination. <sup>F41</sup> Whittingham, who was made dean of Durham on the accession of Elizabeth, received only presbyterian, or non-episcopal ordination. Foxe might, also, in the plenitude of his knowledge of antiquity, have remembered that the church at Alexandria had permitted Origen to instruct the catechumens in the schools before he was ordained; that there was a succession of unordained doctors at that place; and that it was not unusual in the ancient churches, that the bishops should invite the well-qualified, though unordained, sometimes to speak to the people, in imitation of the Jewish custom, of requesting well — EDucated and well-known persons to speak in the synagogues. <sup>F42</sup> The Anglican church, too, was now in a state of the utmost confusion. The bishops were divided. They were doubtful of the extent and nature of their own power. The authority of the pope, as the visible head of the church, had been overthrown. The authority of the king had been substituted in its place. Henry VIII., who had opposed and borne down the temporal authority of Rome, was dead. A young and inexperienced king was on the throne; and Cranmer himself believed that the exercise of his own episcopal authority had ended with the late king’s life. He refused, therefore, to act as archbishop till he had received a new commission from Edward. Bonner, also, had previously taken out a commission for his bishopric from Henry VIII., as Cranmer had done. <sup>F43</sup> The contending claims of the civil power, of the papal power, and of the national will, which desired repose, and yet sought after some great change, bewildered even the rulers of the church. “The gossellers,” says Collier, <sup>f44</sup> “as they were then called, presuming on the countenance of the court, overran the

motions of the state, and ventured to reform without public authority.” It is not improbable, therefore, that Foxe, as even a license might have been refused, preached for two years or more without any permission from his ecclesiastical superiors, believing himself to be justified by the necessity of publishing the truth, even without authority. His subsequent conduct on the Continent, proves to us, in some measure, that he regarded what he believed to be the claims of the congregation for greater edification, to be of superior obligation to a rigid adherence to the written laws and customs of the church, tie might have believed undisciplined Truth to be preferable, before God and man, to well-disciplined error; and that the superstitions, and dark idolatries which prevailed in Reigate, justified the attempt to remove them without delay. However this may be, he was ordained deacon June 23d, 1550, <sup>f45</sup> and continued at Reigate till the accession of Mary. He was ordained thirteen months after the first Service Book of king Edward, which was substantially the same with that which now blesses the people of England, was completed for general use. We shall find many things to lament hereafter in the estimate which Foxe formed of the English Service Book.

We can only hope that he conformed, with the joy and approbation which it deserved, to the complete Liturgy. The Roman forms of worship had now generally ceased. The Anglican Liturgy was partly deduced from those forms, wherever they were sanctioned by usefulness or wise antiquity. It was prepared with the same sound judgment which characterized all those measures wherein Cranmer had taken the lead. It was compiled from the different Romish offices used in this kingdom. Whatever was unexceptionable was retained; all that savoured of superstition was discarded. The prayers to the saints were expunged, with all their lying legends; and the people were provided with a christian ritual in their own tongue. And so judiciously was this done, that while nothing which could offend the feelings of a reasonable protestant, excepting the lessons from the Apocrypha, was left, nothing was inserted which should prevent the most conscientious Romanist from joining in the service. <sup>F46</sup>

Discontents had prevailed in many parts of the country, arising from the opposition of the tenants to the treatment experienced from their new landlords; and the introduction of the reformed Liturgy was made the pretext for commencing an insurrection, first in Devonshire, about

Midsummer, 1549. Fifteen articles were sent to the king as demands, without a single grievance being stated; and among the requests, was the extraordinary desire urged by the insurgents, that the six bloody articles of the late reign, which had been repealed, should be again put in force. To this strange request the following curious reply was made in the name of his majesty: — “ Know ye what ye require? Or know ye what ease ye have with the loss of them? They were laws made, but quickly repented. Too bloody they were to be borne by our people; yet, at the first, indeed, made of some necessity. O subjects, how are ye trapped by evil persons! We, of pity, because they were bloody, took them away; and you now, of ignorance, will ask them again! Since our mercy moved us to write our laws with milk and equity, how are ye blinded to ask them in blood!” <sup>f47</sup>

During these commotions, rumors were prevalent that the Six Articles were to be renewed; and Foxe, using the liberty of an Englishman, as well as displaying the judgment of a politician and the spirit of a patriot, addressed the parliament as an individual against such re-enactment. In this address, he says, that “not only a rumor, but a most positive assertion had gone abroad, that those sanguinary laws, known by the title of the Six Articles, once laid to sleep, are about to be, as it were, recalled from Hades to earth. “If this be true,” continues the bold and judicious remonstrance, “I know not how plausible it may be made by you, and how acceptable it may be to others, but I well know how deadly and ominous it will prove to the kingdom at large.” He then proceeds to argue strongly and eloquently on the subject, and to deprecate the renewal of the act, bringing to mind the dread it has already excited, and the horrors it will produce. This spirited and admirable document was written at Reigate. <sup>F48</sup>

Foxe thus continued at Reigate, attending to his pupils, instructing the people, and devoting himself to the most severe and indefatigable labor — to his books and pen — an useful, happy, contented student. He now began to be known as an author. His first work was printed 1548, while he was at Reigate, before his ordination. <sup>F49</sup> It appears to have been originally written as an effort to obtain temporary relief, and probably to making himself known among the London publishers, from whom he sought employment on his arrival in town after leaving Warwickshire. His penury being, however, relieved by the less precarious occupation of an eligible tutorship, the work was not published till the second year after the

duchess of Richmond had taken him into her service. We may infer the great care which he bestowed on this work, from its correct diction, and the masterly treatment of its subject. It is preceded by an affectionate and able dedication, commencing thus; — “Generoso viro Thomae Pictono. J. Foxus salutem et pacem in Christo.” It is a duodecimo. The letter is a large and open Roman character, and the impression is on the whole uniform and good. It does not appear that the work ever reached a second edition; nor is it a subject likely to obtain popularity. Though it is not equally noble, in either style or matter, to some of his other performances, the reader will find himself taken by surprise by brilliant flashes of originality and genius. Neither must he expect to find every proposition perfectly unobjectionable, and every point treated so as to accord precisely with present opinions. Even had the mind become so far advanced, the press had not then arrived at such a state of freedom as to permit the circulation of intellectual inquiries without restriction and without danger.

He next published, while at Reigate, a treatise, “De Censura, sire Excommunicatione Ecclesiastica, Interpellatio ad Archiepiscopum Cantuar,” Londini, 8vo. 1551; then “Christus Triumphans, Comoedia Apocalyptica,” 8vo. Basil, 1551; and “Tables of Grammar,” 1552.

During his residence at Reigate, too, he must have begun his collections for the first portions of his “Ecclesiastical History.” We may infer this by comparing the date of the publication of the first edition of his “Acts and Monuments of the Church,” with the time of his leaving England. Edward VI. died, and Mary succeeded to the throne July 6th, 1553. Gardiner was released from the Tower, and made chancellor about the 20th of October following, when the laws of Edward concerning religion were repealed, after six days’ debate in the House of Commons. The prisons of England began to be filled with victims. Judge Hales directed his brethren to proceed according to the laws of England. Gardiner began to send forth his spies in every direction. Foxe, who had not only taken advantage of the bishop’s imprisonment and deprivation in the affair of his ordination, but, during the whole time he had dwelt in his diocese, had been industriously teaching the people that the superstitions and image-devotions, which Gardiner still professed, were contradictory to Scripture, could not hope to escape condign punishment if he remained in Reigate. The old duke of Norfolk died in September, 1554. The young duke, when Foxe spoke of

his apprehensions, and proposed to escape abroad, was unwilling at first to consent, and kindly offered to afford him his utmost protection, and share his fate. He left England after the death of the old duke in 1554, and arrived in Basil in 1555. <sup>F50</sup> The first part of his great work was published at Strasburg, after he left Frankfort, and before he arrived at Basil. These circumstances enable us to ascertain that the materials must have been collected, and the MS. prepared, during his residence in Reigate. It exhibits no signs of having been hastily written, as it must have been if it had been prepared while he was travelling on the Continent. It was written in Latin, and was published at Strasburg, 1554, towards the end of which year the author probably left England. It contains the ecclesiastical history of two hundred years; and it was as copious an account of that most interesting period as any which had then been published. <sup>F51</sup>

Such had been the labors of John Foxe, in addition to his daily duties, before he had attained to the age of thirty-seven, and before he was driven from his peaceful abode at Reigate by the tempest which devoured so many of the noblest vessels of the reformation. He still remained in England, venerated by his late noble pupils, for some time after they had been transferred to the care of bishop White. Without any other occupation to engage him, he would be enabled to pursue his historical inquiries during the interval, and to make that progress which has hitherto seemed inexplicable to those acquainted with the difficulties attendant on such researches, and of arranging for publication such a history.

Whether he continued to reside at Reigate throughout the whole of this interval, or whether his place of abode was sometimes London, or elsewhere, we are not informed; yet we may infer that he was a sojourner in the vicinity of some residence of his friend and patron, the duke, either in town or country, at whose mansion, we may infer from a well-known anecdote, he was either a resident or a frequent guest. Gardiner had one day called to pay his respects, probably at Reigate, in his diocese, to the young duke, on whom he was in the habit of frequently calling. He inquired for his old tutor, and expressed a desire to see him. Foxe suddenly entered the room, but immediately withdrew, not knowing that Gardiner was there. The bishop inquired who that stranger might be. "He is my physician," said the duke. "I like his appearance," was the reply of the bishop; "and when necessity requires, I will employ him." Although the

duke had, up to this time, persuaded Foxe not to leave England, he inferred, from this expression of Gardiner, that, under the newly altered laws and system of persecution which was commencing, the life of Foxe would be now in danger if he remained in England. Though he had hitherto been averse to his flight, he perceived that no time was to be lost in the effort to save him. Foxe was apprized by the duke of the necessity of hasty flight; and to render his escape as safe and pleasant as possible, he gave his commands for the preparation of every thing necessary, for the journey. He despatched one of his own servants to Ipswich haven to hire a vessel, and to see that every thing was comfortably and expeditiously arranged for the voyage. The impression made on the mind of the duke, by the manner and speech of the bishop, proved the warmth and reality of his affection. His anxiety suffered no precaution to be omitted — no means that prudence could devise for the greater security of his friend to be disregarded or neglected. He was desirous to prevent the possibility of pursuit, by enabling the worthy fugitive to avoid cities and towns, and delays near any places of public resort, in his journey to the coast. He requested one of his tenants, who lived in a retired farm near to Ipswich, to shelter him till the moment when wind and tide served to put to sea; that he might not be detained, or put to any personal inconvenience, by the usages of a port town; to which one wholly devoted to letters, as John Foxe all his life had been, must be an entire stranger. All these plans and preparations being perfected for his safe emigration, the worthy and faithful historian repaired, as privately as he could, to Suffolk, “taking his wife,” says their son, “as companion in his travels, then great with child, but resolved to go with him, not yielding to the entreaty of those who persuaded her to the contrary.” They secluded themselves under the hospitable roof provided for them till they had notice from the captain that they might set sail with safety.

The anxiety of the young duke of Norfolk to provide for the security of his friend and tutor may afford us an additional proof of the morality, noble-mindedness, and amiable and gentle qualities of Foxe. He could not otherwise, at the end of eight years of intimacy and tutorage, have been thus beloved and esteemed by his illustrious pupil. We may be assured, that recantation, or the flames, would have been the lot of John Foxe if he had remained in England a few days, and possibly, only one day longer.

“Scarcely had they weighed anchor,” his son proceeds, “when suddenly a rough wind rising from the contrary shore, troubled the sea with so great violence that the stoutest mariners began to tremble. Then followed a dark night with continued showers; and a great multitude of clouds gathered together into a thick storm of rain and hail, which both hindered the seamen’s work, and took away all possibility by the compass any longer to direct their course. That night, with much ado, they lay at anchor, and as soon as the day appeared, when the tempest seemed not likely to cease, they began to cast about, and to make back again to shore; so that the tide a little favoring them, at length, with much difficulty, they arrived in the same evening at the same haven again whence they had loosed the day before. In the meanwhile that Mr. Foxe had been at sea, a messenger from the bishop of Winchester had broke open the farmer’s house, with a warrant to apprehend him wheresoever he might be found, and bring him back prisoner to the city: but understanding he was gone already, after he had pursued him even to the port, and there found that the ship he had embarked in was yet scarcely out of sight, he returned back without his errand. Mr. Foxe, as soon as he came ashore, hearing what had passed, although the news somewhat amazed him, yet recollecting himself, presently took horse, and made as if he would have left the town; but the same night returning, he bargained with the master of the ship to set sail again with the first convenience of the winds, telling him that so his business required, nor did he much care what shore he landed at; only desiring him to go forward, and not doubt but God would prosper so pious a work. Whether for reward, or piety’s sake, the pilot took upon him the venturous task, and performed it accordingly: for loosing thence in the night’s silence, as soon as the tide turned, though the sea was rough, and the weather blustering, within two days’ space he landed Mr. Foxe and his company in safety at Nieuport haven, on the other side the sea.”

Thus has been delivered to us, by the son of the fugitive, the particulars of his providential escape from the tragic scenes in which a conspicuous part had been allotted him had he been overtaken; unless, yielding to the weakness which prevented many from persevering in their faith and resolution, he had retracted his own opinions. So much benefit has accrued to the church of God from the publication of his useful labors, that we may believe him to have been delivered from danger by the especial

providence of God. The death of the martyrs was essential to the stability of the spiritual and visible church of England: yet a chronicler of the actions and sayings — of the courage and patience of these martyrs, may be said to be no less necessary. The poet of pagan Rome could lament that many heroes of antiquity were unknown to posterity, because no poet had recorded their bravery. <sup>F52</sup> The memory of the martyrs of Languedoc, and of the south of France, who were actually exterminated by the first agents of the newly-formed inquisition, have perished; or live only in the contemptuous triumphs of the papal histo-riographers. The record of the heroic opponents who died in the faith, protesting against the creed of Rome, condemned by the laws of Mary for opinion, not leading to treason; not as those by the laws of Elizabeth, for opinion ending in treason; was indispensable to the eventual establishment of a better system of ecclesiastical polity than that which the court and church of Rome, in any restoration of its influence, can hope to rebuild among us. The work of John Foxe has rendered greater service to the cause of true, primitive, scriptural, or reformed christianity, than a hundred battles, or than millions of soldiers in the field. Incalculable, therefore, would have been the loss to the church, if the emissaries of Gardiner had captured the writer; and destroyed the already prepared manuscript, with which he was probably travelling. The clouds of darkness were gathering over the Anglican church. The boldest hearts despaired. The writer of the deeds of the heroes who perished in the holy war was preserved to give the loudest warning to the churches; and to inflict the most deadly blow on the united system of superstition and cruelty — of priestcraft and idolatry, which had so long overshadowed and oppressed both liberty and truth. May God in his mercy grant, that whatever be the punishments with which he may afflict our guilty empire, we may both escape from infidelity on the one hand; and, on the other, from the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of all God's judgments — popery! <sup>F53</sup>

## SECTION 3.

### FOXES RESIDENCE ABROAD.

**A.D. 1554 To 1559.**

*Arrival On The Continent- Origin Of The Troubles At Frankfort- Their Progress And Termination — Foxe Arrives At Basil — His Labors There — Returns To England.*

The expediency and prudence of the emigration of Foxe and his family were demonstrated by the conduct of the parliament, which met in the month following his escape to Nieuport. We may safely conclude that he was warned by his friend, the duke of Norfolk, of the severe measures against heresy and heretics now projected. Sixteen months had now elapsed since the death of Edward. <sup>f54</sup> The friends of the reformation had seen, in that short space, the censure of a judge <sup>f55</sup> for directing the people to observe the laws of the late reign, before they were repealed; the restoration of the mass at court; <sup>f56</sup> the prohibition of preaching without an especial license from the queen; <sup>f57</sup> the exclusion of the protestant bishops from the House of Lords; <sup>f58</sup> the abolition of the reformed Liturgy; <sup>f59</sup> and the re-establishment of the doctrine of transubstantiation as a portion of the national faith. They had seen the arbitrary expulsion of religious foreigners; <sup>f60</sup> the deprivation of the married clergy; and the excommunication of the archiepiscopal and episcopal defenders of the prayers in their own language. They had witnessed the increased power of the queen, by that event which, more than any other, gives strength to a weak government — the suppression of an unsuccessful insurrection. They were now to lament over the enactment of the most severe and persecuting statutes. They perceived that, even if the queen herself had been inclined to milder measures, the foreign influence, <sup>f61</sup> which is ever identified with the Italian form of Christianity, was gradually producing its effects; and that the pope and his adherents possessed the sovereignty over the sovereign of England. The houses of parliament, the proper defenders of truth, as well as of liberty, had changed with the change of the prince. The houses of convocation, the proper guardians of the church, had changed with the change of the bishops. The parliament, which was now

to meet in November, after Foxe escaped in October, was to be reconciled in form to the church of Rome; to receive absolution from the papal legate, and to revive the laws of the faggot and the stake. No executions had hitherto taken place. It is probable that the duke of Norfolk had represented to Foxe both the certainty of the revival of these shameful statutes, and the no less certainty, that Foxe himself would become one of their earliest victims.

Foxe arrived safely with his wife at Nieuport. The situation of his wife, who was probably either at this time or soon after delivered of a child,<sup>f62</sup> may have detained him there some time. As soon, however, as he was able, he left Nieuport for Antwerp; from whence he proceeded, by slow stages, to Strasburg, where he committed to the press the first part of his labors. Grindal, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, influenced by his friendship for Peter Martyr, who had been driven from his divinity professorship at Oxford on the accession of Mary, now resided at Strasburg. Foxe found in Grindal a kindred spirit. The principal narratives of the martyrdoms which took place in England from the revival of the laws against heresy<sup>f63</sup> till the death of the queen, were transmitted to Grindal, who had been chaplain to king Edward, and was intimate with the chief advocates of the reformation. These communications to Grindal were given to Foxe, and subsequently formed the foundation of the more enlarged editions of his work, published at Basle in 1659, and in the following years. Foxe, however, did not now remain long at Strasburg, for we find his name appended to the letter which was sent from Frankfort to Strasburg on the 3d of December, 1554, in defense of the Service Book, which had been adopted by many of the exiles, in preference to the Book of Common Prayer, which had been used in England. On his arrival on the Continent, he found his fellow-countrymen engaged in those painful controversies which are more generally known by the name of "the Troubles at Frankfort;" where the largest congregation of refugees had assembled, and to which, as Foxe took a part in the proceedings, it is now necessary more particularly to refer.

To understand better the origin of these controversies, we must consider some circumstances which took place in England in the reign of Edward.

In the year 1647 the emperor Charles, anxious to settle all religious differences, gave orders for the drawing up of a temporary formula called

the *Interim*, which was to be binding upon all Romanists and Reformers until a general council should have fixed the articles of religion upon a more satisfactory foundation. The *Interim* was, in all essential points, agreeable to the doctrine of the Romish church. <sup>f64</sup> The emperor, however, had influence enough to induce many of the reformed princes to accept it. Others resolutely refused so to do, and were put under the ban of the empire, and war was declared against them. It was sworn to by all the diet of Augsburg, January 1548. It inculcated — That man can do more good works than God requires of him; that he must not, without doubting, believe that his sins are forgiven; that the church has the power of interpreting the Scriptures, and explaining the doctrines to be deduced from them; that the pope is the head of the church, the bishops having a certain degree of authority in their respective cures; that, by confirmation and unction, the Holy Ghost is received, so as to enable the receiver to contend against temptation; that sins are to be confessed to a priest; that by satisfaction, which consists in the fruits of repentance, especially fasting, alms-deeds, and prayer, the causes of sin are rooted out, and temporal judgments are taken away, or mitigated. The Romish doctrines and ceremonies respecting the mass were confirmed; and it was decreed that the memory of saints is still to be celebrated, that they may intercede with God the Father for us, and help us by their merits; and that the dead also be remembered, and prayer made to God for them. Married priests were allowed to retain their cures; and where the cup had been given to the laity in the sacrament, it was to be continued. <sup>F65</sup>

This formulary was accepted by the prince palatine, duke Maurice, and the marquis of Brandenburg, but rejected by many others. It gave satisfaction to neither party, and was a complete failure in procuring peace and reconciliation. It is generally ascribed <sup>f66</sup> to Pflug, bishop of Nuremberg, Michael Sidonius (but called Hedding), suffragan bishop of Mentz, and John Agricola, (Elsieben, Ger. Ref.) preacher to the elector of Brandenburg; but Pallavicini <sup>f67</sup> and Courayer, in his learned Notes to Father Paul's History of the Council of Trent, assert that the author is unknown; and the bishop of Westminster says that Louis Malvenda, a Franciscan friar, and author of a work entitled "Lac Fidei pro Principe Christiano," drew it up.

Though this formulary was not received with the approbation which the emperor had anticipated, he resolved to compel its acceptance among all whom he believed he had authority to influence. The will and belief of the civil ruler in this instance, as in so many others, was the criterion of truth, and the rule of faith. The consequence of his violence was, that many clergymen were deprived of their churches, and took refuge in England. Among them was Valerandus Pollanus, a native of Flanders, and minister of a congregation at Strasburg. This man retired with his congregation into England, on his refusing to subscribe to the Interim, and obtained a settlement at Glastonbury. He was there permitted to use with his people the mode of worship which they deemed fittest when they had rejected the Romish service. On the death of Edward they were again compelled to seek refuge on the Continent. They established themselves at Frankfort, where they continued the same form of worship which they had adopted at Glastonbury.

On the 27th of June, 1554, a certain number of English exiles <sup>f68</sup> arrived at Frankfort. They were welcomed to the city on the very evening of their arrival by Valeran Pullan, <sup>f69</sup> and assurance was given them that a church was obtained in which they might worship without interruption from the common enemy.

“Why weeps the Muse for England? “ was once asked by the poet <sup>f70</sup> who mourned over the moral delinquencies of his countrymen. The historian of this lamentable period has, indeed, cause to mourn over the consequences of the restoration of the unreformed religion in the reign of Mary. The savage persecutions of the adherents of the reformation who remained in England were but a portion of the calamities which that event brought upon our devoted land. Though there had been some division of opinion among the reformers in England on the subject of the clerical dresses, the maintaining of discipline, and the best mode of church government; a general agreement subsisted on the value and excellence of the Liturgy; which had been recommended and approved by the convocation, the parliament, and the king, as the best form of national worship. The book had been almost universally regarded by the thousands, who desired to pray to God in their own language, in a spiritual manner, as an invaluable blessing. The curate of Lynn, in Norfolk, <sup>f71</sup> pressed the book to his bosom in the flames, in the course of the Marian persecution, and thanked God

that such a book, under his providence, had been given to the nation. He spake only the common feeling of the people. Happy would it have been for England, if its religious population had uniformly rallied round that admirable standard of scriptural truth, and spiritual religion. It was not so to be: and a fearful warning is given to all sects, and parties, and churches, to study peace and love, where truth is not compromised. The sanguinary war, which brought a moral and religious christian king, by moral and religious christian hands, to the scaffold — which disgraced alike the opponents of Romanism before the universal church, and the character of all Christians before the whole world — the controversy which still divides the nation, and which alike constitutes the weakness of the opponents, and the strength of the friends, of Rome, began in the quarrels of a few exiles in a petty town on the Continent, where they had been received with kindness, affection, and respect. The story has been often told. I repeat it here, because it affords us a key to the opinions and conduct of Foxe. <sup>F72</sup>

On the day after the arrival of the exiles at Frankfort, a formal petition was drawn up and presented to the magistrates, requesting permission for themselves, as well as all other Englishmen who might flee thither, to remain safely within their city. The petition was granted. Philip Melancthon had already written to the governors of Frankfort, <sup>f73</sup> begging them “not to oppress, but to cherish, the English exiles, as their sentiments in religion were found in the main articles of the christian confession; and that, whereas they differed in some points, they were to be instructed and informed, and not be rudely thrown out from among them by force and violence.” The magistrates acted upon his recommendation; and the exiles were grateful for their repose. They were, however, naturally anxious to worship God in their own language, and in their own manner. Their brother exiles at Strasburg and Zurich had already obtained this favor, and preserved their union as Christians and churchmen, in the enjoyment of their liberty, by adopting the services of the Book of Common Prayer, drawn up and ratified in the reign of Edward. The French exiles had obtained the favor of using their own form of prayer at Frankfort. Application was consequently made (July 8th) to Glauberge, one of the chief senators, for a separate church, where all the English might hear sermons, and worship in their own manner. It does not appear, however,

that they preferred their request as they ought to have done, and probably would have done, if they had been zealously attached to the Liturgy — that they might possess the same privileges which had been granted to their brethren at Strasburg. They petitioned in general terms only, and could not therefore complain, if their petition was granted, subject to certain conditions. The required permission was granted July 14th. Liberty was given them to preach, and to minister the sacraments, in the same church which had been previously granted to the French exiles who had come from England. Both parties were to use the church on alternate days in the week; and on the Sundays, at different hours, as they might agree among themselves. As the English, however, had not solicited for the more definite toleration of their own Service Book, which must have been well known to their foreign brethren at Frankfort, who had previously taken refuge in England, and had only been banished thence by Mary, the condition was made — that the English should not dissent from the French, either in doctrine or ceremonies; that they should subscribe also to the French confession of faith. Compliance with these conditions was promised, and the use of the church was granted.

The question now arose, in what manner their worship was to be conducted. They were required not to dissent from the French Protestants in doctrine and ceremonies, but they were not bound to follow implicitly the French mode of worship. They resolved, therefore, after perusing the Prayer Book, to omit the audible responses and the Litany, to adopt another form of confession, to sing a psalm after the confession or prayers, in the common metres then in use, to pray for the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and then to proceed to the sermon. A prayer for all estates of men was then to follow, at the end of which the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed <sup>174</sup> were to be repeated. A psalm was then to be sung, the blessing to be pronounced, and the people to depart. The beautiful and solemn services of the Communion, which have been handed down to the church of England as the best monument of catholic antiquity, were to be altered, as being, in many respects, superstitious or superfluous, and the use of the surplice was to be discontinued. A minister and officers, to whom they gave the name of deacons, were appointed, and possession was taken of the church assigned to them by the magistrates and senators, on the 29th of July.

If the exiles at Frankfort had been contented with the privileges now allowed them, without endeavoring to divide their brethren, by requesting their approbation to these novelties — or if they had declared that they adopted this new form of worship as a matter of necessity, or till they should return to England, or obtain permission to use the Prayer Book at Frankfort — the unity of the depressed and persecuted church of England would not have been broken by these proceedings. I am unwilling to believe evil of any man; and I know that at this time, as at most other times, the conscientious and the zealous victim and persecutor would have been willing to change places; and no man, and no party, and no church, is ever wholly right, or wholly wrong; but there must have been a great deficiency of attachment among these exiles to the Liturgy which they had used in their native land, or they would have made some effort to have been permitted still to use it: and, if the declaration of Bale be true, that the exiles at Basil, when the magistrates permitted the use of the Liturgy, refused to adopt it, and called it a popish mass,<sup>f75</sup> we must believe that it is possible the exiles at Frankfort had already, before they appealed to John Calvin, begun to be affected with the love of novelty, and with disregard to the Book of Common Prayer. This conviction is confirmed by the painful fact, that, though the principal reason adduced by the Frankfort exiles against the use of the Liturgy, was, the disapprobation of the magistrates, Whittingham and his party, when these magistrates subsequently authorized the book, refused to accept it.<sup>F76</sup> If they had done either of these things, or even if they had been silent under the circumstances, and permitted their countrymen to form their own candid conclusions respecting the supposed necessity of the case, the unity of the church might have been preserved. Instead, however, of adopting either of these two measures, they resolved to admit none of their brethren who might afterwards come to Frankfort to their communion, unless they should subscribe and conform to the rules and discipline of this novel worship. Thus began the miserable schism which ended so fatally for the church of England. They next proceeded to communicate their doings to their brethren at Strasburg, Zurich, Embden, and other places; to applaud their own conduct; to invite their approbation to a church, which they declared to be “one free from all dregs of superstitious ceremonies;”<sup>f77</sup> and to request those who agreed with the new system to settle at Frankfort.

The exiles of Strasburg, at the head of whom was Grindal, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, were not willing to understand the purport of this letter. They could not imagine that their brethren at Frankfort had the least intention to do away the use of the Liturgy, which had been obtained by so much labor and learning in England, and for which so many were, at that moment, suffering in their own country. They believed only that the exiles at Frankfort intended to apply to them for a minister; and Grindal, consequently, wrote to Scory at Embden, to proceed to Frankfort. Scory offered his assistance. Before his letter reached them, the congregation had elected John Knox, who was residing at Geneva, and had attached himself with much ardor to the opinions and discipline of Calvin. They were reprov'd by their brethren at Zurich for their rejection of the English Liturgy; and they declared that they were fully determin'd to admit and to use no other. The letters from Strasburg were brought by Grindal, accompanied by Chambers, who came to tender his services. All attempts, however, to compose the differences, and reconcile their brethren once more to the use of the Liturgy, were too late. They had committed themselves before the world; and it is too much to be feared, that the pride of the human heart, which sometimes dupes the conscience as much as the affections dupe the understanding,<sup>f78</sup> began to influence their conduct, and, under the mask of preserving consistency, or contending for truth, made them desire victory more than conciliation or repose. Grindal inform'd them that the object of himself and of Chambers was to solicit the re-establishment of the English Liturgy, which they had used only of late so partially, in its substance, at least, if not in its integrity. Knox and Whittingham eagerly inquir'd what he meant by the substance of the book; and the discussion proceeded, from that moment in the manner which might have been expected. Grindal was compell'd to answer indefinitely, because he could have no power to suggest or propose alterations; and desired to know what parts of the Prayer Book they were willing to accept — a question which was answer'd, as might have been also anticipat'd, by the declaration, that they should permit its use, so far only as it could be maintain'd by Scripture, and agreed with the system of the country. Other questions were propos'd and answer'd, but not satisfactorily. Grindal and Chambers return'd to Strasburg with a letter dat'd the 3d December, 1554, and sign'd, among others, by Foxe, who had arriv'd at Frankfort while these answers were being embody'd, and whose name we now meet, for the

first time, in these sad transactions. They declare that they do not dissent from the doctrines of their brethren, but they will not be ready to die for ceremonies which, as the book specifieth, may, upon just causes, be changed and altered. Knox, declining to use either the Prayer Book, or the Genevan form of worship without further consultation with the exiles of Strasburg, Zurich, Embden, etc., administered the sacraments as his conscience, that is, as his conviction of right, according to his judgment and knowledge, permitted him. He desired, in the most objectionable frame of mind in which a christian teacher can be found, to leave the business of prayer, the most solemn and useful part of public worship, to others, and to confine himself solely to preaching. He threatened to resign his charge, if this strange and most uncatholic indulgence were rejected.

It was under these painful and mournful circumstances that the celebrated letter to John Calvin was penned. Unwilling to accept either the English or the Genevan form, they resolved to apply to Calvin for his opinion and advice. They did not send, however, as they ought to have done, the book itself, without note or comment, but translated portions only, and wrote a description of the book in the language and manner of partizans, who disapproved of it themselves, and desired their opinion to be confirmed by one whom they considered as their friend, and on whose judgment they could rely. They affect to be ashamed of some things in the book, which they therefore withhold, and they speak with much disparagement of many parts, especially of the occasional services. The answer of Calvin was such as might have been expected, and such as they most probably desired. He condemns the conduct of those who pressed upon them the English service, and argues from the persecutions in England, that they should endeavor to depart still farther from popery. He considers all attempts to reform the Liturgy, as advancing to a greater degree of purity and perfection; and regards those who throw away the present opportunity of improvement, as doating upon the leavings of popish dregs. He pronounces the book generally to contain some points, which, though of trifling importance, might still be tolerated; and expresses this opinion in the two well-known words, <sup>f79</sup> which have served from that time to the present as the war-cry of the objectors to the services of the Anglican church. On receiving this letter, John Foxe, who seems to have been one of those who drew up the letter to Calvin, was requested, in

conjunction with Knox, Whittingham, Gilby, and T. Cole, “to draw up some order meet for their state and time.” They did so; which was the same as that used at Geneva.<sup>F80</sup> This was not approved of, and caused much warm contention. At last it was determined that Knox, Whittingham, Parry, and Lever should compile a formulary for their public worship. One was completed partly from the English service, and partly from the Genevan form: it was decided on the 6th February, 1555, that this service should be used till the May following; and that any intermediate controversy on the subject should be determined by Calvin, Musculus, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, and Vyret.

I deeply lament the fact that John Foxe took this active part in opposition to our noble primitive, catholic, and most spiritual service. He was guilty of the common fault of his day. Loathing and abhorring, as he ought to have done, the arrogance and cruelty of the church of Rome, he proceeded to the extreme of imagining, that in proportion as he departed, not merely from the perversions of the early doctrine and discipline of which Rome was guilty, but from the doctrines and discipline themselves; in that same proportion he was nearer to God and truth. He remained at Frankfort from this time till the November following; when he, in company with seventeen others, openly and decidedly seceded from the congregation there, and went, some to Geneva, some, among whom was Foxe, to Basil. The following was the occasion of their secession and departure.

As the congregation at Frankfort had decided, whether rightly or wrongly is not now the question, on adopting a certain mode of worship, they possessed the undoubted right of adhering to the same, without hindrance or molestation. The principles of toleration, however, were not then rightly understood. Every religionist believed it to be his duty to compel others to be of the same external communion, as well as of the same opinion, with himself: and moral persuasion was only one, not the exclusive, means of influencing their brethren to the required conformity.

Among other exiles who had been driven from England was Dr. Cox, who had been chaplain to archbishop Cranmer, and successfully recommended by him to be tutor to king Edward. He had been elevated by him to the rank of privy counsellor, and to the office of king’s almoner. He had been a member also of the commission which had been appointed to visit the

university of Oxford. He had escaped from England to Strasburg, where Peter Martyr and the other exiles were permitted to exercise their public worship according to the Liturgy. The report of the untoward proceedings of the exiles at Frankfort was soon brought to Strasburg. Dr. Cox imagined that his influence might persuade the innovators on the Liturgy, to which he was himself most passionately devoted, once more to adopt the discipline and worship of the Anglican Reformed Church; and he might possibly have succeeded in his object if he had proceeded with more moderation. Instead, however, of beginning to use his influence by quietly conforming to the service which the exiles had established, till he could convince them of their error in adopting the changes which were not evil in themselves, but which needlessly violated that union which was the next blessing to truth itself, — he began his attempts by abruptly and presumptuously violating the compromise which had been made between the admirers and the opponents of the English Liturgy. It had been foolishly agreed that the responses should be discontinued. Whether wisely or otherwise, this was the agreement, and no power was vested in any brother of the common exile to violate the compact. When Dr. Cox, however, first attended the public worship of the congregation at Frankfort, he broke the conditions between the once contending, but at this moment peaceful parties, and repeated the responses aloud, after the custom in England.<sup>F81</sup> He, and those who came with him, having been admonished by the seniors of the congregation, defended their conduct by affirming the necessity of maintaining the appearance of an English church. On the Sunday following, one of those who accompanied the almoner, without the knowledge and consent of the congregation, entered the pulpit, and read the whole Litany; Dr. Cox and the rest answering aloud. This induced Knox, who had been invited to become minister at Frankfort, in September 1554, and arrived there in November, to proceed to the extremity, which probably might have been otherwise avoided. He ascended the pulpit in the afternoon, it being his turn to preach, and in his own bold, unsparing, declamatory style, inveighed against the English Liturgy, and taxed the authors of the disorder with a breach of agreement. This rendered the separation from that moment utterly incurable. For this he was rebuked by Dr. Cox. Conferences were afterwards held between the two parties. Knox, who was as generously-minded as he was inveterate against what he believed to be error, prevailed with the congregation to

admit his opponent and his friends to, the privilege of voting with them. The result of this noble liberality—was, that Knox himself was outvoted, and forbidden to officiate any longer. If the controversy had ended here, by the successful party conducting themselves with moderation, the wound might perhaps have been healed. They did not so. They submitted the dispute to the magistrates of Frankfort, who required them again to conform to the practice of the French exiles, in doctrines and ceremonies. They even complied with this at the request of Cox himself, upon being threatened with dismissal from the town if they refused: —but they then proceeded to an act of the most unworthy and un-English character. They privately accused Knox of high treason against the emperor of Germany, his son Philip, and Queen Mary of England, and to substantiate the charge, they put into the hands of the magistrates a book of his, entitled, “An Admonition to England,” <sup>f82</sup> with certain passages marked. They had been addressed to the inhabitants of Amersham in Buckinghamshire, on occasion of the rumoured marriage of Mary with Philip; an union much dreaded by the English. In this address he had compared the emperor (Charles V.) to Nero. The magistrates, therefore, were compelled either to deliver him up to the emperor, or advise him through Whittingham his friend, <sup>f83</sup> to depart from the city. They chose the latter alternative; and the reformer retired to Geneva, exasperated and embittered by his treatment. Cox and his friends procured from the magistrates of Frankfort, through the means’ of the nephew of Glauberger, permission for the unlimited use of the English Liturgy: and having done so, they actually refused to tolerate the use of the Genevan, or rather the mixed Genevan and Anglican service, which Whittingham, who offered to acquiesce in the new arrangement, requested permission to prefer. Whittingham, in return, exerted himself to recommend the French, and to depreciate the Anglican service. Cox wrote an apologetical letter to Calvin, whose influence with both parties was so great, that all desired his sanction to their proceedings. Calvin still further increased the distance between the two parties, by returning an answer, condemning the exclusive use of the Prayer Book, and censuring many of its observances, which! he calls hurtful and offensive ceremonies. He justly declares that the treatment received by Knox was neither godly nor brotherly. He concludes his letter from Geneva, dated the “last of May, anno 1555,” by wishing that their agreement may be stable, and prays for a blessing upon them in their exile. <sup>F84</sup>

John Foxe, with some others, made another effort to restore the mixed service, by submitting the controversy to four arbitrators, two for each party, and signed a letter to that effect with them on the 17th of August. One more useless meeting took place on the 30th. On the ensuing day, Whittingham, in company with Foxe and others, declared to Cox, and the heads of the congregation, their reasons for departing from Frankfort: among which were the treatment of Knox, and the affirmation that papistical superstitions, and unprofitable ceremonies, which were burthens, yokes, and clogs, were brought in. After a lapse of a few days more, Whittingham with one party retired to Geneva; while, Foxe and another party sojourner at Basil, where he obtained employment from the printer Oporinus. He arrived at this city about the middle of November 1555.

The English Liturgy is so truly worthy of the several commendations which have been bestowed upon it, both at home and abroad, <sup>f85</sup> that we cannot but deeply lament the part taken by Foxe, in the divisions of Frankfort. We may, however, discover many circumstances which should lessen our censure. They were — the state of the controversy among the reformers respecting liturgies — the influence of Calvin, Knox, and others of the chief continental opponents of Rome — and the conduct of the principal supporters of the Liturgy itself, in the congregation of Frankfort.

Though the Liturgy, nearly in its present form, as the Second Service Book of King Edward, had been established by law in England, and John Foxe, therefore, in his ministrations at Reigate, must be supposed to have conformed to its vestments, rubric, and observances — to have joined in its holy prayers and praises — and have administered the sacrament according to its prescribed forms, we must remember that the book itself was not regarded as being incapable of many useful improvements. Much, though unjust and unreasonable, prejudice was excited against it as a translation from the Sacramentary of Gelasius, and from other rituals used by the Romish church. It had not yet received that sanction of establishment and continuance, which adds so much to its estimation in the present day, that many deem it to be a crime even to hint a suggestion for the least change.

It has not been sufficiently observed by the historians of this period, that the Liturgy or Service, which was used at Strasburg, — from which place the exiles under Valerandus Pollanus, settled at Glastonbury during the Interim, — had been framed by Calvin, about the year 1638, in the twenty-ninth year of Henry VIII. ten years before the first Liturgy of King Edward was given to the Anglican church. As this Liturgy of King Edward was afterwards changed by the influence of the foreign divines, the question respecting the final settlement of the best form of Liturgy in England was considered by some to be still undecided at the death of the king; and many, therefore, of the English exiles, though they had conformed to the second book of Edward, were probably already disposed to listen to the reasoning of their foreign brethren AMong the reformers, who advocated the liturgy of Calvin. Between the times when the two Service Books of king Edward were published; and while the controversy, therefore, respecting them was still continued, Valerandus Pollanus, in the year 1550, proceeded from Glastonbury to London, and there published in Latin “The Liturgy of the Strangers, used in their Church at. Strasburg.”<sup>F86</sup> It was dedicated to king Edward, and was dated February 19th, 1551. He declares in his dedication that “he thought it worth his while to translate into Latin the rites and manners (never sufficiently commended) used by the Strangers’ Church at Argentine (Strasburg), exiles for the gospel of Christ: being induced to it as a point of duty, understanding how this good church had been slandered by some for changing their religion; by others, for the licentiousness of their manners. He also mentioned, he says, aphorisms of their discipline, which he intended ere long to publish; and gives this high character of the said church, that there was none purer, or that came nearer to that which was in the apostles’ times.” This liturgy is short. It was printed in October. Calvin was now a teacher of great eminence on the continent;<sup>f87</sup> and as this liturgy, though now first published in London, must have been well known to Cranmer and his brethren before they drew up the First Service Book of Edward VI., I believe that the one principal cause of the spleen of Calvin against the English Liturgy, was not so much the non-acceptance of his service in the compilation of it by Cranmer, nor the letter of Whittingham and Knox, by which it was misrepresented, as the passing silently over the liturgy which Calvin had given to the congregation at Strasburg,<sup>f88</sup> which was used both

there and at Glastonbury; and which Cranmer had probably seen and rejected.

If I did not believe that the ambition of Calvin was of that kind, which rejected the appearance of submission to any ecclesiastical authority, I could have imagined that the assertion is true, which affirms that he **applied to Cranmer for episcopal ordination.**<sup>L2</sup> The letter, it is said, never reached the archbishop, having been intercepted by some of his enemies. If this be true — and if the declaration of Strype also, be true,<sup>f89</sup> that the protestant foreigners took so much satisfaction in Edward VI., and his establishment of religion, that the heads of them, Bullinger, Calvin, and “others, in a letter to him, offered to make him their defender, and to have bishops in their churches as there were in England, with the tender of their service to assist and unite together,” we might almost conclude that John Calvin was anxious to obtain from England episcopal ordination, that he might consolidate his power by canonically obtaining the bishopric of Geneva.

Calvin’s liturgy was deficient in that deep homage to antiquity which characterizes the English service. The Anglican reformers were anxious to prefer the words of the ancient services. They were as learned as they were devout. While they studied to be useful, they generally found that they could tender the most expressive services in the thoughts which had been hallowed by the early churches. They did not despise good sentiments because they were old, nor prefer them because they were novel. They avoided at once the superstition of Rome and the rashness of Calvin; and their liturgy has been approved, and loved, by the wisest, the best, the most reasonable and learned, as well as the simple and the ignorant, both in life and death. Cranmer thus acted; and Calvin, I believe, neither forgot nor forgave the rejection of the liturgy he had given to Strasburg, which had been used at Glastonbury; and which has been used in the kirk of Scotland, without much alteration, to the present time. However this resentment might have been indulged on the part of Calvin, many of the English reformers did not at that time fully appreciate the value of their own liturgy. They were anxious for changes, and their opinions were supported not only by Calvin, but by the foreign reformers, who were well acquainted with the liturgy of Calvin. The details of this liturgy may not be interesting to all. As much attention, however, has been

lately given to the subject, the curiosity of some may be gratified by a short account, which will enable those who admire the spirit of the English liturgy, to contrast it with their own.

The service of the Lord's Day began with "*Sursum corda.*" Then the first table of the Decalogue was sung in rhyme. Then the pastor, standing at the table, turning to the people, thus begins, *Our help is in the name of the Lord*, etc. A short exhortation follows, to confess their sins. A confession. <sup>F90</sup> Then the pastor rehearseth to the people some sentence out of the Scripture of the remission of sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the people either kneeling or standing all this while. The Gospel is read. The absolution is again repeated. The rest of the Decalogue is sung. The pastor exhorteth them to pray. A very short prayer follows, like one of our collects, that God would give them grace to keep the commandments: and the same collect is sung. The pastor then ascends the pulpit; where he first prays, and then preaches upon the New Testament, beginning some one book of it, and going on till he hath ended the whole book in several sermons. Then follows a prayer. The banns of marriage are published, baptism is celebrated, the sick are particularly prayed for, alms are collected by the deacons; a long prayer, the same with that prescribed in the French form, for the whole church, after sermon, following. Then the Apostles' Creed. Then, when there is a communion, the pastor first rehearseth the institution of that sacrament out of 1 Corinthians 11. and subjoins an excommunication of all idolators, blasphemers, heretics, schismatics, perjured, seditious, contentious, disobedient to parents, whoremongers, thieves, covetous, etc. forbidding any such to partake of the said supper. He then makes an exhortation concerning the Lord's supper. He communicates in both kinds himself; next, the deacon in both kinds; then, all the men first; and after them, the women approach reverently to the table, where the pastor, at one end of the table, gives to every one of them the bread one by one; and the deacon, at the other end of the table, gives them the wine; a psalm of praise being sung during the time, by the people. The pastor, in giving the bread to every one, says, *The bread which we break is the communion of the body of Christ*. The deacon, in giving the cup, says to every one, *The cup which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ*. Then follow the same

thanksgiving and benediction which are at this day used by the French protestants. Here ends the morning service.

At noon, after the singing of a psalm, the children are catechised and instructed in the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, for an hour.

At evening, after a psalm was sung, a sermon follows, with a prayer, and the benediction.

In the daily service; every morning a psalm was sung, a prayer, a sermon, a prayer and benediction in the pulpit <sup>f91</sup>

There was a service of repentance. Every Tuesday was a day of more solemn devotion, to deprecate God's judgments and to confess their sins: a psalm, the confession, a sermon, a long prayer, the same as above.

The service of baptism was the same which is used by the French, except that the parent and godfathers brought the child. The minister asked them, Will you have this child baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost? They answered, This we desire, etc.

The service of the blessing of wedlock, and of visitation of the sick, was the same with the French.

The service for ordination of ministers, and for ecclesiastical discipline, did not much differ from that which the French now use.

Such was the service used by the exiles when settled at Glastonbury, and, no doubt, at Frankfort also when they left England. I omit the description of the English liturgy, drawn up by Knox and Whittingham, and sent to Calvin, which elicited the celebrated *tolerabiles ineptias*. Whoever compares the two — that is, the published form of Pollanus, and the epitome sent from Frankfort, will perceive that the variations between them ought not to have excited the bitterness which both then, and subsequently, characterised the congregation at Frankfort, and their followers, the future nonconformists. There were common to each — sentences of Scripture — the exhortation to confession — absolution <sup>f92</sup> — the gospel — the decalogue — prayer before sermon — sermon. In the English form there are, in addition, the great improvements of the two lessons — the psalms — the epistle — jubilate — the versicles before the

Lord's prayer — with the collects, litany, and part of the communion service.

This was the liturgy to which Foxe had conformed before he left England. We may justly regret that he did not adhere, in the troubles of Frankfort, to those of the exiles who preferred their own service. He did not, however, depart from the Anglican church on his return to England, four years after, on the accession of Elizabeth: and he remained a stedfast conformist to the services, to the hour of his death.

Another motive, which might at this time have been influential with Foxe, was the eminence, in those days of trouble and confusion, of the two men who have now been the chief causes of the great schism among protestants. Personal piety makes error popular. Decision and uncompromising energy often render it permanent. John Calvin and John Knox were the two leaders of that great army of pioneers and guerillas which has cleared the intermediate space for the more disciplined warfare, between episcopacy and papacy. One spirit ruled them. If the rude and fiercer soldiery of the Calvinist and nonconformist had not carried on the war in the manner which, in many instances, cannot be justified, we may rightly doubt whether a greater evil than the temporary ascendancy of their power would not have recurred, in the gradual succumbing of episcopacy under the power of the ancient usurper of its authority. When Foxe took refuge on the continent, the reformer of Geneva, and next to him, the impetuous, the rash, yet noble-minded reformer of Scotland, were regarded as the two most illustrious Christians of their age. The church of England had again received the deadly enemy of its spiritual greatness and influence. The hopes of those who wished well to the freedom of man to worship God in their own language, to possess the Scriptures, and to resist Rome with success, were turned from the dungeons of England, in which those hopes were perishing, to Geneva, Strasburg, and Frankfort. May we not here find some apology for the zealous and humble student, who loved the truth, and imagined that, though it was being extinguished in England, it was beaming on the Continent? Foxe was dazzled by the brightness which still bewilders the aliens from episcopal government, and which still demands our admiration for many great and good qualities, though we deprecate the error which prevents the union of the Trinitarian Christians throughout the world. John Calvin was at this moment the most influential

teacher among all the opponents of Rome.<sup>F93</sup> Luther was dead. Cranmer was imprisoned; and, what was worse, Cranmer was wavering in his stedfastness. Other bishops of the protestant church of England were firm in their resistance; but the disputes about vestments, and the great eagerness of some of their adherents to proceed still further from Rome, had weakened the cause of the protestant English episcopacy, and therefore of the protestant Liturgy. The attention of Europe had been now for more than twenty years directed to Calvin. From his earliest age he had been eminent for his dedication to the study of the Scriptures. He had been compelled, when still a very young man,<sup>f94</sup> to make his escape from Paris in consequence of an harangue spoken by Nicholas Copus, at the suggestion of Calvin. Nicholas Copus was rector of the university, and this harangue is said to have caused the persecution of those who had embraced the reformation principles. Calvin returned, and met Servetus in Paris, during the year 1584; but being again driven away, he settled at Basil. Before his return to Paris, in 1584, he had been received into the house of Lewis de Tillet, canon of the church of Angouleme, where he wrote the greatest part of his "Christian Institution." It was published at Basil in 1585. He first arrived at Geneva in 1586, after a visit to the duchess of Parma, by a circuitous route through Savoy, to escape the spies who were observing him. Geneva at this time abounded with zealots, hating every thing that savoured of popery to such a degree, that many most useful laws and practices were abolished merely on account of their adoption by the church of Rome. Calvin's zeal and energy, his learning and endurance of persecution, so commended him to Farel and others, now at Geneva, that they declared the curse of God would be upon him if he did not undertake the spiritual superintendence of the anti-papal-population of that city. The confused and agitated state of christian people at this moment, can alone afford the least palliation for the conduct of Calvin in departing from the ancient axiom, that none should speak in the name of the church, without the authority of the church; and without the external setting apart also of the person who so spoke, by those to whom the administration of that authority had been confided. He was indefensible in complying with the request of Farel, if, by any possibility, he could have procured the sanction of his episcopal brethren to the office of teacher, preacher, superintendent, or bishop. If this had, indeed, been impossible if the whole mass of the bishops of his age had so taught, and enforced

unscriptural and antichristian error — and if they had, therefore, refused to recognize the teacher who, from the purer fountains of the inspired page, with deep study and devout humility, desired to oppose their errors, and to instruct his brethren — some apology might have been made for his compliance with the request of Farel. We do not read that Calvin endeavored to obtain at this time, whatever he might have subsequently done, the episcopal authority for his efforts, as the report of his having applied to Cranmer for ordination, is not corroborated by any evidence to give it validity. He had already preached before he went to Geneva, without having received episcopal ordination. <sup>F95</sup> Neither was he any further an ecclesiastic, than that he had received the first tonsure. He seems, however, whether there was any necessity or not, to justify the measure, to have acceded to the request of the people, and to have acted as their bishop, without any effort to obtain the sanction of the bishops of the neighborhood to his proceeding. But his influence was increased by his boldness. He had the courage to propose, and the skill to institute, the most strict system of ecclesiastical discipline, and he enacted the most indefensible innovations. The arbitrary spirit, upon which Beza so justly comments, was suited to the hour. He obliged all the people to swear solemnly to a body of doctrines, of which the chief merit seems to have been, that they were the antipodes of popery. He refused to administer the Lord's Supper until certain irregularities (as he deemed them) which subsisted in the church at Geneva, should be rectified. He also declared, that he could not submit to the regulations which had been lately made by the synod of the canton of Berne, and which required the use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, the replacing of the baptismal fonts, which had been removed out of the churches, and observance of the feasts which had been abolished, to be restored at Geneva.

The dissensions thus produced occasioned his expulsion; and he appeared before the world as spoken against by all men, for conscience' sake, as a severe and ascetic reformer, when severity and asceticism were most valued and admired. Between the time of his expulsion from, and return to, Geneva, he went to Basil, and from thence to Strasburg, where he was made professor of divinity; and planted the church or congregation, to which he gave both a liturgy and a discipline. <sup>F96</sup> The imperious, haughty, ambitious, and most decisive character of Calvin, made him act as if the

whole religious reformation depended on himself; and as if the discipline he had established was essentially necessary, not only for the welfare of the churches, but even for the salvation of individual souls. <sup>F97</sup> All this, however, contributed to that superiority which minds of his high order always obtain over their contemporaries. Such men are the true aristocracy of mankind. The unjustifiable tenacity with which he adhered to an opinion which he had but once expressed, so that he is said never to have retracted a sentence or proposition, which he had delivered either in speaking or in writing; together with that arbitrary exercise of his power, which never allowed any deviation from his decision, or any opposition to his mandates; had the beneficial effect, for a short time, of planting a standard, round which the converts might rally; and established a temporary anti-papal infallibility, which neutralized the papal infallibility, till the Anglican episcopal church recovered from the double error of both the Calvinistic and popish presumption. Heresy was still deemed a crime. While the church of Rome anathematized both Calvin and the English reformers, the influence of Calvin was maintained by his inflexible severity towards Castalio, Bolsec, and Servetus; as the influence of Cranmer and his brethren had been upheld by their condemnation of Joan Boucher. Castalio, though he had been recommended by Calvin himself to the college at Geneva, was expelled thence by the counter-recommendation of Calvin, in consequence of some difference of opinion. Bolsec disagreed with him respecting the doctrine of predestination; and this was alleged as a reason why he should be imprisoned. His treatment of Servetus, whom Beza, in the spirit of the age, calls wicked (*impius ille Servetus*), however reprehensible we may deem it to be, was not condemned by the zealots of the age. <sup>F98</sup> He was the great man of his time, in the worldly sense of the word *great*. He desired to make Geneva the mother and mistress of the reformed churches, and to make himself the pope of the anti-papacy of Europe. Such a man could only be the instrument of temporary good. Geneva has become among the lowest of the reformed churches; and the name of Calvin, because of his ambition, error, and dogmatism, has sunk in honor below its proper estimation. The reformers of the church of England, free from personal ambition to exalt themselves — free from political ambition to exalt their church to supremacy over other churches — have been honored above Rome and Geneva to be the benefactors of the christian world. They have been honored as the instruments of establishing

a church which combines all the spirituality and truth which Calvin demanded; and all the valuable discipline which Rome is justified in desiring. Foxe had approved their labors before his emigration; he approved them after his return. We may justly believe that he approved them at this moment; but he believed that the prayer-book of Calvin, which was first used at Strasburg, afterwards at Glastonbury, and then at Frankfort, did not clash with the use of the English prayer-book in other parts of the continent, or in England, if the exiles returned, lie submitted to the influence of Calvin in the places where that influence had banished the common enemy, which was now beginning to consign his brethren at home to the dungeon and to the flame.

The zeal with which John Knox, who had taken priest's orders in the church of Rome,<sup>f99</sup> and who had been employed by Cranmer, after many vicissitudes at Berwick and Newcastle-upon-Tyne, embraced also the opinions and discipline of John Calvin, may have much influenced the mind of the martyrologist. Knox was of the same unbending, bold disposition as Calvin. Having made his escape from England, in the year 1554, he landed at Dieppe, traveled through France and Switzerland, and settled at Geneva, where he formed a friendship with Calvin. In the September of this year, he was invited to Frankfort. He had a higher opinion of Calvin than of any other reformer. Before he left England, indeed, his opinions had not been in strict accordance with those of the English reformers, and he diverged much further from them during his residence near Calvin. He considered the liturgy which Calvin had drawn up, to be more perfect than the Service-Book of Edward, and was anxious, in compliance with Calvin's own desire, to introduce it wherever he was appointed to minister.

But though the influence of these zealous opponents of the Service-Book of king Edward may have contributed to the unfortunate inconsistency of Foxe, I believe the principal cause of his secession from the party at Frankfort, who adhered to the Anglican service, was the rashness and vehemence of that learned and eminent reformer, whose zeal was equally directed against both papist and puritan. Richard Cox, like all his brother reformers, had been attached to the doctrines of the church of Rome. He had been admitted a junior canon of Wolsey's "Cardinal College" at Oxford, and left Cambridge for that preferment. He became attached to the

principles of Luther, and of the reformation; and demonstrated his zeal for his new opinions by destroying, in the various stations to which his learning and merit raised him, a great number of rare and valuable books which favored the church he had forsaken. He retained, as so many did, the intolerance of Rome, without its other errors. The same vehemence with which he assailed Rome, characterised his defense of the liturgy, and his hatred of the service-book of John Calvin. The manner in which he introduced the Anglican form at Frankfort, has been already related. As the church of England is the middle ground between popery and puritanism, so churchmen are then rightly understood, when they resist the mass on the one hand, or ill-considered modes of worship on the other. Cox proved his sincere admiration of the liturgy, by refusing, when he was bishop of Ely, to administer in the chapel royal, because the queen continued to use the crucifix, and lights on the altar. <sup>F100</sup> He resisted the injunctions of the queen in respectful language and submissive demeanor; but his firmness was equal to his courtesy. If he had behaved with equal courtesy, but with no less unflinching firmness, at Frankfort, I believe it to be probable that the schism between the exiles would not have been continued in England; that the prayer-book of Calvin, being weighed by its own merits, would have been regarded, as it is, less preferable than that of the Anglican Church; that the puritan rebellion itself might not have taken place; and that the painful inconsistency which John Foxe shared in common with so many of his brother exiles, would have been avoided. The church of England, and the individual churchmen who uphold her sacred cause, will only then do justice to the ark of God committed to their trust, when they boldly declare to their countrymen of the communions both of Rome and of Geneva, and all others, that their liturgy is worthy of reception and adoption, not only because of its antiquity, and of the authority which enforces its observance; but because of its usefulness, holiness, and adaptation to the spiritual necessities of those who believe in the divinity and atonement of the Son of God. They must convince the world, as they may do, that it commends itself to the heart, by its force — to the intellect, by its wisdom — to the ignorant, by its simplicity — to the learned, by its fullness. It has conquered, and it does conquer, in Scotland, America, and England; and it will, wherever it is known, gradually conquer, throughout the civilized world, all other forms of worship. As mankind progresses in knowledge, and adds to that knowledge, faith in the gospel of

Jesus Christ, the holy, useful, humble eloquence of these prayers will present the best clothing of christian devotion. But it is with religious truth as with any other. If a man is suddenly commanded by rude and uncourteous violence, to believe that two and two make four, though the truth is immutable, the offended pride of the insulted man inclines him, at the moment, to deny the very truth which his own calm reason would perceive and approve. So it was with the exiles at Frankfort, and with John Foxe among the number. The violent interruption of the worship at Frankfort, and the forcible introduction of the scriptural liturgy of the Anglican church, alienated some for the moment, and some for a longer period, from the very prayer-book which their reason would have approved. The puritan rebellion might, possibly, have been avoided, if Cox had either remained at Strasburg; or if he had persevered in commending the English liturgy by reasoning and persuasion, and not by rashness and violence, to the exiles at Frankfort.

Immediately prior to his departure from Frankfort to Basil, Foxe had written to Peter Martyr respecting the desire of the English at Frankfort to appoint that reformer to the office of lecturer in divinity among them. We learn from his letter that Foxe was not anxious to leave Frankfort.<sup>F101</sup> He was deeply sensible of favors. The opulent men of the city had bountifully contributed to the support and protection of himself and his fellow-exiles; and he has permanently recorded his gratitude to them by his Epistle Dedicatory to his **“Christus Triumphans.”**<sup>F102 L3</sup> His friend Nowell, too, remained at Frankfort; and if Peter Martyr would have accepted the offer of the exiles to lecture to the congregation who were now united under Cox, it is probable he would have continued his residence in that city. We may lament that he did not. In that case the very appearance of sanctioning the opposition to the unaltered English liturgy would have been withheld. Whatever were the opinions he had formed respecting the proceedings of Cox, in the disputes concerning the liturgy, by which the breach among the refugees was rendered irreparable on the continent, and eventually in England, John Foxe never thought of resenting this conduct by separating from his communion. He seems to have been utterly exempted from that strange and most unjustifiable weakness, of permitting his decision in questions of religion, to depend on his good or bad opinion of the theologian, who propounded them. Peter Martyr declined to accept the

Divinity chair at Frankfort, for reasons which cannot now be ascertained. It is possible that he believed his instructions would be unacceptable; or that he could not depend on the willingness of the English merchants to continue their support. He was at Strasburg when the invitation was sent to him; and he does not appear to have been much attached to that place, as he accepted, in the following year, the situation of lecturer at Zurich. The precariousness of provision was, therefore, the probable motive: <sup>f103</sup> and his refusal to leave Strasburg for Frankfort, together with the representations made to Foxe, by both Martyr and Grindal, that he would find more encouragement at Basil than at Frankfort, and not any intention or desire to unite himself to John Knox, and his brethren, who had preceded him to Basil, finally induced the martyrologist to proceed with his family to that destination; and to become the corrector of the press to his friend Oporinus, the printer.

The more public life of Foxe, as an author, may be said to commence at this period, 1555. Basil was, at this time, says his son, “much celebrated for the great friendship and courtesy showed to those of the English nation: for which cause many famous men, withdrawing themselves from the cruelty of the times, had escaped thither out of England. Of these were marty but of slender estate, who, some one way and some another, but the most part, gained their livelihood by reviewing and correcting the press. This place, for careful printing, and plenty of diligent and wealthy men in that profession, then surpassed all the cities of Germany; and they preferred the industry of our men, in that employment, before any of their own countrymen.”

“To these men Mr. Foxe joined himself, so much the better liked of, because having been always inured to hardness, and in his youth put to the trial of his patience, he had learned how to endure labor; and that which seemed the greatest misery to others, to suffer want, to sit up late, and keep hard diet, were to him but the sports of fortune.” He did not, however, devote himself to the mere mechanical labors required in a reader for the press. He proceeded to collect the materials for the completion of his Ecclesiastical History. There were no annual registers, magazines, journals, nor newspapers, in that day, for recording the events which daily took place in the courts of law; or of the transactions, whether at home or abroad, which most interested the public. The want of such sources of

information was deeply felt. It appeared to the reformers, and to the protestants of the day, absolutely necessary that the cruelties which the enforcement of the laws against heresy had inflicted so mercilessly, and so needlessly, against the Anglican and-papal church, should be permanently recorded. They could not any longer permit such transactions to be confined to the registers of the bishops, or to the memory of their contemporaries. Foxe was already known to the reformers as a laborious and zealous annalist; he appeared, therefore, to be the fittest instrument to record the consequences of the re-enactment of the persecuting statutes; and Foxe was as anxious to write, as they were to contribute, the materials of his pages. Details of the transactions in England were sent, therefore, to Grindal, one of the chief refugees, who communicated them to Foxe; and thus commenced the authentic compilation which the church of England, till within the present age, has uniformly deemed so useful and so valuable. The letter is still extant which proves this to have been the origin of the chief part of the work of Foxe. It is preserved among the Harleian manuscripts. Foxe, in that letter, acknowledges having received from Grindal the account of Bradford's death. He highly extols his faith and diligence; and does not doubt but that he has many such histories; also, that he will as faithfully and diligently make like inquiry for the future. He then says, he had at length concluded a bargain with Froschoverus, and that in October his first book would appear. <sup>F104</sup> He adds, that he was completely without money, and reduced to the last penny: and that for two months he had been occupied in completing the agreement. Froschoverus had come to him with letters from Aylmer and Bullinger, bargaining with him for certain things at the next fair, which he readily agreed to. He was about to write to Haddon, but suddenly heard he was dead. He wished to thank Haddon for a kindness conferred, and also to tell him what he was doing. <sup>F105</sup> He lived with Anthony Gilby, at Frankfort, when John Knox was unjustly accused, and afterwards banished the city.

In the reply of Grindal to a second letter of Foxe, he alludes to another request, that he would send him, with equal fidelity, the narrative of the martyrdom of Cranmer. <sup>F106</sup> There can be no doubt that similar communications were the chief sources of the histories of the martyrdoms which Foxe relates. The accounts were sent by the spectators of the murderous executions, to their friends on the continent; and from these, as

well as from other authentic records, after the most ample examination, they were printed by the martyrologist. An expression occurs in the first of the letters to which I have last alluded, which requires some attention from the light which it throws upon the many labors in which Foxe was now engaged. He informs Grindal that he doubts whether two of his letters had been received, because he makes no mention of the books of Cranmer. This refers to the subject of Cranmer having defended the doctrine of the Eucharist, as still received in the Anglican Church, against the arguments of Oardiner in favor of Transubstantiation. As early as 1630, Cranmer had published a work to refute the advocates of the celebration of the mass.

<sup>F107</sup> Gardiner, who was then a prisoner in the Tower, wrote an answer to this publication. <sup>F108</sup> The controversy caused considerable excitement. The doctrine of transubstantiation was maintained with so much zeal by the Romanists — its denial was made so uniformly the criterion of heresy — it was regarded with so much devotion by the people, in consequence of the great earnestness with which it had been so much insisted upon, that it was resigned with more difficulty than any other of the long-received errors — it was the last tenet which Cranmer himself, who, in common with all his brethren, had been educated a Romanist, believed to be indefensible. When, therefore, Cranmer had arrived at the conclusion that this doctrine was untenable, and announced that conclusion to the world, his book may be said to have sealed his doom. Gardiner undertook to refute Cranmer; and to prove the truth of the long-received opinion of the transformation of the wafer into the very body and blood, which had been sacrificed upon the cross. The result of their respective works would consequently be considered, at such a moment of religious fervor, as of vital or fatal interest to the cause of the Reformation. The reply of Cranmer was completed and printed in September 1661, but the power of the press was at this moment so much dreaded, that even the primate, the chief person of the commission which ruled the kingdom during the minority of Edward, was compelled to ask the favor of the permission of its publication. A proclamation had been issued while the work was at press, prohibiting the printing or sale of English books without the allowance of the king or privy council. Both parties had frequently resorted to these intolerable prohibitions, by which free discussion was prevented; and both religion and liberty alike suffered. The archbishop himself, therefore, was compelled to solicit, from the secretaries of state,

permission to publish his book after it was printed, by which the public were obliged to wait a month for the contents. The day, we may believe, will never again arrive when two controversialists, who had held the respective offices of archbishop and lord chancellor, will again discuss this topic; or if they do so, be debarred from the free use of the press. I subjoin Cranmer's letter. <sup>F109</sup>

The book was at length published under the title — “An Answer by the Reverend Father in God, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitan, unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation, devised by Stephen Gardiner, Doctor of Law, late Bishop of Winchester, against the True and Godly Doctrine of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Savior Christ, wherein is also, as occasion serveth, answered such places of the Book of Dr. Richard Smith, as may seem anything worthy the answering. Also, a True Copy of the Book written, and in open Court delivered by Dr. Stephen Gardiner, not one word added or diminished; but faithfully, in all points agreeing with the Original.” Gardiner, under the reigned name of Marcus Antonius Constantius, <sup>f110</sup> answered the archbishop through the Paris Press. <sup>F111</sup> Cranmer undertook the rejoinder to this work also. He completed three books. Before, however, his labor was finished, Edward died; Gardiner was released; Cranmer imprisoned; and two of the books perished with their author at Oxford. “The third,” says his biographer, “fell into the hands of Foxe, and has, by this time, probably perished also.” <sup>F112</sup> What use Foxe made of the pages to which Strype refers, we know not; but the second work of Cranmer, which he published in reply to Gardiner, was deemed by Peter Martyr, Grindal, Aylmer, and other reformers, to be so conclusive, and so valuable, that they requested Foxe, when he was at Frankfort, to translate it into Latin for the common benefit of the reformed church. Foxe complied with their request, but had not completed the undertaking when he removed to Basil. He seems to have experienced more difficulty in translating the sentences of Gardiner than he could possibly have anticipated. <sup>F113</sup> “Most learned sir,” he says, in a letter to Peter Martyr, “you would scarcely believe how much pains that great dispute of my lord of Canterbury cost me; which by means of you, and the persuasion of my friends, I undertook to translate. I never saw anything more unpleasant, rough, and intangled, than Winchester's discourse: wherein sometimes he is

so full of depths, that he needs; some sibyl rather than an interpreter. Yea, I doubt whether any sibyl be such a riddle resolver, or Apollo so great a prophet, to be able everywhere to comprehend his sense. In the third book there be one or two places, where you may sooner draw water from a pumice, than find light for the sentence. In his periods, for the most part, he is so profuse, or rather infinite, that he seems twice to forget himself; rather than to find his end. The whole phrase hath in effect that structure, that consisting for the most part of relatives, it refuses almost all the grace of translation. Whence how great difficulty arises upon me, it will be easy for you to guess. The archbishop of Canterbury is somewhat softer, but so much the longer; whereby, if it doth not create me more trouble, yet certainly as much labor. To these dark sentences happeneth moreover the want of books and doctors, cited up and down herein. And you know, how it is not handsome to bring in doctors speaking otherwise than in their own words. This thing will oblige me shortly to resort to your Strasburg for a month or two, to beg the aid of some library. In the first book Winchester cites your name with Luther and Bucer, laying to your charge the imputation of a forger or a liar. But the archbishop of Canterbury, on the other hand, omits nothing for the defense of the name of his friend Peter. I shall send over to you the very place translated, together with the remaining part now finished.” <sup>F114</sup>

Peter Martyr, however, encouraged him to proceed. The murder of Cranmer at the beginning of 1656, before the translation was finished, gave new interest to the task. Grindal, also, exhorted him to persevere. The love of labor in Foxe was so great that these exhortations were seldom necessary. Yet, whether it was that the harshness and obscurity of Gardiner’s style, of which he so much complained, prevented him from succeeding — whether his historical labors demanded his leisure — or whether his daily task for his employers, the printers, occupied his time, this translation was not finished till the year 1557. The printing of it then commenced at Basil. It was not then all published, though it was finished. <sup>F115</sup> I mention these things to show the severe labors which John Foxe was now undertaking at Basil. He toiled in a printing-office for his daily bread. He maintained a correspondence in Latin with M. F. Illyricus, and with the most learned persons in Europe. He was collecting materials for the most voluminous work which England has hitherto seen on ecclesiastical

history. He was engaged, moreover, in translating a large controversial work, in which rapid progress was prevented by the fastidiousness of his refined taste and scholarship, contending with wilful obscurity disguising or perverting truth.

In addition to these harassing engagements we must remember that the miserable dissensions which had divided the exiles at Frankfort now broke out at Basil. The party which seceded from Frankfort still continued their wretched antipathy to the English prayer-book. Their inconsistency in so doing was perhaps most decidedly proved by their objecting to the use of the Ten Commandments as a portion of the service, when that very part of our Liturgy, though it was not actually borrowed from the Liturgy of their master, Calvin, was incorporated in the amended service-book of that reformer, commended to their approbation by Valerandus Pollanus. <sup>F116</sup> They called the communion-office a popish communion; and said it had a popish face. They undertook to set up a new service in the congregation of Basil. The account of these sad contentions may be seen in Strype. <sup>F117</sup> The part which Foxe might have taken in them is not recorded. He could not have commanded leisure to have embarked in them very actively. They probably disturbed his peace, though they might not have employed his time. A letter from Bale, afterwards bishop of Ossory, gives us the best account of these painful disputes; and from the forcible manner in which it appeals to the understanding on a question which must again be discussed, it is worthy of attention. It was addressed to Mr. Ashley

“My special friend, master Ashley, after my accustomed salutations in the Lord: This shall be to assure you I have received your gentle letters, and am very joyful for that you are willing now to resort unto us. And whereas you desire before your coming to know the state of our church; to be plain in few words, it is troublous at this present. I find the admonishment of S. Paul to Timothy, and of S. Peter to the dispersed brethren, most true, and in full force in this miserable age. They said, that *in the latter times should come mockers, liars, blasphemers, and fierce despisers*. We have them, we have them, Master Ashley; we have them even from among ourselves: yea, they be at this present our elders, and their factious affinity. When we require to have *common prayers*, according to our English order, they tell us, that the magistrate wil

in no case suffer it; which is a most manifest ly. They mock the rehearsal of God's commandments, and of the epistles and gospels in our communion, and say, they are misplaced; they blaspheme our communion, calling it a *popish mas*,<sup>f118</sup> and say, that it hath a popish face, with other fierce despisings and cursed speakings. These mocks, and these blasphemies, with such like, they take for invincible theology. With these they build, with these they boast, with these they triumph, in erecting their church of the *purity*.

“But wheras they report our communion to have a *popish* face, I desire you to mark that which followeth here, and to judge their impudency. The face of a popish mass is the shew of the whole action, with the instruments and ceremonies thereunto appertaining. To that face chiefly belongeth a monstrous brothel, or ape of antichrist, with shaven crowns; side-gowns, oyl in thumbs, tippet, portas, and mas-book. Our communion hath none such. To the face appertaineth on autre: which we have not. To that face belongeth a superaltare, a chalice, a cover, a cake, a corporas, cruets, candlesticks, censers, and lights; which we have none. To that face belongeth vestments, crisable, amyss, albe, girdle, stole, altar-cloth, torch, and towel; beside the holy suffragre for pope, for pestilence, and for old meseled swine; which our communion hath not. What then may be thought of our unnatural and bastardly brethren, that so falsely report it, so maliciously mock, so unlearnedly ly open, so seditiously slander it, so wickedly blaspheme it, and so villainously contemn it.

“Our communion, on the other side, beginneth with prayer unto God in the mother tongue; so doth not the mas. It sheweth us the commandments of God; it teacheth us the necessary articles of our christian faith; so doth not the mas. It bringeth both the law and the gospel, to shew us both damnation and redemption; so doth not the mas. It moveth us to acknowledg our sins; it stirreth us up to repentance for them; it exhorteth us to mortification of our sinful flesh; so doth not the mas. It preacheth the Lord's death til he come; it calleth for a worthy preparation for so heavenly a supper; it promiseth ful remission of our sins through Christ's gainful sufferings; so doth not the popish mas. It giveth high thanks to

God for our redemption; it praiseth the eternal Majesty for the same, and wisheth the true receivers to depart from thence in his most holy peace and perpetual blessing, and continue always; so doth not the abominable mas: *ergo*, our holy communion hath not the face of a popish mas, as our new Catharites have most wickedly, maliciously, mockingly, falsely, frantickly, unlearnedly, loudly, seditiously, blasphemously, and beastly reported and written to their affinity or proselytes; yea, more like devils than men. And they boast of the glory of God, of sincerity, of the world, and of the highest *purity* in religion.

“But the truth of it is, they seek to set up in their idleness (as they are all idle, saving in this point) a seditious faction, in contempt of the English order, for their own pharisaical advancement, planting the foresaid lyes, mocking, and blasphemies, as the first principles of their building.

“This write I unto you, that they should not in this behalf pervert you, as they have done other men. I would not in the mean time, that this should discourage you from coming towards us, but that you might come the sooner, with other good men, to help to repress their malicious and idle enterprizes. Thus, though we be not in JEngland among the wicked papists now, yet are we molested of idle brethren, as wickedly occupied as they, though in another kind. The times are perilous. Thus farewel in the Lord, and commend us to al our good brethren.” <sup>F119</sup>

This letter is valuable on another account. It gives us the time and place when and where the puritans, as a party, first took their rise.

Nonconformity was kindled at Frankfort; Puritanism at Basil, among a few exiles. They have rent the church of Christ, and done infinite harm to pure and vital Christianity. “Behold, how great a matter a little fire kindleth!”

About the time of his arrival at Basil, Foxe is supposed to have written to the honorable Robert Bertie <sup>f120</sup> and his wife, the duchess of Suffolk, the beautiful letter, of which a part is still preserved, — “The grace of God, in Jesus Christ,” it begins, “which aydeth, governeth, and conducteth all such as truly put their confydence in hym, be multiplied upon you and your vertuouse yok fellow, that as by the holy institutyon of the Lorde, ‘ye are

called to be one flesshe, so by fayth you being one in mynde may in the unytie of Christes spyryt lik true yook felowes bears the crosse with pacyence, and folowe our guyde and fore leader Christ Jesus, Amen.

“Whan I understood by your fryndly letters sent to my brother what our good God and moost sweats father hath donne for you and other members of his mystycall bodye, in delyveryng you out of that myserable land, from the danger of Idollatrye and fearefull companye of Herodyans: I was compelled with a gladde hart to render unto his dyvine majestie moost humble thanks, besechyng hym that as he hath delyvered you from their contagious venym and deathlie stinge with a saffe conscyence, so he will vouchsafe to protects and preserve it styll undefyled. To forsake your country, to despice your commodyties at home, to contempne rycheis and to set naught by honors which the whole woorld hath in gret veneracyon, for the love of the sacred gospell of Christ, are not workes of the flesshe, but the most assured frutes of the holye goost, and undesueable argumentes of your regeneracye or new birth. Whereby God certyfyeth you that ye are iustfyed in hym and sealed (to) eternall lift: therefore ye have gret cause to be thankfull, first that he hath chosen you to liff; and secondly that he hath geven you his holy Sperryt which hath altered and changed you quite a news creature, working in you thorow the word such a mynd that thes thinges are not paynefull but pleasant unto you. Agayne to be delyvered from the bondage of conscyence from the”... (Unfinished.)

On the back of this, reversing the leaf, is the following: —

“Not but the lord wyll bryng us as he did them into our dere cuntry, or into his kyngdom which further exceedeth it than the bright sunne doth the dark night. I can not (derely beloved) recompens the gret gentyllnes I have receyved at your handes, but I leave that to God my father which hath moved your hart to such liberalytie, who I am well assured wyll not leave it unrecompensed; not withstanding to testylve my dew thanks, I have sent you this poore letter, poore indede but yet playne and true, following the example of a poor Persyan named Cinata, who being farre from

whom (home) and sodaynely metyng with the kyng of the land named Artaxerxes, and seeing every man presenting him with giftes, made haste to (a) certayne well called Cyrum and toke up a lytle water in his hand, and after he had saluted the kyng he said having nothing o kyng better to present"... (Unfinished also.) <sup>f121</sup>

Though this letter is generally thought to have been addressed to Mr. Berrie and his wife, the duchess of Suffolk, upon their arrival abroad, it is difficult to trace any connection between Foxe and these parties. Charles Brandon, the first duke of Suffolk, married Mary, sister to Henry VIII., and widow of Lewis XII., king of France, to whom she had been married at Abbeville the 9th of October, 1514, being St. Dennis's-day. Lewis died about three months after his marriage. His widow soon after was privately married to the duke of Suffolk, before they quitted Paris. They had three children — one son, Henry, earl of Lincoln, who died without issue, and two daughters, Frances and Eleanor. Frances married Henry Grey, marquis of Dorset, who, after the death of Charles Brandon, in 1546, and of his two sons, was created duke of Suffolk, in 1551, by Edward VI., at the instigation of the duke of Northumberland, of which marriage Lady Jane Grey was the offspring. We have evidence of the high estimation in which Foxe's talents and knowledge were held by this amiable and accomplished princess, in the acknowledgment from himself of the first suggestion respecting his undertaking to write the Acts and Monuments of the Church having been made to him by Lady Jane. The duchess of Suffolk, <sup>f122</sup> mother of Lady Jane, who, after the death of the duke, married Adrian Stokes, died on Midsummer-eve, 1563. Eleanor, sister to the duchess, married Henry Clifford, earl of Cumberland. Thus may the purport of this strain of congratulation be associated with recollections, dearer to the writer, than are expressed in the fragment of the epistle.

The latter part of this letter would almost lead us to suppose that Foxe had received kindness from the hands of Mr. Berrie himself, while at Oxford. The circumstances related in the note will fix the place whence it; was written, Basil, though not the date. It could not have been earlier than 1555, nor later than 1558, as it was addressed to them when abroad. It shows that Foxe was always ready to give consolation under afflictive dispensations; as his pleading against the wicked statutes of Mary prove him to have anticipated, as great minds only can anticipate, the spirit of a

more enlightened age, and to have been the zealous and eloquent advocate of religious forbearance.

While these transactions were harassing the exiles on the continent, the storm of persecution was raging in its utmost severity in England. Pole had arrived in London <sup>f123</sup> to reconcile the nation to the still unreformed and unchanging church of Rome. The council of Trent was still sitting. In that council the several doctrines which divided the believers in christianity were supposed to be discussed. The results of the deliberations of this council were not waited for, by the legate. His desire, and that of the court, was to uphold the supremacy of Rome at all hazards, as a bounden duty to God. This may be inferred from the language of the absolution. The two houses of parliament were summoned to Whitehall. The bishop of Winchester addressed them, stating that the cardinal had come from Rome as legate *a latere*, upon business of the most weighty concern, which, at the queen's pleasure, he would make known to them himself. He made a long oration to them, in which he thanked the king and queen for the repeal of his attainder — exhorted them all to be reconciled to the holy see, and expressed his readiness to receive them into its bosom. The next day <sup>f124</sup> a supplication was drawn up, to be presented to the cardinal, desiring their reunion and absolution. This the parliament presented to the king and queen, who, having risen from their seats and made obeisance to Pole, presented it to him. He then caused his commission to be read, and pronounced their absolution, and reception into the bosom of the church; the two houses being upon their knees before him. The form of their humiliating pardon, and restoration to the favor of his holiness, was this:

—

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, which with his most precious bloud hath redeemed and washed us from all our sins and iniquities, that he might purchase unto himselfe a glorious spouse without spot or wrinkle, and whom the Father hath appointed head over all his church; he by his mercie absolve you. And we, by the apostolike authoritie given unto us by the most holie lord pope Julius the third (his vicegerent in earth) do absolve and deliver you, and every of you, with the whole realm, and the dominions thereof, from all heresic and schism, and from all and every judgements, censures, and pain for that cause incurred. And also wee do restore you

again to the unity Of our mother the holie church, as in our letters of commission more plainly shall appear.” <sup>F125</sup>

Such restoration to the unity of the church, was but restoration to the authority of Rome. This, and this alone, was the real object of the papal party. This was the object at which they aimed in the reign of Elizabeth, when the pope offered to sanction the liturgy of the church of England, provided his supremacy was acknowledged by the queen. This is the object which is still pursued, with unabated zeal, by the same reviving party, in our own day. The great controversy does not respect religion so much as it respects the ascendancy of an ecclesiastical dictator, and the predominance in the political government of Great Britain, of the faction, who are servants of the pontiff.

When the reconciliation of England to the ecclesiastical usurpation of Rome had been completed, the next step unavoidably and naturally followed — the attempt to compel the subject to profess the religion and to follow the example of the sovereign, the court, and the legislature. It was “deemed advisable,” as one of our modern historians smoothly and courteously observes, to revive the statutes which had been formerly enacted to suppress the doctrines of the Lollards. “It had been held,” says Dr. Lingard, “that by the common law of the land, heresy was a crime punishable with death: and it was deemed advisable to revive the Anti-Lollardian statutes.” <sup>F126</sup> They were revived; and the consequence of their revival is too well known to render necessary the recapitulation of the fearful consequences that followed these proceedings, or to enlarge upon the wretched executions that disgraced the legislature of England for three years and seven months, from the martyrdom of Rogers, the prebendary of St. Paul’s, <sup>f127</sup> to the proclamation which forbade the spectators of the executions to pray at the burning of heretics; and the increasing severity of the government till the death of the queen. I omit, therefore, the queen’s directions to her council for their proceedings in matters of religion, with the commission of Philip and Mary “for a severer way of proceeding against heretics.” The death of the queen alone prevented the establishment of an inquisition, and the probable extinction, therefore, in England, as effectually as in Spain, of the united liberty, and pure christianity, of the protestant episcopal church. The conduct of the queen was in unison with the determination of all the Roman Catholic princes. They had determined

to root out heresy, by fire and sword. The parliament of England supported the queen. The people were in despair. There was no opposition in the legislature, no periodical press, to submit to the court the public disapprobation of its measures. The exiles only ventured to remonstrate at the commencement of the persecution; and John Foxe, after the deaths of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, addressed to the queen and principal nobility an expostulation, worthy of his gentle nature, and the holiness of the cause of the and-papal church of England. The petition of the exiles <sup>f128</sup> represented to the queen “the danger of being carried away by a blind and furious zeal to persecute the members of Christ’s church, as St. Paul had done before his conversion.” They remind her of “the manner in which Cranmer had preserved her in her father’s time, so that she had more reason to believe he loved her, and would speak truth to her, than all the rest of the clergy.” They collected many passages out of the writings of Gardiner, Bonner, and Tunstal, against the pope’s supremacy, and her mother’s marriage; concluding thence, that they were men, who, by their own confession, had no conscience in them, but measured their actions and professions by their fears and interests. They told her that the persecution which she had set on foot, was like that which the scribes and Pharisees raised against the apostles, who, it was pretended, had been once of their religion, and so were heretics and apostates. They reminded her, that in her brother’s reign, none of the catholics had been used with the rigour which she had authorized; and, in conclusion, they represented to her, that she was entrusted with the sword by God, for the protection of her people, as long as they did well, and was to answer to him for their blood, if she delivered them to the mercy of such wolves. From the queen, the petition turns to the nobility, and the people; warning them of the danger of losing their liberties, and the abbey-lands, and of being brought under the Spanish yoke. In the conclusion, it exhorts them to repent of their great sins which had brought such heavy judgments upon them, and to intercede with her majesty to put a stop to this deluge of blood, by granting her subjects the same liberty that she allowed to strangers, of transporting themselves abroad. This petition had no effect.

The expostulatory letter of John Foxe was addressed to the commissioners. It has been considered one of the most eloquent appeals of that day. It was contrary to his disposition, he said, to interfere with the

duties of his superiors in their high stations; yet the people had now fallen into such straits, that as they could neither be silent without impiety, nor speak without danger, he begged them to consider, not so much what courtesy, as what duty, might require. “Who,” he says, “most exalted fathers, can bear this; who will not deplore it; whom will it not draw to groans and tears, even if he have never seen England, to hear of so much christian blood being shed in the land: that so many ingenious citizens, so many honorable and innocent men, promiscuously, with women, are daily in danger of their lives and fortunes — are slain, burnt, and torn to pieces, almost without bounds and number? If the barbarians from farthest Turkey, or a fierce enemy from some other quarter, invading England, had caused such a slaughter of the nation, perhaps neither the calamity nor the complaint would have been less. This cruelty would have been the same in reality, yet the opinion of the nation would have lessened it. But now those persons, whose safety belongs principally to you, ye see and allow to be apprehended, to be hunted after, to be torn in pieces and lacerated — English, their country-men — magistrates, those under their command — Christians, those of the same religion. Those who, under the government of the most celebrated prince Edward VI., enjoyed when at home, not only security of life, but even pleasure; now, the aspect of human affairs being changed towards them, are deprived by dreadful torments of that life which they cannot protect; not that their life or manners are changed, but because the times have changed.

“And where is the gentleness of Paul, where is your mercy, most gentle lords, where that ancient and ever-lauded piety of the English, even towards their enemies, if, among yourselves, ye desire to be so fierce and deadly? I know that the variety of dispositions in the world is great, almost numberless, both among men and among animals; but surely nothing is so becoming and natural to honorable men, nothing is so agreeable to this nature as a certain generous disposition and ingenuousness of manners; which benefits every one, does harm to none, unless it hath received an injury, and not then indeed, unless more by compulsion than of its own desire: and that more for the public good, than its own cruelty. Generous piety will indeed forget its own injuries, and be more desirous for the preservation than the destruction of the wretched (offenders);

excusing, defending, assisting them, and relinquishing the accusation, whenever they can find an opportunity of mercy.

“But now so great is the degeneracy of men, or shall I say, of the times, that towards men, not only not wicked, but of an innocent and blameless life, by whom none of you have been injured, or are likely to be injured, but towards men, good, publicly as well as privately, the cruelty of some so burns, that there is no hostile nation however barbarous, where they cannot sleep safer, than among their own people.” He expresses deep regret that “what nature among unbelieving nations, and literature among civilized ones, have been able to accomplish, piety, the power of the gospel, and that kindness so often inculcated by Christ, are unable to excite among the English: but for the slightest cause, yea, even for no cause at all, they are hurried to punishment, so cold everywhere is brotherly love, that I know not but that the same will be inflicted upon me which happened to Justin Martyr, the apologist for the early Christians, who, while he pleaded for the martyrs, himself suffered martyrdom.” <sup>F129</sup> The date of the queen’s commission against heretics, <sup>f130</sup> **determines this letter of Foxe to have been written from Basil.** <sup>L17</sup>

The circulation of this admirable letter; the publications which Foxe had already given to the world; and the knowledge which his fellow-exiles possessed of his former volume published at Strasburg in 1554, containing the account of the Wicliffite persecution, pointed him out to his brethren as the fittest person to record the actions and deaths of the martyrs in England. While, therefore, he continued to correct the press for Oporinus, he devoted all his leisure to the reconstruction of his Ecclesiastical History, and to the compilation of the materials for its invaluable additions, up to his own time. The edition of 1559, published at Basil soon after the death of Mary, was chiefly prepared for Oporinus. In his address to the reader, prefixed to the first book of this edition, he observes, that as his former attempt had succeeded to his wish, he now rejoiced to turn his attention to the martyrs of Germany, Gaul, and Italy. The first book contains the account of the persecutions of the Wicliffites and Hussites — the second, the stormy times of Luther to the death of Henry VIII. — and the third, the persecutions under Mary up to that very time. <sup>F131</sup> In this part of the work, he received material assistance from Grindal, who was then at Strasburg; he designed it to be a “History of the Persecutions of the

Church of Christ, and especially in the later times of it.” Many accounts of the acts and disputations, of the sufferings and ends of the godly men under queen Mary, came from time to time to Grindal’s hands; who had a correspondence with several in England for that end and purpose. And as they came to his hand, he conveyed them to Foxe. Nor did he only do this; but he frequently gave Foxe his thoughts concerning them, and his instructions and counsels about them; always shewing a most tender regard to truth; nor adopting common reports and relations till more satisfactory evidence came from good hands. And because a complete account of all particulars of those that suffered in that sharp persecution could not so soon be procured, he advised Foxe, for the present, to print separately the acts of some particular men, of whom any sure and authentic relations came to hand: and that a larger and more complete history of these martyrs should be printed together afterwards, when he should be supplied with fuller accounts of the whole persecutions. And, finally, that his history might be both in Latin and English, for the more general benefit, <sup>f132</sup> he began soon after Bradford’s death <sup>f133</sup> to transmit papers to Foxe, and continued to do so till he returned to England. In the year following, <sup>f134</sup> Foxe requested Grindal to take some pains to describe the life and death of archbishop Cranmer. Foxe profited much by his advice, and in the year 1557 recommended that the History as far as the end of the reign of king Henry VIII. should be got ready. <sup>F135</sup> In the year following, Mary died, when the greater number of the exiles returned home. Foxe, at the persuasion of Grindal and Sampson, continued at Basil to complete his work; and till they might have more certain and larger intelligences out of England of the late persecution. <sup>F136</sup> This must have been supplied to Foxe, from England; because the edition of 1559 contains the account of the disputations and deaths of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer.

In the prooemium to the second book, he says, those who have attended to the nature of different lands, say that in Egypt, which is much infested with poisons, there also the best remedies are to be found. He applies the comparison to England. Having treated, in the first part, of those who contended for the faith before the times of Luther, he now proceeds to those from his time till the end of Edward VI. placing them in order as the events of their life occurred: so that the light of history for the future may be more apparent, when a continued succession of blessed martyrs is

known to be in the church. In this book Thomas Hylton and Patrick Hamilton are mentioned; and it begins with the story of Richard Hunn.

The third book was probably completed after the departure of Grindal from Strasburg, and was no doubt compiled from the accounts and letters which were sent to him from London. In the prooemium, Foxe says it cost him much labor to collect the number of martyrs, whom the five years' tempest had swept away, to the number of more than five hundred: and if he has not related their histories so graphically as the reader could wish, his excuse might be, the magnitude of the affairs related, and his incompetency to do them justice. He adds that lady Jane Grey was the first to hint to him his writing concerning the martyrs; and that Philpot collected the disputations.

There is no prooemium either to the fourth or fifth books, though there is to the sixth, in which he mentions that the book contains the disputations of the three bishops. He laments that the holy eucharist, which is the symbol of peace and union, should be the chief cause of dissension. "And oh!" he adds, "that it was nothing else than disputations and strifes of words! But they have verged into such a butchery of the most gentle martyrs of Christ, of whom I can set forth not less than two hundred and seven put to death in one year, and in England only: and what was the subject which afforded cause for their execution, but the differences of opinion on the eucharist? " So, indeed, it has ever been from that time to the present; and so it will continue to be until the church of Rome adopts another criterion of attachment to christian truth, and of submission to ecclesiastical authority, than the doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

Such were the labors of Foxe before he returned from Basil to England. This edition of his book was printed in Basil, and great must have been the difficulties with which the author had to contend in the accomplishment of every part of his design. Every material of his work was to come from beyond the seas: and to travel far over land, when there were impediments and restrictions innumerable to prevent the safe transit of such papers as those which he would require. Those who sent them, as well as those to whom they were addressed, would be exposed to constant danger. There was then no free press. An *imprimatur* was necessary to give currency to

every publication. One edition of this work in Latin was being printed at Basil. Another edition, in French, was in the press at Geneva, so that the burthen upon him was very great. In addition to all these impediments to his more rapid progress in his labors, the pope was exerting himself to the utmost to prevent the free circulation of the books which were being published by the Reformers. Leo X. had issued an ordinance commanding that no book be printed until it had been previously subjected to examination. This decree had been confirmed in the tenth session of the Lateran Council held in 1515. The popes assumed the power of prohibiting any publications that opposed their policy. Paul IV., anxious as any of his predecessors to suppress the efforts of the Reformers, issued a prohibitory index in 1559, the very year of the publication of the edition of Foxe's "Commentarii" published by Oporinus, forbidding by name, Oporinus, <sup>f137</sup> Stephens, and many others, from printing any book whatever. It is not improbable, that the papal decree was more especially aimed at the work of Foxe.

Nor were these the only labors to which this indefatigable student devoted himself. When he saw that his brethren and fellow-disciples, who were united with him in common hostility to the persecutions of Rome, deserved censure, he did not hesitate to reprove them.

John Knox, who had returned to Geneva at the end of the year 1557, published, early in the year following, his treatise called, "The First Blast of the Trumpet against the monstrous Regimen of Women;" in which he attacked with great vehemence the succession of females to the government of nations. With many of his sentiments it appears Foxe did not agree; and he, therefore, wrote to him expostulating with him, in a friendly manner, upon the impropriety of his book, and the use of such strong language. To this Knox returned the following characteristic answer.

"The mightie comforte of the Holie Ghost for salutation.

"Dearlie beloved brother, albeit at the departure of this our brother, from whom I receaved your loving and frendlie lettre, my selve could writ nothings be reason of the evill disposition of my bodie, yit becaus I could not suffer him to depart without som *remembrance* of my deutie to you: I used the help of my left hand, that is of my wief, in scribling these fewe lynes unto you, as

touching my purpose and mynd in the publishing The First Blast of the Trumpet. When the secretes of all hartes shall be disclosed, that shall be knowen which now by manye can not be perswaded; to wit, that therin I nether have sought my selve nether yit the vain prase of oney; my rude vehemencie and inconsidered affirmations, which may appear rather to proceed from coler than of zeal and reason, I do not excuse; but to have used anye other tittle mor plausible therby to have allured the world by any art, as I never purposed to do, I not yit purpose. To me it is yneugh to say the black is not whit; and man's tyrannye and folishnes is not Goddes perfite ordinance; which thinge I do not so much to correct comon welthes as to delyver my own conscience and to instruct the consciences of som semple who yit I fear be ignorant in that matter; but further of this I delay to better oportunitie. SMut your wief and dowghter hartlie in my ham. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ rest with you now and ever. From Geneva the 18th May, 1558.

“Youre brother to power,

**“*JOHNE KNOX.*”**

“I your sister, writer hereof, saluteth you and your wief most heartlie, thanking hir of hir loving tokens which my mother and I received from Mrs. Kent.” <sup>F138</sup>

From the conclusion of the letter it may seem as if the bearer of it was Lawrence Kent, to whom Knox was known at Frankfort, he being one of the number that seceded from Dr. Cox and his adherents. There is also another piece of intelligence contained in it, not yet noticed in his life, and of which his son makes no mention; that a daughter had been born to Foxe while abroad. <sup>F139</sup> This is also mentioned by Strype, when recording Grindal's generosity to him, or rather the dispensing part of the charity of others to him.

Foxe was thus employed at Basil, when the death of Mary gave new hope to the reformers, both at home and abroad. The English exiles began immediatly to return to England. Foxe still remained abroad. It is probable that he continued on the Continent to complete his Commentaries, as his

dedication to the duke of Norfolk is dated from Basil. A strange anecdote is related by his son, which the present age would call a singular coincidence, but which our ancestors would attribute to divine interposition. I am willing to believe anything on sufficient evidence. The testimony on which this anecdote rests is said to be that of Aylmer, afterwards bishop of London. "He was accustomed," says Mr. Samuel Foxe, "in the presence of many living persons, to declare that he was present at a sermon, wherein Master Foxe, among many other things which he preached to comfort the banished English, did with confidence tell them, that now was the time come for their return to England, and that he brought them that news by commandment from God. For these words," says his son, "he was sharply reprov'd by the graver divines there present." He was, however, excused afterwards by the event; for, by comparing dates, it was found that the queen died but the day preceding the prediction uttered by Foxe.

A tradition of this kind, coming to us through such a succession of reporters, and obviously liable to some variation each time it is handed from one to the other, would scarcely call for any lengthened comment, were it not that an undue degree of stress has been laid upon it, with the obvious design of exhibiting Foxe as either an enthusiast or an impostor. It has been said, that "he distinctly told his hearers that *'he brought them that news BY COMMANDMENT FROM GOD.'*" And it is then asked, "Could he have more decidedly assumed the prophetic office?"

Now, before such representations as these are allowed to pass, we must look at the facts of the case. Foxe is alleged to have assumed to be a prophet. But what is the proof? Not anything written by him; — nor any word of his recorded by a credible witness, being himself an auditor of the fact. Nothing of the kind is before us. All that we have, is this: — Samuel Foxe, the son, who was not born until 1560, records, in 1610, some words said to have been spoken by his father in 1558. Of course he himself was no auditor of these words; nor does he give them as related to him by his father himself, or by any one who was present on the occasion. All that he tells us, is, that "persons then living" had heard bishop Aylmer declare, that in a sermon preached at Basil in the year 1558, Foxe had used certain expressions. Now there can be no reason to doubt, that something of the kind here described, did actually take place. But it is scarcely safe or

reasonable to lay much stress upon any particular *form of expression*, when that form of expression only comes to us through one, who heard another person say, that he heard bishop Aylmer say, that he heard Foxe say, such and such things, at Basil, fifty years before.

We maintain, therefore, that it is not reasonable to assume more than the substantial truth of this anecdote; nor just to the martyrologist to make him answerable for certain specified words, reported by others, more than half a century after they were alleged to have been spoken. Yet we doubt not the fact, that on the occasion in question, Foxe did comfort his partners in affliction, by an assurance of the approaching termination of their sufferings and exile; and that he also signified his belief that the confidence which he felt was from other than a human source.

But we ought not to forget, that times of persecution naturally bring Christians into habits of constant reference to invisible power and supernatural assistance. Language and modes of thought, which would seem strange and artificial in times of peace and dull repose, then become both natural and intelligible. Hence, expressions which have reference to the unseen, are common in the records of the martyrs. It may be sufficient to refer to the prediction of Roger Holland, (vol. 8:p. 478,) that “after this day, in this place, there shall no more be put to the trial of fire and faggot,” — an assurance which was literally fulfilled. Or, to any who put this from them with incredulity, we may offer that other instance of a reference to invisible realities, in the dying exclamation of Robert Glover, — “HE is come! HE is come!” (vol. 7:p. 398) — words which, without having any assumption of prophetic power in them, are just as much above nature as the most direct and circumstantial prophecy.

It ought, however, to be remembered, that the event referred to, and said to be predicted by Foxe, was not a sudden or unlooked-for occurrence; but one which *had been for months in the contemplation of all the exiles*. That their church and their native land should be delivered from its dreadful scourge, was a matter which must of necessity have been uppermost in the mind of every English protestant. In this state of things, Foxe receives a strong impression that the event is actually occurring; and he imparts this impression to others; and gives them also to understand, that his conviction is, that the thing is of God. Such we apprehend to be the real

history of the circumstance; and to this extent, and no more, must Foxe be held answerable for whatever of enthusiasm there might seem to be, in such an impression, so imparted to his companions in trouble.

Some difficulty is found in reconciling the account of his biographers as to his resources at this period. In the second year after Mary's death he returned to England. His son informs us that he was so poor that he was compelled to remain at Basil with his family, which was now increased by two children, till money was sent him from England to bear his expenses in travelling. Fuller and Strype <sup>f140</sup> speak of the success of his literary labors, in language which prevents many from giving implicit credence to these statements.

We may infer, from the narrative by his son, that the disputes on the Continent had begun, even at this early period, to divide the reformers in England. By this writer of his life we are informed that, in consequence of the delay of the martyrologist in returning to England, some hard speeches were spoken against him, as "if through pride he had delayed to come, thereby seeking a shorter, and more speedy way to preferment, as being due to him when he should be sent for." Foxe paid no attention to these and similar observations. He was the retired and secluded student, despising injuries, and neglecting his own right, says his son. He hid himself in his study. Though he was now eminent for his exertions, and was favored with the friendship of the great, and might easily have attained to honors, neither avarice nor ambition tempted him to leave his retirement. Disinterestedness of this kind is seldom credited. It is understood by few, and appreciated by fewer. Yet the whole tenor of the life of the martyrologist compels us to believe that his son has described him rightly, when he thus represents his father as the contented, unambitious, religious, laborious, and happy student.

Though he did not return to England immediately on the accession of Elizabeth, Foxe wrote to her a Latin address, congratulating the queen, in the name of the German nation, on her accession to the throne. It does not consist of merely complimentary and eulogistical phrases, but abounds with useful advice to the queen, the court, and the clergy. <sup>F141</sup>

In the year after the queen's accession, the Basil edition of his work appeared, dedicated to the duke of Norfolk. <sup>F142</sup> The dedication is written

in his usual elegant Latin. He mentions to his former pupil his endeavors to form his youthful mind, and requests him to accept this literary labor from the hands of his old tutor, or, if he would rather, from his now new client. He hopes that it may tend to establish him in the protestant religion, and that the commentaries will not be read only by him, but by all men of his rank and station, from the highest to the lowest, public and private, not in England merely, but by Christians every where. He ascribes the glory to Christ, and adds, what can be a more delightful contemplation than that, casting one's eye around, we may, in such small space, consider so many changes of times; see such instability in the mass of the people, that they always follow where the prince leads; to behold so many heroes and chief men — dukes, counts, knights, and esquires — so many, both learned and unlearned, passing in review before one, each performing so bravely and admirably his part; to look upon such an army of most chosen martyrs, O blessed Jesus, contending for thee with such constancy, dying with such fortitude, and disputing with such prudence! He then says, that it will show God's providence, afflicting upon the heads of some that which they assigned to others; that to many who find there — some perhaps their parents, others their sons, some again their wives, another part husbands, some relations and near connexions, others neighbors and friends, it will be pleasant to read of them in these records, as if each affectionately desired to listen to them speaking. Here, also, is afforded the character of both churches, so that a judgment may be found without much trouble. There are also the decisions, testimonies, reasonings, and arguments of the most learned martyrs in the weightiest controversies; so that there is left no place for error or doubt. He concludes by saying, “that he desired to say much more to his highness (*sublimitatem*), but his time was short, and that both printers and markets were urgent, and that he could not write as he desired.”

The poor student was writing his history for his bread; and though his labor was his amusement and his passion, as well as his means of subsistence, he had no leisure to devote himself further to the language of courtesy and kindness. <sup>F143</sup> His task was now, however, completed, and Foxe returned to England by the month of October 1559, the year after the accession of Elizabeth, in great peace of mind, but in precarious health of body, and in the deepest privation and distress.

## SECTION 4.

### FROM HIS RETURN TO ENGLAND AFTER THE ACCESSION OF ELIZABETH, 1559, TO HIS DEATH, 1587.

*Return To England — Residence At Norwich — First English Edition Of  
The Acts And Monuments — His Preferments — Labors —  
Correspondence — Sermons — Prayers For The Romanists At Paul's  
Cross — Address To The Puritans — Death — Character — Estimation  
Of His Works.*

The time of the return of John Foxe to England is ascertained by the date of a letter, October 1559, written from London to the duke of Norfolk. From this letter we learn, too, the severe privation and distress under which he still labored. The printers at Basil, had only, it seems, requited his valuable services with shelter, bread, and water. His own delightful pursuits and employments in the service of the best Master and the best cause, had given him that inward happiness which is the greatest earthly blessing. The letter to his former patron, the duke of Norfolk, reveals to us the embarrassments under which he suffered, and the deep sense of the religion which comforted him.

“I have so often,” he says, “written to your highness, that I feel ashamed to trouble you any more. However, I am so conscious of the ingenuous kindness of your nature, that I know there would be no necessity for my petition if there was only wanting the will to bestow aid. But perhaps these times hinder you sending to us, and me urging you. I cannot think that it is from forgetfulness of us, nor from pride, you have so long withheld assistance to us. But whatever may be the cause why your liberality has thus ceased, one thing I know, that it is most easy for thee, in the midst of your great fortune and abundance of all things, to set aside for us some small allowance out of, as I hear, your immense and unbounded expenditure. More earnest prayers would be necessary where benefactors are less inclined to confer benefits. But your disposition always seemed of that character, that you gave rather from your own nature than the prayers of others. I think, alas! my

disposition is not unknown to you, which is not to be importunately craving, although dying with hunger.”

“That as yet I have dictated nothing to you; <sup>f144</sup> apprehension of danger to you, rather than my own will, has prevented me, which your highness, if God permit, shall afterwards rightly understand.

“As far as regards religion, I think there is no necessity for me to tell *you* where the truth stands. Wherever that be, God grant that you may manfully stand with it. In the mean time bear this in mind, that if you cannot help Christ at this juncture, let no mortal persuade you in any way to become his adversary. He will at length conquer all opponents. The time which others spend in courtly pomps and dice if you devote to reading the sacred Scriptures, you will in this act wisely.” <sup>F145</sup>

The duke was not in London when this letter was addressed to him. His reply is — “ I have received your letter, my excellent preceptor, from which I learn your affection towards me, which is very acceptable to me. And unless the return of my servants had preceded my letters, you would have been here with me before this. For I wrote to them that they should so provide you with all things, that you might speedily come to me: which would have so happened had they not returned more quickly than I expected. Now, since I shall be in London shortly, I wish you to await me there, where, as I desire and ought, I will look to you. In the mean time I bid you farewell. — From my house at Reyningate, the 30th October, 1559.

“Your pupil, “THOMAS NORFOLK. <sup>F146</sup> “To my right-loving schoolmaster, John Foxe.”

The duke performed his promise, and received Foxe into his Manor-house, Christ’s Church, Aldgate. The following letter to Mr. Hickman, <sup>f147</sup> at Bugden, proves that his health at this time was in a precarious state.

“The grace of Christ Jesus grant us hys everlastyng comfort, through true fayth in hym. Amen. Of your long looked for return I am glad. Of your reformed health I am more glad. As also, yf yt so please ye lord, we may mete here at London I wyl not be sory. Yf strength and courage had been correspondent to my *wyl*, I wold

have been glad to have seen you at this present at Bugden, and to have seen Bugden for your sake. But this doubtful whether, this could ayr, ye foule way, and ye weakenes of my health would not wel matche together, or els no travayle, nor lack of good wyl, shuld have witholden me from rydyng to Mr. Hyckman, to no man in England more soner. Notwithstandyng yt which serveth not now, may serve an other tyme, if yt so please ye Lord, our merciful Savior, who confirme and stablyshe us dayly, increas-yng in the trew knowlege of hys name, and if yt be hys pleasure, graunt we may both safely and shortly see yow here at London. Londini, Octob. 5. <sup>F148</sup> I pray you commend me to your good hoast, and to your good hoastes, and to your good wife.

“Your in Christ, “*JOHN FOXE.*”

It was probably in consequence of the bad state of health into which the duke of Norfolk perceived Foxe to be falling, that he sent him to Norwich soon after they met, on pretense of executing some commission. He was collecting additional materials for a new and enlarged edition of the “Acts and Monuments” in English, and his intense application and studious habits were impairing his constitution. One additional cause might be his deep anxiety to see further improvements in the manner of worshipping God in the service of the church. Though he conformed to the Book of Common Prayer as it had been lately restored by Elizabeth, he believed that certain changes in the Liturgy would be improvements, and he wished to see them established. We have no evidence respecting the part he took in the private discussions which probably took place among his friends, who entertained the same views. The duke of Norfolk gave him some commission, as already intimated, to proceed to Norwich, where the friend, though an opponent of Foxe, at Frankfort, was now bishop. Dr. Cox had been elected to Norwich by the dean and chapter, after the death of bishop Hopton, June 1559. He was appointed to the see of Ely in the December of the same year; and Parkhurst succeeded him at Norwich, March 27th, 1560. Foxe was the intimate friend of both Cox and Parkhurst, as well as of the duke of Norfolk. He continued at Norwich for some time; and is said, by Strype, to have been residing with the bishop at the end of the year 1560. “The bishop,” says Strype, “took Foxe down to Norwich with him, not only for his company, but to preach the gospel,

being of excellent eloquence; and to instruct the people in good religion, which was much needed, as bishop Hopton, the last popish bishop in the reign of Mary, who died in the same year with that queen, had leavened the diocese with popery.”

This anecdote of Foxe affords us a pleasing illustration of the comparatively happy state of England as to matters of religion in the earlier years of the reign of Elizabeth. Nations progress slowly, and learn only by experience — the experience of evil. Great calamities and sorrows bear to states, the same analogy which the Iliad of Homer bears to the laws of epic poetry. The poem of the author preceded the rules of the critic. The sufferings of a nation arising from bad laws precede the regulations and theories which aim at better government, and wiser institutions. The intolerable severities by which the Romanists had endeavored to promote uniformity of belief made the people rejoice in the supremacy of a native sovereign instead of a foreign bishop, of whom the temporal ruler was only vicegerent and minister: and though the doctrine of toleration was not fully developed, and the magnificent freedom which permits every man to inquire fully into the truth, and to believe those conclusions only which he adopts upon evidence, appearing to him to be satisfactory, was unknown to the legislature; yet the people welcomed with rapture the cessation of the persecutions, the restoration of the liturgy, the temporal supremacy, and the general repose. One hundred and sixty-two beneficed persons, from the bishop to the priest, out of ninety-four hundred beneficed clergymen, (the number who survived the reign of Mary,) adhered to the church of Rome. The rest submitted to the change. The council of Trent had not ceased its sittings, when the thirty-nine articles were re-established as the faith of England. The church of Rome in its present form is, consequently, of later origin than the church of England in its present form. The decisions at Trent, had not yet erected the insurmountable barrier between the two churches. The friends of the church of Rome in England then attended their parish churches. The queen desired to conciliate all; but the papists more than the puritans. The objectors to some portions of our church service on the principles of the Frankfort seceders, remained, with Foxe, stedfast to the communion of the episcopal church; and fought against the common enemy without any schismatical separation. The foreign religious societies, which had not, unfortunately, retained the best

bond of union- episcopal government — were considered as churches deserving the name of our dear sisters in Christ. Episcopacy was upheld in England, both as of divine appointment, and as the best form of church government; without any offensive declaration that those who had not adopted it, were unworthy of being considered as partakers of the covenanted mercies of God. The pensions of the monks, and of others who had been ejected from their *asyla*, were paid; and though a proclamation was issued this very year, in which all anabaptists were commanded to leave the kingdom, this very enactment was the proof of the great change which had already taken place in the spirit of the public law, which substituted the punishment of exile in the place of death, for religious opinions. John Foxe, we know, had not abandoned his long-recorded objections to some portions of the service-book. He was probably, on this account, not deemed eligible to the higher preferments, with which his labors, talents, and usefulness would otherwise have been rewarded: and a church and a government are right, while they permit every citizen to express his opinions without punishment, to exempt from the list of candidates for the higher stations those who are not devoted to the existing institutions. No state can be desired to give power to those citizens who would endeavor to destroy the institutions, for the very defense of which they are invested with that power. If the opinions of any citizen, when submitted to the people and their rulers, so influence the mass, that those opinions are urged upon the rulers as the will of the majority; the ruler may be justified in calling the propounder of those conclusions to the high places of authority, that the change may be made more peacefully, and more effectually. The opinions of John Foxe, and of the rest of the Frankfort objectors to the liturgy, were not sanctioned by the people; and he was justly, therefore, excluded from the episcopate of England. He was happier, far happier, in his liberty than he would have been in further advancement. He was employed in those departments of the public service in which he could be useful by preaching through the diocese, in conjunction with his friend, the bishop of Norwich; and he was admitted, as we shall see, to the lesser preferments, which gave him comparative competence and provision, without authority and power.

There is a moral influence exercised by an eminently useful and good man, upon the minds of his contemporaries, which is more gratifying to the

heart than the fascinations of power, when unattended by similar homage. Though Foxe was not raised to the episcopacy, he appears, from many evidences, to have been regarded with much veneration and affection by his contemporaries. We learn this from various letters published by Strype, or preserved in the Harleian manuscripts. I shall give a few evidences of his moral influence, and the value set upon his friendship and interest, exercised on various occasions, from some of these letters.

He is solicited by one to remember those near him in his prayers to God, they not having bowed the knee to Baal; as also to obtain for others some preferment: he himself being still without either a benefice or an ecclesiastical dignity. Strype informs us that the letter, of which the following is a copy, was addressed to him at Norwich.

“Derelye beloved in Christ Jesus oure only comfort in all extreame assaultes, etc. These fewe words are but as a testimonie of my hartie salutacions unto youe, contynuallye wysshynge your prosperous successe in the Lordes harveste, and that ninny laborers maye by your meanes be sent forthe in that good worke to call the yonglinges to the greate supper of the lambe that was slayne from the begynninge of the worlde, etc.; and for your memento I have noted a fewe names (which have not bowed their knees to Baall) which I commit to your remembrance, not that I judge ye have them in oblivion, but that I must have somewhat to blot my paper wythe, to make matter, etc. Mr. Brull,<sup>f149</sup> James Yonge, Mr. Playlet, William Fausset, mynister of Linseye, and thys berer Peter Foxman,<sup>f150</sup> and are all vertuous men, fearinge God. These fewe, with many others, I trust shall not be forgotten. Elyzabeth my wyffe, and our brother To Upcher, salutethe youe, desyringe youe, when ye speake unto God, to tell hym of us. Thus the eternall Spirite governe youe in all youre affaires, to hys glorie and your everlastinge cornforte in hym. Thys 18 November, Anno Do. 1560, in London.

“Syr, yf ye can procure some lyvinge of 50li. a yeare, or upwarde, for Robarde Cooll, he ys mynded heare to give up wheare he ys; and allso Rycharde Berde, a good mynister. I comyt them all to your remembraunce. Once agayne byddinge yowe hartely farewell

in Christ. Amen. “Youres in the Lorde assuredlye, “*WYLLYAM WYNTROPP.*” “To hys very fferide Mr. Jhon Foxe, preacher in Norwiche.” <sup>F151</sup>

The following will be read by those who have appreciated the moral as well as literary merits of Foxe, as a gratifying testimony from one whose voice in his praise could be lifted up only from proof of his virtues.

“I am greatly rejoiced, my Foxe, since your coming is so near at hand: and I think every day a year until I behold yourself Your love and labor bestowed upon me in my youth and poverty, I forget not; and, God willing, you shall find that it has not been bestowed upon an ungrateful man. I am ashamed of my unskilfulness in the letters I write to you, but my affection compelled me to do that for you, which I wish to do for no other, because I have not, for five years past, written a Latin epistle. As other business calls me, and that I may not detain you from other engagements by these barbarous letters, hoping to see you in a few days, I wish you, in Christ, the happiest life and arrival.

“March 5. “Your most loving scholar, “*THO. NORFOLK.*” <sup>F152</sup>

The following is part of a letter from one under temptations to blaspheme, and requesting Foxe’s counsel thereupon.

“I have writyn a longe letter, but I will not trobell your wurshype no more but to have your avise, howe, if you were so provoked yourself withe orribill temptacions of blasphemye, what you wold do, and howe youe wold overcome it and be thorowlie comforted and quyeted, for my feithe is not strong to overcome suche a ferfull matter, and dowtinge myche for that Syente Peter in feithe fayled in a grete dele lesse terror: but if one myghte gather this hope and comfort that if one shold do all the syn that ever was doff or shall be, so as he do it not of a pretenced wilfull malise and purpose agaynst the holie gost, but faull by fere or weknes or by fraylte, or by any other cause and combred mynde, or by temptacion oppressed, but he myghte be remytted, then thes feres and dowtes wold be mytigated, and if one faull some hope he wold gather in God’s mercie, for it is wrytyn his mercie is in gretnes lyke to hym

selfe and hathe no ende. And also to have your arise whatt youe wold do if in such sorte youe shold oftende as God forbydd, for to despeyre none maye, nor to slee themselves none maye, for that is a grete offense, and of this I desyre your counsell, for I am not in this trubele alone, but all men have that nede of counsell that I have if suche things come into there heds and be moved therewith. And also to have your avise howe to discharge my herte from suche movings and fere. They come on me sodenlye, but they be hard to avoide and put awaye, if I maye be clered agayne and held (*healed?*) I am not abill to make youe amends, for this is the hevest burdyn that ever was, to be in suche fere that if men falle to such things, and beinge of them selves se weke and prone, they shall have no mercye. Jobbe nor Davuhe (David) were never in that case <sup>f153</sup> ...”

Another letter of T. H. to Mr. Fox, desiring comfort, as byinge wonderfully appawlede to se no frewt to follow the herynge God's worde thys 20 yers: but that rather he wexsythe worse and worse.

“For somitehe, mi adopted father, yt unthankfulness ys hated of God as dothe manifestlye apere in his holy wordes, and of all men hyely detested, which I may justly be charged withall consyderynge the great consolation and fatherly counsell I received at youre handes, beynge then sore deseased in sowle and body allso; the where in youre ortcharde I reseved most happy consolation, yf grace had so governed me as the spirit oft provoked me and dayly dothe, but this old putrified Adam, mi synfull flesh, I ned (*named*) earythe styll so lofty a sayle yt by no meanes yt wylbe made subject to the spyryt, butt evermore rebellythe and hstethe after carnale and fleshly thynges, not worthy onse to be named, as the apostell testifyethe, and where yt pleasythe owre Savior Crist to comand all syners, excludyng non, to com boldly unto hym. I in truthe beynge the greatest synner in all Christendom am provokyd oft to call upon God by Christ mi only Redeemer, he of hys great mercy preservythe me from desperation byinge wonderfully appawled to se no frewt to follow the herynge God's worde thys xxti yeres, but rather wexsythe worse and worse, therefore yet ones agayne I make bold in Christ to send unto you for helpe in this mi dystres, beynge as it were overladyne with the

multitude of mi synes, and greatly affheared to aprotche in yowre presense, yett so longe as lyeve endurythe, God's grace assystinge me, I wyll hope for pardon, knowynge yt God, in his good tyme, wyll sende helpe. Into whoes handes I holly comend mi weke and synfull body and soule, requiryng pardon for my syns past, and grace to amend hereafter; besychynge you, good father, to remember me in your dayly prayers to the throne of — yt at the least wyse, allthowe I am most unworthy to be God's (*servant*), yett by the dayly medyation of Christ Jhesu, I may be amoung the number of his ehosyn and elect children and hyred servants, which were rewarded all alyeke, as well thos yt labored but one ower as thos yt bore the burden and heat of the hole day, for in hym we all do lyre and have owre beyng, and are to be caryed wether yt pleasethe hys goodness, and without hys spetyall grace cannot of owreselves thynke somitche as a good thought, mutche lesse do a good deed: thus you se what I am beyng left to miselfe, even a thyng of nothyng, ye in lyre worse then a Jewe, hatynge all goodnes and doinge all that yll ys. Beloved in Christ, thus I end for this tyeme, knowynge yt you are allways occupied in good thynges, and thys mi letter shuld rather offend yowre sowle and body then aniweys to perfect ether, seyinge in me no amendymnt att all, butt yett herby I confesse I am greatly dysburdyned of yt longynge desyer I had and dayly have to here from you, in yt I cannot cum to you as I wold, accordynge to dewti. Good father, herein I have sent you a small tokyn of a great good wyll, which I pray you accept in good part, and pray for me as I do for you, allbeyt God knowythe mi prayer ys very cold, mutehe encumbered with worldly vanites, even when I am most desyrus to serve me God. Vale.

“*T. H.*”<sup>f154</sup>

“To mi dere and faythfull frend, Mr. Fox, geve these.”

The following letters show what interest Foxe took in the welfare of his fellow-creatures, and what respect he must have been held in, when so many and so various applications were made to him both for his advice and his assistance.

“Draught of a Letter from Mr. John Foxe to some friends, in behalfe of a poor man wronged by Stephen Bechyng.

“Beati pacifici. (Blessed are the peace-makers.)

“Grace in Christ. Mr. Boyne, Peter Woodgat, and Thomas Petter, yf yt shal please you. Concernynge ye case of this pore man, as I understand yt, ye matter ys playn, hys vexation gret, his injurie intolerable, and suehe as none of you wold ever suffer to be done to your selves. Yf yt would be so, that evyl persons by fraud and injurie may oppresse and circumvent ye simple, and no redresse in such wrongfull sufferyngs, then the Lord gyve us pacience and be merciful to thys realme. But yf yt be the parts of godly and christen men to helpe in suehe wrongs and iuries (*thus, but meaning injuries*) and to sett peace, wher disquyetnes is, and to doo for others as they would to be doen to them selves: Then I pray you aforenamed, joynng also Edward Barcoke with you, in your zeale of ye Lord, to worke in thys matter, what ye can, to talk earnestly with Steven Beehyng, and to requyre hym in ye name of the Lord Iesus, to defraud thys pore man no longer from hys ryght, to ye gret disquyetynge of hys mynd, and undoyng of hys wyfe and her children. Yf he doo, let hym understand, blessed be ye Lord, there be lawes in the realme, lustice is not al asleape, tiler ys also a court of concience and a godly overseer of ye same, ye Lord Keaper, who both by hys wysedome wyl sone find out ye matter, and upon hys lawful authoritie wyl see ye wronge to be redressed. And yf ther were no ryght at al here to be had in earth, yet let the saed Steven Bechyng thys understand, that ye Lord Iesus ys alyve in heaven, whose hand he can not eschape, nor yet able to abyde yf yt falle. But beste ys, that your wysdomes gentlyly and quyetly compose the matter at home. Wherein I beseche you, as a peacemaker, to do in ys matter what ye can. The zeale of the Lord Iesus dwel in you. Amen.” <sup>F155</sup>

“Mr. John Foxe to the Lord Chief Justice, recommending Mr. J. Smythe to be made Schoolmaster of Ippeswiche.

“Forasmuch as thys yong man, for whom I wryte, ys not so well known to your honor, peradventure, as he ys to me, by long

acquayntance and continuance, to signifie therefore to your lordshyp, not only upon privat affection but upon treuth and knowlege in hys behalf: thys ys briefly to testifie to your good L. that if ye town of Ypswyche stand in neede of a worthy, godly, and lerned scholmaster, for all such indewments and ornaments requisite in such a function, or trew religion, lernyng, diligence and practice, for these, and such other gyftes of abilitie, I know not how, nor where they may be better spedd, then in receavyng thys Mr. J. Smythe, beyng hym self born in y same town of Ypsewyche: whom both present occasion of tyme, and ye good vocation of Christ, I trust, offereth now unto them. Certefying, moreover, your good Lord- ship, and not only you, but also ye whole town of Ypsewyche, that who soever shall receive him for guydyng of theire schole, shal doo no such pleasure to hym, as profyete to them selves, and commoditie to theire yougth. D. Iesus tibi benedicat, et tuis. Amen.

Lond. Novemb. 23. “ Yours in Christ Iesu,

“*JOHN FOXE.*” <sup>F156</sup>

“To ye ryght honorable and hys very good lord, ye Lord Cheefe Justice of England.”

From this it would appear as if the lord chief justice either had the appointment of a schoolmaster for Ipswich, or else his recommendation would be so much respected, that the person bearing it would be elected. Yet Foxe, not content with having endeavored to interest the chief justice, wrote the following letter to the inhabitants, or authorities of Ipswich, in favor of the same person.

“Although privat affection and good wyll I beare to thys good man moveth me to doo for hym as every man wold be glad to do for hys frend, yet not so much that, as publike dewtie I owe to others, namely to your worshypes and the whole townshype of Ypswyche, to whom I am not a lytle bownde, also the consideration I have to the ryght education of youth, which I wyssh in al places to be brought up in godly vertue and good letters, causeth me to wryte to your worshypes, not so much for the

preferment of hym for whom I wryte, as for your own comoditie I trust, and furtherance of your youth. Understanding therefore yt you are in some consultation about placyng a mete instructor for your schole as ye matter in my mynd requyreth good advisement and deliberat circumspection, so I doubt not but your wysdoms may have sufficient choise of a number in dyvers places, wherin, yf my opinion and censure were required herein, whom I cold commend or wold wyssh unto you, I know none other.” <sup>F157</sup>

The next letter is one of a very different character, for it is one recommending to a gentlewoman, a very godly gentleman, a friend of Foxe’s, for a husband.

“As your discret circumspection is not unprovided of sufficient counsail what you have best to doo in your own aftayres, to yourself best known, to me nothyng appertaynyng; so nether do I enterprise so boldly to wryte to you, as havynge any nede to be advertised by others. Yet notwithstanding for so much as we are so wylled by the Aposfie to exhorte one an other, I trust you wyll not be offended, if I shal wryte unto you by way of persuasion, in ye behalfe of a certen godly gentleman, and deare frend of rayne. The same gentleman I meane, whom you dyd see not long ago with me at Mr. Moulton’s, whose syncere integritie, vertuous lyre, myld and softe conditions, stayde and satted discretion, hys amiable lovyngnes, loved of all men that know hym, with no lesse singular affection workyng in hys hart especially towards yow, yf they were so well known to you, as they are to me, and others which have experience of hym, I shuld not nede to bestowe thys laboure herein, eyther in exhortyng of you, or commendyng of hym: yow wold soone understand yourself what ye had to doo best for your self.

“But because ye partie as yet as unacquaynted, ys not so wel known unto yow, to thentent therefore by report of others ye shuld not waynt some intelligence herof, I thought thus much to wryte in hys behalf, who nether wryteth for hym self, nether ys privye, I assure yow, of my wrytyng for hym, testifying to yow simply what I do thynke, and not only what I thynk roeself, but heare also

testified by some others, which knoweth yow better then I doo, that yf the favor of your mynd culd be no lesse inclined to hym, then the lord hath wrought in hys hart toward you, verely it is supposed a meyer matche euld not be found for you, nor wysshed unto you, al thyngs on both parts considered, both that I heare of you, and known by hym. Thus much have I signified to you what I thought, and know of hym to be trew. You for your part doo what you thynk good, better in my mind ye cannot doo, then to counsail in thys matter with ye lord, who as he hath ordayned maryage betwen man and wyfe, so gyveth housbands as he pleaseth. Nether am I ignorant, but there may be, that come to you with gretter offers, which in deede myght be somethyng for you to harken to, yf your case stode in any such neede of worldly goods. But now you havynge enough, and blessed be God, abundance; what can you desyre more now, then a quyet lyfe with that which God hath sent you? And let the offerres be never so great, ye shal fynd at length trew godlynes joyned with stayed temperance more fyttter for your condition as yt standeth, then gretter supperfluytie of worldly substance. And furthermore, when all your counters shal be cast, ye shal prove yt trew, and so counte with your self, that an hundreth pounds by yeare with thrifty and prudent gudyng wyl goo further at ye yeares end, then 5 or 6 hundreth, with wastful spendyng. I say no more, but as I sayd, I repete agayn, you are wise enough, ye know herin what ye have to do. The lord almyghtie disposer of all thyngs, directe youre wayes and counsails to that which best shalbe to your quyetnes and commoditie, per Christurn Jesum dominure nostrum. Amen.”<sup>f158</sup> **“J. FOXE.”**

The following letter is curious. It was addressed to him by an individual complaining of his temptations, and seeking the advice and prayers of the martyrologist.

“Mr. Foxe — I wish you *pacem Deo et consolationem Spiritus Sancti*, whiche, I praye God, I maye once fynde with you. Sir, you shall understande that I have bene of late, and am presentlye merveylouslye troobled with my accoostomed passions, et *subit animum dubitatio, num filii Dei talibus tentationibus occupentur, tentatione namque desperationis cencior*. I remember that of Sawle,

after he was rejected, hit was thus written: Spiritus autem Jehove recessit a Saule et terruit eum Spiritus malus a Jehova, whiche woordes make me merveyulouslye afrayed, for when I consider the case wherin I stande, methynketh I am vexed even with Sawles evill sprite. There is also another place of Scripture whiche Sathan objecteth agaynste me, which is this, (Romans ii.) his vero qui sunt contentiosi et qui veritati quidera non obtemperant, sed obtemperant injustitiae indignatio et ira afitictio et anxietas, etc. methinketh yt here indignatio ira affiictio et anxietas is even ye same that was in Sawle. Good Mr. Foxe for Christes sake resolve in these doubttes, and praye to yours and my allowed lorde Jesus yt in mercye he will strengthen me and other his servantes with ye invincible force of his grace agaynste ye maliciouse assaultes of Sathan, for you know what S. James sayeth: confitemini vicem peccata vestra et orate invicem alii pro aliis ut servemini, multum valet deprecatio justii efficacax (*James 5:16*) wherfore good Mr. Foxe per Jesum Christum servatorem nostrum obtestor rogo etiam atque obsecro ut in precibus tuis coram Deo mentionem mei facias. Idem pro te facturum polliceor, allquid rescribas obsecro quicquid velis et modo consolatorie valeas in domino, amen, paracletus ille tui meique sit custos nostraque studia dirigat ad sui nominis gloriam propriam sahtem ecclesiae suae utillitatem amen. Datum nuberie anno 1566. 40 mensis martii. “Tuus in Christo frater, **“THOMAS DOLLMAN.”** <sup>F159</sup>

“To my good frende Mr. Foxe, at Mr. Dayes, over Aldersgate geve these.”

This letter, and many others of the same kind, fully confirm the truth of the statement made by his son, that he was by nature an amiable man, who desired always to be friendly to others. “By good advice,” says his son, “by comfortable persuasions, or by a charitable hand, he relieved the wants, or satisfied the desires, of innumerable persons. No man’s house was more thronged with clients than that of John Foxe. There repaired to him both citizens and strangers, noblemen and common persons of all degrees; and almost all for the same cause — to seek some salve for a wounded conscience.”

Foxe continued in the same poverty in which he returned to England for some years. The provision allowed him by the duke of: Norfolk was but small. He alludes to this circumstance in a letter to his fellow-collegian, Lawrence Humphrey, who was appointed president of Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1562. He condemns Humphrey for leaving his post. "Are you not ashamed," says he, "to become such a fugitive? You ought to have taken example of greater constancy by me, who still wear the same clothes, and remain in the same sordid condition as when I first returned to England from Germany." This poverty did not, however, induce him for one moment to waive his objections to some of the ceremonies and canons of the church. He desired to see a further reformation effected. He was a decided episcopalian; <sup>f60</sup> and as such, never united himself to any schismatical separatists from the church; yet he professed to have some objections to the new changes, as not receding sufficiently far from popery; and these objections prevented him, as before intimated, from receiving the higher preferments in the church. They did not, however, keep him back from all. In common with many others, who held similar objections, he was admitted to some preferments, of which I shall proceed to take notice.

During his residence at Norwich, when he was engaged in preaching, in translating, or rewriting his laborious work in English, and making many, and carefully-studied, additions to it from all quarters, his exertions were well known to bishop Parkhurst, who held frequent conversations with him on the subject of preferment. He wished Foxe to be constantly near him; and endeavored to procure for him a prebendal stall at Norwich, that he might there pursue his studies, and remain the companion and friend of the bishop. No opportunity occurred of this favor being conferred upon him; and Foxe was compelled to return to London to labor in the printing-office of John Day. The desire to devote his life to the perfecting of his history seems now to have overruled all self-considerations. Upon his return to London from Norwich, Foxe, for some time, resided in the town mansion of his friend the duke of Norfolk, the duke being himself with his family at Framlingham, <sup>f161</sup> where the death of the duchess occurred. In this continued absence of the duke from London, Foxe accepted an invitation from Day to remove from his residence under the roof of the duke into his house. That he was now busily engaged in superintending the

first English edition of his work, appears from the date of its publication in 1563. In the February of that year, bishop Parkhurst wrote from Ludham, about ten miles from Norwich, to Foxe in London, on the subject of his preferment.

“Salutem in Christo Jesu. — I have received your loving letters, and do understand thereby your visitacion at Goddes hand, in this tyme of mortalytie, you are not ignorant that he ys wont to chastise whom he loveth. As tochyng the prebend, what I with other your frendes have donne in that behalfe I am sure you have herd. Howbeit the successe is not suche as we hoped at Foules hands, but tiler ys one Mr. Smith in Cambridge that hath another of the prebends who, as I hear, can be content to part from the same uppon reasonable condicions. Good Mr. Foxe appointe you and come down, as soon as convenientlie you may, and doubt you not God will provide for you eyther that or some other thing as good, whereunto there shall want nothing in me that I am able to doo. And this with my hartie commendacions to my good frends with you, I commit ye to the keping of Almighty God. From Ludham this xxixth of January, 1563. “Your assured frend, “*JOHN NORWICH.*” <sup>F162</sup>

This unsuccessful attempt of bishop Parkhurst to procure a prebend in his own cathedral for Foxe, that he might be near both his friend and fellow-exile, the bishop, as well as near his patron the duke of Norfolk, <sup>f163</sup> was made early in 1563. Three months after this, another and more successful effort was made to serve him. He was inducted on the last day of May in that year into the canonry and prebend of Shipton in the cathedral of Salisbury. We cannot now ascertain by whose interest this was obtained. It is thought to have been at the instance of secretary Cecil. The date of Foxe’s institution to this prebend is generally placed in 1564, a little later; but the extract from bishop Jewell’s Register, marks it distinctly in 1563. <sup>F164</sup> He was instituted in the person of his procurator, John Randal, as appears by the extract from the bishop’s Register, who is called *Thomas* in his letter to the dean and chapter of Salisbury, in which he requests them to set their seal to the transaction with “*Thomas Randal:*” at the same time not wishing to do anything that might be detrimental to his successors in the prebend. <sup>F165</sup> The poverty of Foxe was at this time so great that he

petitioned the queen to remit the first fruits of his new preferment. <sup>F166</sup> He appointed as his vicar William Masters, who was not unknown to the queen, as he was the orator of the university of Cambridge, who delivered a speech to the queen after her address to that university. <sup>F167</sup> Such, says Foxe, was the poverty of both, that they had not one farthing to pay the first fruits; and the petition therefore prays that the queen would release both from the payment.

The prebend of Shipton not only gave him a respectable maintenance, but afforded him an opportunity of transmitting a valuable lease to his descendants. It was enjoyed by his family until sir Richard Willis married the heir, or heiress — the daughter of Robert Foxe, the physician.

The other preferment which Foxe enjoyed in the English church, in addition to Cripplegate, which he soon resigned, <sup>f168</sup> and the prebend of Shipton, was a stall at Durham, which he held only one year.

Among other fallacies frequently maintained by those who object to the establishment of the reformed religion, is the opinion that the revenues of the church, were taken from one church to be given to another. The fair way of stating the question is this: In the commencement of the reign of Henry VIII. the church of England was in communion with, and subjection to, the church of Rome. In the course of that reign, while the communion continued, the subjection ceased. Under both the communion and subjection, the creed of either church was unsettled; that is, it received continual additions. In the reign of Edward, the communion and the subjection of the church of England with, and to, the church of Rome, ceased altogether. The creed of the church of England became definite. The creed of the church of Rome was still indefinite, and remained so till the termination of the council of Trent, in the fifth year of Elizabeth. The clergy of the church of England, at the conclusion of the reign of Henry VIII., who had possessed the revenues of the church under the subjection to, and communion with Rome, generally retained those revenues, with the exception of the confiscations to laymen during the reigns of Henry and Edward. Though some went into exile under Mary, the great majority of the clergy, in consequence of this very indefiniteness of its creed, submitted to the restoration of the old system.

The council of Trent itself may be called the chief establisher of the reformed religion, by withholding from the church of Rome, and from all the episcopal churches which it desired to govern, any certain conclusions round which its adherents might rally; and thus affording an apology to all, to consent to the changes in religion enacted by the governments and bishops of the several states. The very clergy, therefore, who had upheld Henry, Edward, and Mary, now received the laws of Elizabeth in matters of religion; and, throughout the whole of the changes, they possessed the same revenues. The revenues were never taken from one large class, to be given to another large class of men. Many refused to conform in each reign. The majority, however, did conform to each change; and the majority died in the possession of the same revenues in the reign of Elizabeth, when the church of England was neither in communion with, nor in subjection to, Rome, as they had held in the reign of Henry and Mary, when the church of England was both in communion and thralldom. The truth of this statement is proved to us in the case of the last monks of Durham. They were generally the first prebendaries. Henry VIII. dissolved the monastery of Durham. He continued the monks in their places under new names. Thomas Sparke, for instance, the prior of the cell of Lindisfarne, was a monk, and chamberlain of the monastery of Durham at the time of the dissolution of the monastery. He was made suffragan bishop of Berwick in June, 1637; and bore that office (an office which might, perhaps, wisely be restored) during the remainder of his life. He was empowered by bishop Tonsal to exercise his dignity, as chorepiscopus, through the whole diocese of Durham. In the reign of Henry VIII. he obtained this preferment. In the reign of Edward he was made rector of Walsingham. <sup>F169</sup> He held this, and his other appointments throughout the reign of Mary; and died, still possessed of them, in the reign of Elizabeth, 1671. His successor was John Foxe. The appointments of the other prebendaries on the refoundation of the cathedral of Durham by Henry VIII. confirm this statement. Hugh Whitehead, the prior of the monastery at its dissolution, became dean, under the new establishment. The prebend, or canonry, <sup>f170</sup> which Sparke held, was granted to John Foxe. In consequence of the doubtful manner in which Strype mentions this fact; <sup>f171</sup> together with the manner in which Hutchinson, <sup>f172</sup> in his History of Durham, in spite of his long list of references, relates it; as well, too, in consequence of the dubious manner in which his other biographers notice the circumstance; the

appointment of Foxe to the prebend or canonry at Durham appeared to me, for a long time, to be very doubtful. The difficulty was increased by the absence of evidence at Durham itself. Many of the chapter-books had been long lost. The dean and chapter, even in the year 1646, in reply to an order of the upper house of parliament to produce their book of chapter acts, sent up the reasons of their inability to obey the order. The books were lost at Hull, or on their way to that city, when they were sent there for security against the Scotch army. <sup>F173</sup> Of the chapter-books which have escaped the changes and chances of the civil wars, and other casualties in our history, I found that the receiver's book does not mention Foxe's name; the treasurer's book, of 1572, is lost; and the installation-book commences only in the year 1660, after the restoration. I was convinced, however, that such a tradition must have had some very probable foundation. I believed that Pilkington, who was now bishop of Durham, and who had been a fellow-exile with Foxe, would endeavor to provide for his friend. The nomination to the stalls had been vested by Mary in the bishops of Durham. Pilkington had now the opportunity to serve him; and he might have offered the prebend to Foxe, in the hope that he would at length conform to the vestments, and consent to accept it. The nomination of Bellamy, the reputed successor of Foxe, to the canonry, was dated by Hutchinson on the very day that the year elapsed in which the martyrologist was said to have accepted the appointment; and it did not seem probable that all this could be affirmed without some good reason. The memorandum in bishop Cosin's library was also too express to permit us to reject the supposition. <sup>F174</sup> I at length discovered in an old register of dean Whittingham's, which, by some strange accident, had escaped the general wreck, amidst a large mass of documents respecting the renewals of leases, and other capitular business, the original induction of Foxe, and his resignation of the stall in the same year. I am sorry to have made the discovery; for I cannot reconcile his holding the prebend of Shipton, and rejecting the stall at Durham, if such rejection proceeded, as bishop Cosin supposes, from his dislike to the clerical vestments. He should have resigned Shipton also, if this was his reason for rejecting the appointment at Durham. The admirable manner in which the history of this unfortunate controversy has been lately brought before the public <sup>f175</sup> renders it unnecessary to say more, than that bishop Hooper, the martyr, had objected to the vestments in the reign of Edward, that these objections

were strengthened by the foreign reformers, and that the exiles under Mary saw in the vestments the dresses only of idolaters, and persecutors. “You go like a mass-priest,” was said to archbishop Grindal, who, after opposing the clerical dress, consented to its adoption with reluctance. <sup>F176</sup> Nearly all the exiles had wished the ancient dresses to be discontinued. Young, archbishop of York; Parker, archbishop of Canterbury; Grindal, bishop of London; Pilkington, bishop of Durham; Horne, of Winchester; Jewell, Sandys, Sampson, Humphrey, Whittingham, and, in short, all the bench of bishops, and the higher orders of the clergy who had returned from exile, opposed the use of the ancient vestments. The miserable results which followed the pertinacity of the mass, who followed their example in objecting, but not in their eventually conforming, must be left to the historian. <sup>F177</sup> Foxe habitually, I am sorry to say, refused to conform; and Soames is of opinion that this stedfast refusal prevented the hope of the high preferment to which he was otherwise entitled. He could not refuse conformity to the doctrinal articles of the church. He wholly agreed to them. His conduct with respect to the “Reformatio Legum” will prove that he regarded the canons. He must, therefore, as it is said, have only declined conformity, because of the laws respecting the vestments. He would not, when requested by archbishop Parker to subscribe, pledge himself to anything but the Scriptures. “To this I will subscribe,” he said, taking a Greek Testament from his pocket; and he added, that he had nothing in the church but a prebend at Salisbury, which was at their disposal. He proved his integrity, and consistency, more, I think, than his sound judgment: for the peace of the church was broken by the useless and foolish schism, which identified fatal errors in doctrine, with the questionable propriety of external appearance. It is possible that the chapter of Salisbury dispensed with his wearing the vestments, while that of Durham refused to do so. The matter must be left in doubt. I am neither required to defend nor to assail his memory on such a point. I believe that he acted upon reasons which seemed to himself to afford a sufficient apology; but I cannot comply with the custom now so usual in modern biography, of representing the subject of the narrative, as free from spot or blemish. We do not read that any other preferment was offered to Foxe. This was, of course, not to be expected. **The documents respecting his appointment to Durham will be found in the Appendix.** <sup>F178 L5</sup>

The precise time of Foxe's return to London from Norwich cannot be now ascertained. His eldest son, his biographer, who was admitted demy of Magdalen in 1576, was born at Norwich in 1560; and it was to Norwich that Oporinus addressed the letter to Foxe, in which he thanked him for a book of which he supposed Foxe to be the author, on the "Cruelty of the Papists." <sup>F179</sup> The book had been published anonymously. When he left Norwich, the duke of Norfolk was absent from London. The principal residence of Foxe, however, when he was not at the house of John Day, his printer, at Aldersgate-street, still appears to have been at the house of the duke of Norfolk, at Aldgate. "That most bounteous, charitable, and princely lord," says one of Foxe's principal contemporary admirers, <sup>f180</sup> "gave him free entertainment and dwelling for him and his, at his manor of Christ's church, by Aldgate. From that his house, he traveled weekly, every Monday, to the printing-house of John Day. In that, my father's house, many days and years, and infinite sums of money, were spent to accomplish and consummate his English 'Monuments,' and other many excellent works in English and Latin." This language is certainly indefinite, and must refer, not merely to the residence of Foxe immediately on his return from Norwich, but to his general residence in London for many successive years. He seems to have left Norwich about the year 1562. A curious expression in a letter from the bishop of Norwich about this time, would seem, at first sight, to imply that Foxe was known to the bishop in a character under which he has never been considered, — that of a great sportsman. The sentence occurs in the midst of references to books and letters, and requests that search be made in libraries for some literary information. I interpret, therefore, the expressions metaphorically; and believe that the good bishop alluded to those whom Foxe might have employed to hunt for him the game he was pursuing in historical preserves, when he speaks of a bloodhound being sent to Zurich; and that when he calls Foxe a good hunter, who had plenty of dogs, he meant only that he was indefatigable, and that his friends and helpmates were no less staunch and sagacious than himself. The following is the extract: —

"I have sent you here inclosed a letter, written to me from Dr. Gesner, and two catalogos. The one for you to searche by that the queene's librarie, according to Dr. Gesner's request, and to ask of other learned men concerning the same. The other I pray you send

to Dr. Sampson or Dr. Humphrys, that searche may be made in Oxford also. One I have sent to Mr. Beaumont, in Cambridge, that he may do the lyke.

“I wold rather be negligent in other things, then in setting forthe old ancient writers; and yet to say the truthe to you, I lyke no olde wryter worse then Dionysius, the which, although he be somewhat ancient, yet I am persuaded that it is not Areopagita ille de quo Act. 17.

“I praye you certifie me of these things as sone as you maye, and if a bloodhound or twayne might be sent to Zurich, according to Dr. Gesner’s requeste, I wold rejoyce not a little, and wold be contente to pay for the charges thereof. I wryte this unto you, because you be so good a hunter, and have suche plentie of dogges, etc. I praye you, when you have perused Dr. Gesner’s letters, that you will send them againe forthe to me, that I may make answer to the same against the next caste.

“Commende me to Mrs. Foxe, to Mr. Day and his wyfe, and thanke him for the boke of the reliques of Rome which he sent me. I will thanke Mr. Becon, which dedicated the same tO my name, another time, if God so will. Yf you see the bishop of London, the deane of Paul’s, Mr. Whitehedd, and other of my friends there, I praye you salute them in my name.

“Yours, “*JOHN NORWIC.*” <sup>F181</sup>

Soon after his return from Norwich he published, in the year 1563, his first English edition of his great work, under the following title: “Actes and Monuments of these latter perillous days touching matters of the Church, wherein are comprehended and described the great persecutions and horrible troubles that have been wrought and practiced by the Romish Prelates, speciallye in this realme of England and Scotland, from the yeare of our Lorde a thousand unto the time now present, etc., gathered and collected accordinge to the true copies and wrytinges certificatorie, as well of the parties themselves that suffered, as also out of the Bishop’s registers, which were the doers thereof. By John Foxe. Imprinted at London by John Day, dwelling over Aldersgate, beneth St. Martin’s. Anno

1563, the 20th of March. *Cure gratia& privilegio regime Majestatis.* <sup>F182</sup> It was comprised in one vol. folio, containing rather more than 1700 pages, exclusive of the index, prefaces, etc.

I reserve for the second part of this humble memorial of the father of ecclesiastical history in England, the fuller consideration of the value, the reception, the objections which were urged against, and the imperishable effect of this most splendid result of the discovery of printing, and of the revival of literature. The moment of the publication of this book was that aera in the religious history of man, which decided the question — whether the power of the great dragon should be restored or destroyed. It enlisted the reason of the people on the side of free inquiry, by submitting to them the facts and reasonings by which the leaders of the two great churches which were dividing the christian world, appealed to that great tribunal — the public mind of Europe. Up to this time, the opponents of the errors which had gradually crept into the paradise of the catholic church, enveloped in the mist of the ignorance and darkness which resulted from the prevalence of formalism, and the suppression of the Scriptures, — as Satan is represented by Milton to have obtained admission into the Paradise of Eden, — had appealed to rulers and senates rather than to the people. But Liberty is as uniformly the handmaid of Truth, as Slavery is the companion of Error: and one blessed result of the re-establishment of the ancient christianity of the apostolic age, in the reformation of the catholic church from the apostasy of its Romish member, has been the raising up of that unbribable tribunal the mass of thinking, reading, religious persons, whose frown constitutes censure and oblivion, and whose approbation is praise and earthly immortality to the politician, the statesman, the historian, and the writer. This great tribunal is the true lawgiver. It was now in its infancy. The work of Foxe gave it strength; raised it into activity; and, more than any other human work, created its now undying energy. The value of the work consisted not merely in its vast accumulation of knowledge and materials, but in its solemn appeals to the intellect and souls of its readers, as men responsible for those souls; and whose bounden duty it consequently became to seek truth, and to commend themselves to God, by loving priesthood, but hating priestcraft, and valuing the ministers of religion as their useful directors, but not as their infallible teachers. Its value consisted in the unintended, but inevitable

enforcement of this great truth — that an individual Christian may be right, when the great body of the priesthood of the catholic church might be wrong; and, therefore, that each individual must deem himself to be responsible to God alone, and not to any human power, political or ecclesiastical, for his religious conclusions. Its value consisted in this mighty service also — the unavoidable, though still slowly learned and unintended enforcement upon all the governments of the world, that every system of laws must be founded upon the conviction of their usefulness and truth, or they cannot be made permanent by the most unrelenting persecutions of the most formidable power. Its value was, that it began the more universal reception of the axiom — that conscience must be governed by conviction, and not by authority alone; and, therefore, that governments must rule for the happiness of the people, and not merely for the advantage of the governors. All these conclusions, which are now so common that they are almost unquotable because of their triteness, have been only gradually received as undeniable axioms, since the publication of that book, which the tame elegance, or the degenerate weakness, of the present day, which places the happiness of churches and communities in retrogradation, rather than in progression, is beginning to depreciate and decry.

This view of the value of the work of John Foxe is confirmed by his letter to the president and fellows of his own college (Magdalen) at Oxford. After many expressions of regret, that he cannot submit to them any labor more worthy of their acceptance, he affirms that he published the work, not in Latin, which might have been more imposing, and pleasant to them, but *in English, for the good of the country and for the information of the multitude*. Men slowly and with difficulty emancipate themselves from the erroneous impressions which are produced by the long continuance of that specious and fascinating priestcraft which appeals to the learned and literary classes, as if their souls were of more value to God than the souls of the peasant, the mechanic, and the weaver; and as if their superior educational and intellectual improvement was the chief object, both of the original impartation of revelation, and of all the devotional instruction derived from its sacred pages. Whereas, the object of all theological learning is to render the poor, as well as the rich, free, holy, and happy; and to teach that the soul of the meanest is of as much value as the soul of the

highest and greatest. Up to this time very few appeals had been made to the intelligence of the multitude. The people were supposed to be ordained to be the passive followers of their political or ecclesiastical superiors; to have nothing to do with laws but to obey them; and to receive their religion from authority enforcing opinions by penalties, instead of enforcing them by conviction. The strength of the church of England, like the strength of Christianity when it was first preached to the world by Christ and his apostles, reposes on the same solid basis. It upholds authority which permits and demands that the people do esteem it, because it deserves their christian affection. It appeals to the arguments derived from conviction, upon evidence, and not to the penalties and severity which compel an unwilling conformity; and the church will never be truly safe till its ministers as universally and as boldly adopt this system of appeal to the people, as the laws of their church allow, and as Christ and his apostles practiced it. John Foxe was one of the first of our reformers who took theological controversy from the priest, the scholar, and the political or ecclesiastical ruler, and summoned the common people to read, think, judge, and be convinced, that popery, whatever were its appeals to antiquity, tradition, or long-established laws, was alike deficient in usefulness, truth, and holiness — that its boasted appeal to antiquity comprised only many ancient errors, with many ancient truths — that its traditions were the blendings of human observances, customs, and maxims, and were consequently rejectable by any episcopal church, without the imputation of crime — that its laws were a collection of canons, or ecclesiastical regulations, gradually superseding the statutes of princes; and upholding in all ages the continued enlargement of error, by the ever-increasing severity of cruel and wicked punishments — and the effect of his book, therefore, in promoting, confirming, and establishing the Reformation — that is, of the pure, ancient, and apostolical Christianity, as contradistinguished from Romanism, is so universally acknowledged, and so fully proved by the very antipathy which the enemies of that Christianity, who adhere to the inventions and errors of popery, still retain to it, that to demonstrate the effect of its publication would be to gild the rose and paint the lily.

The reception of the book was enthusiastic. “Great,” says Strype, “was the expectation of the book here in England, before it came abroad. The

papists scurrilously called it Foxe's Golden Legend. When it first appeared there was extraordinary fretting and fuming at it through all quarters of England, and," on the continent, "even to Louvaine." The common people of England welcomed it as the true record of the past; and they loved the church of their forefathers as they saw it restored by the queen, because of the power which Foxe had now given them, of comparing its pretensions to their favor with the true catholicism of the primitive church; and the pretended catholicism of the church of Rome.

The contemporary objections which were made to it — and such a book could not be free from unintentional errors — were fully and candidly considered by its truth-seeking author. These, and the subsequent objections which were made to it, shall be considered.

The devotional, amiable, and gentle spirit of Foxe is eminently conspicuous in **the letter to the president**<sup>L6</sup> and fellows of Magdalen, to which I have alluded. He commends his book to the approbation of Oxford generally, but especially to the Society of Magdalen. The best part of his history, he observes, relates to Oxford itself, whence, as from a fountain, it took not only its first beginning, but its increase. He prays that the Lord Jesus Christ would preserve them and their president, that they may daily increase the glory of His name; and deep and bitter, therefore, must be the regret of those who admire the character and appreciate the services of John Foxe, that the most unsparing assailants of his name and work, next to the adherents of the church of Rome, have been, even in our own day, certain members of the University of Oxford. These persons have not hesitated to deride his motives, decry his services, and stigmatize his work as a caricature of the history of the catholic church. The foreign reformers, in common with their protestant brethren in England, in the day of the regeneration of the Christian Church, were of a different opinion. Bullinger, for instance, who read the work, probably in the proof-sheets, before it had been published in England, writes to its illustrious author: — "I am devotedly attached to you on account of your piety and learning, but chiefly for your book of the martyrs of England."<sup>F183</sup> The principal subject of the work of John Foxe may be said to be — the consequences which resulted to the catholic church from the usurpation which was defended by spiritual anathemas, leading to temporal punishments: and as the anathemas of the canon law of Rome were enforced by the deposition

of sovereigns, the imprisonment and burning of their subjects, and all the fearful penalties described by the historians of religious persecution; the value of his book was demonstrated to the world not only by the eulogies of its friends, but by the persevering folly of its enemies. In the very year in which the English edition was published, the council of Trent brought its proceedings to a conclusion. The last act of that council, instead of being a holy, humble, christian protestation to the whole catholic church, inviting them to union among themselves, and to peace with Rome, on the foundation of its perpetually desiring improve-merit, was a declamatory vote, passed by acclamation, of anathema — anathema to heretics! The word heretic included the episcopal protestants of England — the presbyterians of Scotland — the Lutherans and Calvinists on the continent — and all religious and literary inquirers in Spain, Italy, and elsewhere, who had found reason not to uphold the supremacy of Rome. In the latter two countries, as well as in a certain portion of the Netherlands, the sanguinary Inquisition executed the decrees of the council. In every other part of the catholic church, the labors of John Foxe presented the solemn warning of the consequences of this decree to the peace and happiness of every church, and of every congregation of christians. Anathema to all heretics, was the sentence of the cardinal of Lorraine, who had uselessly contended in the council for the religious privileges and independence of his own church and country — Anathema, anathema — was the reply of the assembled ecclesiastics: and they all returned to their churches to perpetuate, till this very day, the yoke of the ecclesiastical usurpations. Anathema to all heretics who should refuse to admit the rule of faith which was not, even then, drawn up; but which *was to be* submitted to the reception, not to the approbation, of the churches, by the Bishop of Rome. What is the meaning of this anathema? the humble Christian might demand. Take up the pages of Foxe and read, was the answer of the Queen of England and the bishops of England there learn the fearful meaning which is attached to the anathemas of Rome, when Rome is able to enforce them. Place the book (they subsequently said,) in the churches and the colleges — in the houses of gentlemen, and in the halls of the bishops, that all may read the narratives, to the truth of many of which our eyes can testify — and learn, and reflect upon, and remember the meaning of the anathemas of Rome. If it be said that the canons of the church of England were enforced in the reign of James I. in the same language: I answer, that,

not only are the anathemas of our canons unattended with temporal severities; but the time has arrived when England, as well as Rome, is required by the best interests of truth, freedom, and catholicism, to revise its canons, for changes, additions, and expungements.

In the year 1564 the Queen visited the University of Cambridge, and was entertained at King's College. She attended in the schools the Acts, or academical disputations in divinity, philosophy, and medicine; <sup>f184</sup> and made, on leaving the university, a Latin speech. She encourages them, in this speech, to study; and promises that she, like her ancestors, would do some work, while she still lived, to express her esteem of them: but that, if she died before she could accomplish her promise she would leave *aliquid opus egregium* — some glorious work — to be done after her death, whereby both her memory might be celebrated to posterity, and that she might excite others by her example, and make them (the scholars of that university) more cheerful to apply to their studies." In the answer to this, the public orator, William Masters, recommended the university of Cambridge to her majesty's notice as being more ancient than the sister one of Oxford; but without intending any disparagement of it. This, however, was taken ill by some of the Oxonians, who presented to the Queen, upon her visit there, a tract entitled "Assertio antiquitatis Academiae Oxoniensis." One of the copies of the Queen's speech fell into the hands of John Foxe, who addressed to her majesty, on the occasion, an elegant Latin epistle, partly to the following effect: "To let pass (most noble Queen) those commonly known things, viz. that presently at the very beginning of your most fortunate reign, you saved so many good men at home in great danger of their lives, and called back so many more abroad from their banishment; that you restored their own country to them, and not only to them, but the country in a manner to itself; and England, then almost at the very point of expiring, to its light and life again; that at your said most happy beginning, having procured peace, you do now every day improve it in good studies and arts; to the good laws you give again their force, the bad ones you take away, and supply their room with such as are wholesome; the mischievous and the idle sort you reduce to order; robberies and the bands of spoilers, wherewith your realm is reported at this day in a foul manner to swarm, you restrain; the afflicted you give an ear to; what is fallen and gone to decay you build up; and not only money

embased, but also the manners of men much more corrupted, you purify and refine. In a word, you restore every thing to its own brightness, nay, more than its own; and many other things of this kind you do; which, although of themselves they be not ordinary benefits, and such as in other monarchs might seem very great, yet, I know not how, do not sufficiently express the largeness of your praiseworthy deeds.

“But assuredly these things that follow are much greater still; and of all the greatest, that your excellent highness defendeth so vigorously the ecclesiastical state no less than the commonwealth; that you take upon you so affectionately the care and protection of religion; that you quench the direful flames of persecution; that you open a liberty to consciences so long shut up; that you illustrate and promote the temple of God and the glory of evangelical doctrine; that is, by all means endeavoring, that the remainder of old superstition by little and little be destroyed, the sincere truth of the gospel return to its native brightness. This was lately declared by that excellent voice and answer of your majesty given to the petition of some divines concerning the habits. By which words, then by your majesty spoken, it can scarce be thought how great prosperity you did in one day bring to the whole church, how great comfort to the minds of all godly people, how great benefit to posterity, how great a light to all succeeding times; and moreover to your own name how great and how immortal an honor, more lasting than any monument of brass. The tongues and learning of all Englishmen would be stained with ingratitude, should they suffer as well this godlike thing, as all the other trophies of your virtues, by an antiquity of time to be abolished.

“Hither must be added your majesty’s singular favor towards learned studies. In the adorning and furthering whereof, you would never have shown yourself so inclinable, had you not been so exquisitely furnished and dressed yourself with them. Happy Cambridge lately perceived it: and I doubt not but hereafter our Oxford also will look for it. And further, we all, though absent thence, well perceived it, by your late speech delivered there at Cambridge; which is come to my hands, (among other monuments of historical matters,) not unworthy, methinks, to be transmitted to

posterity; and so it shah be transmitted, if your highness give way to it. In the meantime this only grieves me, that when I am preparing a full account of the history of you, and have great collections serving thereunto, many things are wanting, which are yet unknown to me, and cannot be known but to your majesty. And if they might, they could not be described better by any than by your own commentary. Which I heartily wish might be obtained by your most excellent wit, in this time and space of your life; but of the commendations of your excellent parts, I shall elsewhere, God willing, have occasion to speak.” <sup>F185</sup>

The close of this letter implies that Foxe purposed to write the life of Elizabeth; or at least, the part the queen took in establishing the Reformation. “If he had done so,” says Strype, <sup>f186</sup> “this work of mine had been superseded.”

The controversy on the clerical vestures still proceeded, though the majority of the original opponents of the habits had conformed to them. On this, as on other subjects, Foxe was consulted, and his interest with the queen solicited. Lawrence Humphrey, the president of Magdalen College, Oxford, wrote to him, to exert himself in procuring some favor or dispensation for those who hesitated to adopt the habits ordered by the queen to be worn. He says, he had not time to see him in London; and recommends to him “Nicholas Balgay, master of Magdalene school, a pious and learned man,” and, as if to ensure him Foxe’s friendship, calls him a studious reader of your “Acts and Monuments.” He then commends to his prayers and care, the spread of religion, and the reformation of the church; and desires him to use every exertion that the nobles and bishops should procure some exemption. He adds, at the end of the letter — “Send, if you can, by this Balgay, the specimen of the *Reformatio Legum.*” <sup>F187</sup>

The queen, soon after this letter was sent to Foxe, visited the university of Oxford. She was entertained, says her biographer, <sup>f188</sup> with the most stately welcome the muses could make; and was addressed by the Greek professor in a Greek speech, to which the accomplished queen returned an answer in the same language. Before this visit of the queen to Oxford, Dr. Humphrey had changed his opinion on the necessity of continuing his

opposition to the vestments. He had been appointed, too, professor of divinity; and he now attended the queen in his robes. The queen could not resist the opportunity, according to her custom, of cheerfully, yet with some severity, reproving the faults of her subject. “Master doctor,” she said to him, “that loose gown becomes you mighty well; I wonder your notions should be so narrow.” <sup>F189</sup> A letter written to Elizabeth from Oxford, on her arrival at her palace after this visit, partakes of the punning turn of the age. <sup>F190</sup>

Foxe at this time, 1566, began to prepare for the press the second edition of his work in English; and we may infer from the following letter that he was the object of general attention to all parties. A complaint against a clergyman named John Day, the curate of Maidstone, was laid by his parishioners before archbishop Parker. The chief of his accusers thought their object would be better effected if they endeavored to interest John Foxe in the matter. The archbishop was a member of the ecclesiastical commission; and the accusation against Day — the account of his sermon at the burning of seven heretics — his excuse for not remembering the precise words he uttered, because of the smoke of the fire in which they were burned his affirming, and subsequent withdrawal of the affirmation, that the persons burned denied the divinity of Christ — his levity and want of all feeling, form a most painful picture of the manners of the times. Foxe has merely related, in his Martyrology, the burning of the seven victims, and the previous examination of one of them. He has omitted the details contained in this letter. He was wearied, perhaps, of his own sad task; and the narrative may be regarded as a specimen of the scenes of which he has only left, after all his labors, a comparatively scanty memorial. The letter is found among the Harleian papers. It is dated 1566, five years before the publication of his second English edition.

### **JOHN AND ROGER HALL TO JOHN FOXE. INFORMATION OF ONE DAY A PRIEST, CURATE OF MAYDSTON.**

“It may please yowe to understande that one John Daye is curate of Maydston from the first yere of quene Marye unto this present yere 1666, of whome we beseche God for his mercye delyver us, for he sheweth him selfe still not to have any feare of God at all before his eyes. In the yere of owre lorde 1667 on Wednesdaye the

16 of June, seven blessed and constant marters were burned all at one stake in Maydston in a place there comonly cauled the kynges medowe, ther names were these, Edmunde Alen and - his wife, Walter Apelbe and Parnell his wife, one Elizabeth Lewes comonly cawled blinde Besse, Jone Manninge the wife of one Robert Manyng of the sayd towne, and a vertuous maiden cauled Jone Bradbrege. At the burnynge of these blessed marters, this wyked preste preached, fyrst bendynge his abhominable blasphemus talk to them, saynge, that they were heritykes moste damnabell, and that by tiler heresy they had separat them selves from the holy cherche as he called yt of Rome, whythe he eauled the spowse of Chryste, and Christ his misticall bodye, and therefore sayd he ye have no part in him, but when he sawe that they wet buylded on the unmovable Rocke of Christ his worde, who was ther swete comfote (for they kryed unto him, Away Satan, away wt thy doctrine, away wt thy blasfemye); in great hast and fury he tornyd bothe his thee and talke to the people there assembled, sayenge, good people ye ought not in any wyse to pray for these obstinat herytykes, for loke how ye shall se ther bodyes burne here wt materiall lyre, so shall ther damnabel soules burn in the unquenchabel fyr of hell everlastynglye: and not beyng thus cotent the nexte Sondaye folowyng whythe was the 20 of June he iterated beyng in the pulpet to his Audience, most abhominably that Whiche he sayde the Wednesdaye before in the kynges medowe to the people, these wt innumerabel other popish blasfemyes uteryd he in quene Maryes dayes, but when yt pleased God to sende ovr nobell quene to the crowne, dyvers men who all the dayes of quene Marye were in exile for ther concience came home; amonge whome one Roger Newman who was brother to John Newman who was burned in quene Maryes time for the true testimony of Christ, and one Peter Brown and Matthew Milles exorted this preste to repent and recant these his great blasfemys before sayd against the truthe of God and his saintes; he answered them that he wolde so do. The next Sonday folowynge whiche was the Sonday next before Whytsontyde, he went in to the pulpet and thus he saide, It is reported of me sayde he, that in the tyme of quene Marye when sertayn people wer burned in the kynge his

medow, I showlde saye that they were damned, but I think thay do belye me that so say or reporte of me, but to say the truthe I know not nor do not remember, what I ther sayde, no nor then at that present (by meanes of the flame of the lyre and the greate smoke, that the wynde browghte so violently towardes me) cowlde I tell my selfe what I sayde or spake, but this I know that some of them did deny the humanity of Christe and the equalitie of the trinitie, and no man dowbteth but such are heretykes. Wherefore I may be bowld to say even now againe that unles by the great mercy of God and repentance thay are damned. The forsayd men herynge this it much greved them as yt did many other that hearde him, whetfore after evensonge they stayed to speak wt him at his acustomed way to the ale-howse, and asked him this question, whiche of them sayde thay amonge them that were burned at this towne wer it that denyed the humaniteye of Christ or the equalitye of the trinitye, as ye sayde to day in the pulpet. At the whych he stode still and paused as one astonied, and at the laste he answered that none of them that were burned in the sayde towne of Maydston held these opinions: wherfore they asked him, wherfore he then made suche abhomynabel lyes, and farther whether the pulpet wer mad to utter lyes and blasfemyes in (for thay well knewe as also all other that knew them do that he dedly belyed them, for none of them ever helde any such eror or opinion but much abhorred all heresyes unto the death). Unto them he thus answered, asking them whether they were not men or that thay never lyed: dyd yow quod he never lye in yowr lyves, ar ye not men, ye seine sayd he to be justifiers of your selves and hipokrytes; and thus in a furye he fiunge from them to the ale-howse whych he so much frequentlyth that he veray often goyth home dronke scant able to speak or stande on his legs. ye (yea) drynkyng bowsyng cordyng (card playing) and table playeng is all his hole holy exarsyse all the weke from tyme to tyme: this brefely for this tyme but I meane that ye shall shortly have a cople of owr supplication whych we meane shortlye to make to my lorde of Cantorbury wher in ye shall more at large understand the lyre and behaveour of his monster. Thus Jesus Christ be our comfort, and geve us after the affiycions of this lyre peace and joy in him. Amen. **“JOHN HALLE.”** <sup>F191</sup>

The liberty of the press was not well understood at that time. All parties seem to have followed the example of the church of Rome in endeavoring to suppress and to punish the circulation of controversial works, instead of answering them, and thus making the press the proper guardian and controller of the press. While Foxe was engaged in revising his second edition, some general restrictions had been laid upon printers and publishers. To be enabled, therefore, to proceed with his work without incurring the lash of the law, he addressed a letter to sir William Cecil, the queen's secretary, in the name of John Day, in which he states that he, Day, desires his assistance and counsel.

“You are aware that it is provided, both by public and municipal law, that citizens and artificers (printers) should not engage in their employ more than four foreigners and strangers. If any one exceed this number, I know not how heavy a fine is threatened to him. I am not aware of the tenor of the law, nor am I concerned to inquire. The framers of it, wise and prudent men, saw reasons for it, which those of less foresight might not perceive. However this may be, it is of serious inconvenience to our printer, as well as to ourselves. While we are supplying materials for three presses, we cannot procure among our own countrymen fit persons to work them, and are by the law forbidden to seek the assistance of strangers. This is our complaint, and we solicit your highness to interpose your authority, so as to relieve us from the difficulty, and enable us to complete the work we have in hand. If we ourselves should not be worthy of such kindness, yet you will extend it to those pious and holy martyrs of Christ, who have so long lain in the grave, and thus will be more easily brought to light.”

The letter is dated July 6, 1568, and signed

“Yours in all christian obedience, *J. Foxe.*”

“In addition to these, unless we appear too importunate, we solicit that to this printer, whom I have named, may be secured all those privileges which he formerly enjoyed from you, while printing the Psalms in the vulgar tongue: because from this one source alone is his family sustained.

“To the Lord Cecil, secretary to the queen, a man eminently conspicuous for his prudence and piety.” <sup>F192</sup>

In the year 1563 the following letter was addressed to the merchants and citizens of London in behalf of the sufferers in the pestilence:

“Grace and Joy in ye Holy Ghost; with increase of all felicity through Christ our only Savior. To ye dispersed company of Londiners as well Aldermen Merchants, and other rich and wealthy members of ye same citty, with all other well-disposed persons whersoever, harry greeting in ye Lord. If wee ye poore servants of Christ and ministers of his word within ye citty of London, here nowe remaining, and sustaining ye affliction of this dangerous and infectious time, shall seeme in this our writing to you something more plaine, or bold, then wee should, humbly wee crave of your wisdome wisely to construe ye cause therof, imputing it not to any inconsiderate suggestion or prtensed devise conceived of our parts; but rather to ye serious and earnest necessity of this present calamitous time; thus much signifying to you before, yt if ye cause wet ours only, privately to us belonging weh write to you, wee would never soe farr embolden ourselves, for as wee for our parts have lerned not to shrink away from our charge comitted to us of ye Lord; soe wee have lerned alsoe to stand content, whatsoever it bee, wee have of him, butt nowe hearing as wee heare, and seeing as wee see ye pittious cry of ye poore and desolate flocke of Christ, some in lanes, some in houses, some in ditches; some harbourlesse, some clotheles, some menteless (*mad*), some frendeles, all succourles, wee cannot chuse, — being their pastours, and ye mouth of ye flocke, but both tender ther pitifull lamentation, and alsoe certify ye same to you, desiring you in ye Lord, to extend your tender and christian compassion upon the, in helping them in this infectious ayer, with some good odour of sweet savor from you; so yt though your bodily comfort bee absent from the, yet your charitable sustentation may be present with them. As members together of one mysticall body, soe wee beseech you utterly forsake not yr fellowe members. And though God hath sett you in a more safe state of life, yet neglect not them weh beare ye crosse, yt God might, or yet may lay upon yourselves. It is ye point of

an honest mind, and a christian heart, yt though hee bee in ease, yt hee neede not for himselfe to feare, yet to lament and sorrowe with the yt lie in misery. Wherefore being therunto necessarily constraigned by ye pittifull cry, and exclamation of ye poore people of Christ, here left in London, wee are forced to write to you, speaking for them, yt cannot help themselves, that you of yr clemency, and christian dewty, (whereby you are borne, not only to yourselves, but alsoe to your country and neighbors) will bestowe some comfort uppon your fellowe members and poore bretheren, miserably here oppressed and consumed, as well with penury, as with pestilence; of wch two, ye one is the hand of God only to stopp, ye other partly under God lieth in your hands to reliefe. Extend therefore wee beseech you your helping hand, and in case you will not or darenot visitt the with yr prsence, yet visitt them with your purses, that ye Lord (who peradventure doth this to try you, what you will doe) may say to you, I was sick and you visitted mee, I was hungry etc. for else howe this your flying and departing from yr needy neyghours, wch nether with your visitation, nor provision you will helpe, wilbe allowed before God, wee cannot see; especially such of you as by charge of office are obliged to your companies: [is not] ye aldermen being magistrates of his ward, as well bound in conscience to the, as ye minis[ter] to his parish? or what meane ther robes of scarlett, butt to declare themselves ready with their blood to defend ye safegard of ther people? And howe bee they ready to ye s[hedding] of ther blood to defend, wch att every slight occasion doe shrinke away, leaving th[em in] danger whom they should succor with ther provision? And what is then to bee said [where] as nether with ther blood, nor yet with ther goods will minister any supportation.” <sup>F193</sup> ... (Caetera desunt.)

Foxe, since his return from Norwich, had principally resided in the house of the duke of Norfolk. After the demise of the duchess, however, and probably on account of the duke not coming to London, or in compliance with an invitation from John Day the printer, he removed to the house of the latter in Aldersgate-street. Many letters still extant addressed to him at that residence, fully prove the high estimation in which he was now held.

One, for instance, intimates his influence with Grindal, the bishop of London; and earnestly solicits him to use that influence in procuring the suppression of some great immoralities in his diocese: —

“The grace of our Lorde Jesus Christ,” it begins, “and the continuall presence and assistance of his Holy Spirit be with you ever (my good brother, and most deare freind in the Lorde) in all your studies and laboures, and give you strengthe bothe in mynde and bodey joyfully to bringe the same to that good effect, which maye be to the glorie and prayse of his eternall Majestie, the consolacion and profett of his afflicted and persecuted church, your owne cornforte, and the strengthening and confirmacion of our faithe in him, against all the craftiness and power of Satan our cruell enemie. Amen. I was bolde at my last being in London, to use your helpe to the byshoppe of London, for the obteyning of a commission to certain gent of worshippe in the countrie, for the examinacion of divers persons.” — Then follow the particulars of the crimes which the writer desired to be investigated and suppressed.—“Remember me,” it concludes, “in your prayers, and commende me hartelye to the lorde, to Mr. Bull, when you see him, mistresse Fox, and Mr. Randall, and to Mr. Sampson. The Lorde increase our faithe, and graunte us alwayes therby the joyfull light of his most gracious and joy-full countenance. Amen. From Bredgrowse the 19 of February, 1565.

“Yours in the Lorde to command, *WILLM PLAYFERE*. “To my verie friend Mr. John Foxe, at Mr. Daye’s house, over Aldersgate in London.” <sup>F194</sup>

Numerous other letters, partly in English, and partly in Latin, to Foxe, some seeking his advice, others his prayers or favors, are preserved in the Harleian Collection, and are testimonies of the approbation of his contemporaries. I omit them only because they would not, probably, be interesting to a modern reader. <sup>F195</sup>

Foxe was still busily employed in preparing his materials for the next edition of his Acts and Monuments, when the first attack was made on the edition of 1563, by Nicholas Harpsfield, under the name of Alan Cope. The objections of this writer, with those of other antagonists of the

martyrologist, will be subsequently noticed, as well as the correspondence of Foxe with M. F. Illyricus on both their works having been cavilled at by the same writer. Harpsfield published his objections in Six Dialogues, which have ever since been made the foundation of the chief attacks on Foxe. A letter is still preserved in the Harleian Manuscripts, which is indeed without either signature or date; the internal evidence of which, however, is sufficient to compel us to believe that Foxe was the author. The letter is chiefly of importance as proving to us that Foxe had read and considered the arguments of Harpsfield before he committed his next edition to the press. The Dialogues of Harpsfield had been published in 1566, at Antwerp. The letter alludes to this circumstance as taking place three years before. Allusion is also made to the reference, in the first five dialogues of Harpsfield, to the person addressed; and it would be difficult, therefore, to assign the letter to any other than to Illyricus. Foxe relates the contents of the Six Dialogues to his correspondent — that the first five refer to the Magdeburg Centuriators, upon the earlier volumes of which, he had probably been engaged with Illyricus, in the press of Oporinus; and the sixth referred peculiarly, and by name, to the writer. The object of the letter is to solicit the opinion of his correspondent, whether he should reply briefly, or at all, to the attack of Harpsfield. <sup>F196</sup>

Foxe appears to have received from Flacius Illyrieus, in reply, a recommendation to answer Alan Cope, “the sycophant,” as he styles him; and in addition to what he says above respecting his labors, he remarks, in his answers to Harpsfield: “If I had thought no imperfections to have passed in my former edition before, I would never have taken in hand the recognition thereof now the second time, whereby to sponge away such notes as I thought would seem great stumbling-blocks in such men’s walks, who walk with no charity to edify, but with malice to carp and reprehend, neither admonishing what they see amiss in others, neither tarrying while other men reform themselves; and, finally, finding quarrels where no great cause is justly given.” <sup>F197</sup>

When a church has been once founded, and its members have been well instructed in the great truths and doctrines of the gospel, the people will bring their infants to baptism, and derive one great part of their own spiritual nourishment from their constant attendance at the Supper and Table of the Lord. The commemoration of the death of Christ, and the

grace which is imparted by the omnipresent Savior, who blesses, above all other means of grace, the spiritual communion of the believer with himself in the holy sacrament, may sometimes be more efficacious to the benefit of the soul than Christ's own ordinance of preaching. But the command of Christ to his disciples to preach the word, both preceded and followed the institution of the Lord's Supper, as if to prove to us that the churches which constitute the catholic church, must be both founded and built up, by the zealous, energetic, persevering preaching of his apostles and their successors; that the holy body of Christ's church triumphant might be composed of that portion of the church militant who shall be brought to the marriage supper of the Lamb in heaven, after they have been brought, by this preaching of his sacred gospel, to the table of the Lord upon earth. The religion of Christ was extended by the preaching of his word, and sacraments. When the veneration ever due to the sacraments degenerated into the superstition, that baptism constituted in itself the holiness of heaven, instead of being merely the mysterious commencement of the reception of the soul into the covenant of grace, and thereby into the kingdom of God; and when the sacrament of the Lord's supper was degraded into a corporeal presence of the body which was pierced, the blood which was shed, and the bones which were unbroken on the cross — when the dispensers of such awful mysteries founded priestcraft upon priesthood, and taught themselves, and not Christ; and when the light in the churches of Christ became darkness; it was then perceived by those, upon whom the light from the gospel, which pierced that darkness, began to shine, that the dominion of the true, ancient, apostolical Christianity could only be restored to the world, by reviving the same ordinance which Christ had instituted and ordained before and after he commanded the observance of the Lord's supper. They commanded the preaching of God's word to be re-established. They called forth, they sent out, the preachers of truth. They depended upon the prophetic, as well as upon the priestly duty of the church of Christ; and the preacher became once more the chief agent in extending the knowledge of the will of God, and the constant interpreter of the open scripture, as well as the dispenser of the sacraments, and the upholder of an useful ritual.

Among other places where those who were held in reputation for their spiritual gifts were called upon to preach, was St. Paul's cross; and John

Foxe, in spite of his still declining the required conformity to the habits, was commanded by bishop Grindal, the year before his second edition of Acts and Monuments was published, to preach at this celebrated spot. He very unwillingly, in consequence both of diffidence and ill health, obeyed the injunction. In writing to Grindal he urged his incapacity. "Consider also, in fairness," he proceeds, "how unequally this will press upon me, when, as I believe, there never yet was ass or mule who was so weighed down and overdone by carrying burthens, as I have long been by literary labors; every day employed investigating and drawing forth the contents of writers, reading copies, and reading them again, and putting together materials which may be of public benefit to the church. By these labors I am almost worn out, not to speak of ill health <sup>f198</sup> and want of books. Yet, amidst all these labors and defects which I have narrated, I am summoned, in addition, to St. Paul's cross, that celebrated spot, where, like an ape among cardinals, I shall be received with derision, or driven away by the hisses of the auditory."

We learn from another letter, that he was solemnly adjured by many who appreciated his services to preach there, whatever might be his own conviction of his unfitness; and that bishop Grindal also gave him the subject of his sermon. "Yesterday," he writes in another letter to Grindal, "I heard, when too late, that your servant had been with Day, the printer. Had I seen him, perhaps I might have sent a different answer from the present. But although I saw him not, I now see there are friends who by no means will suffer me to refuse, what by all means I had determined to deny. I find that they will not rest till they have thrust me forward, most unwillingly, at Paul's cross. By every means, by entreaties, threats, upbraidings, they urge, press, and solicit me. What is more painful, they pretend that you are displeased with my last letter. In addition, they solemnly adjure me in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. This, indeed, more than all besides, induces me not to refuse. Pray for me again and again. I entreat you, beloved prelate, who have laid this burden upon me, help me to sustain it. And I cannot but express a pleasing surprise that in your letters, where by virtue of your authority this burden is laid upon me, your piety has kindly suggested a subject — that I preach Christ Jesus, and him crucified. May the Lord Jesus, crucified for us, keep your mind in perfect humility amidst the honors of your calling, and with that

humility of mind may he also preserve you in your present dignity, for the lasting welfare of his church.”

Controversy in the present day is banished to the press, or to the platform. It seldom intrudes itself into the pulpit. At this time, however, the preacher who should have omitted all allusion to the great division between Rome and England, would have been considered as deserting his duty. He would have been deemed either ignorant, cowardly, or traitorous. We may justly believe, therefore, that the public anticipated some vehement and bitter invective against popery from the martyrologist. If they did so they must have been much disappointed by his sermon at St. Paul’s Cross. Though he was both willing and anxious to comply with the popular wish, after he had once consented to preach, of assailing the errors of the apostate church, he did not treat popery as the political enemy to the government, or institutions of England. He spoke of it as the spiritual enemy of the souls of men. He contrasted the effects of the papal doctrines, with the christian doctrines to which they are opposed. He argues well and satisfactorily, that the popish doctrine of the continual sacrifice of the mass, and the christian doctrine of reconciliation with God, through faith in the one, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction which was made once for all, cannot consist together, but must destroy each other. He preached the one only doctrine which is again beginning to be stigmatized as absurd, by many learned and deeply-reasoning theologians; but which will ever be regarded by the humble-minded and wounded in spirit, as the only source of comfort — justification before the Creator, by the faith which worketh obedience, by love to the Savior who has completed the reconciliation of the soul which believes, to his Father and our Father, to his God and our God. He preached a sermon which would be called ‘ultra-protestant,’ among those who would neutralize our opposition to the soul-destroying doctrines of the church of Rome, by inventing new terms of reproach against their brethren, to palliate their own inconsistency. Christ, and his apostles, the fathers and the reformers, conquered the dominion of evil, by urging on their hearers, the christian, evangelical, ‘ultra-protestant’ truths of the sinfulness of the unconverted nature of man — the necessity of repentance—the value of the only atonement — and the continued work of the Holy Spirit to sanctify and renew the soul. From these solemn topics

they derived warning to the impenitent, and comfort to the humble believer. John Foxe followed in their train, and imitated the example of those sacred leaders of the church, from earth to heaven. He addresses his discourse — To all them that labor and are heavy-laden in conscience.

After alluding, in his Epistle Dedicatory, to the means by which the church of Rome presents the circumstances of the passion of Christ to the people, he observes, that “to know the crucified sacrifice of Christ’s body to be a perfect deliverance of all his people, to be a full satisfaction once, and forever, for all our sins — to be a free justification, redemption, and righteousness before God for ever, to all them that believe in him, without any other means or help adjoined to him — this is to know Christ Jesus crucified.” He apologizes for the publication of his sermon, and affirms that he only permitted it to be printed that it might give consolation to the humble and heavy laden. “Forsomuch,” he says, “as the Lord hath a remnant of some faithful servants, which walk after their Lord and God with a perfect heart, and are not hearers only, but seekers also of his kingdom; and especially for your cause that labor and are laden in conscience, wheresoever, or whatsoever ye are, in whom the Lord hath wrought an earnest hunger, and hearty seeking for his kingdom, for you most principally I have penned this sermon of Christ crucified, and to you specially I dedicate and commend the same; desiring the same Lord Jesus, crucified for us, that you in reading hereof may receive such spiritual refreshing to your souls, and high courage of faith in Christ Jesus, that neither Satan may deceive you; nor the law terrify you; nor death confound you; nor sin oppress you; nor conscience captive you; nor hell-gates prevail over you; but that you, rightly understanding with all saints what is the hope of your calling, the riches of your inheritance, the greatness of his power towards you; and what is the breadth, length, and profundity, and what is the super-admirable love of knowledge of Jesus Christ crucified, may superabound in all heavenly consolation; (Ephesians 1.) and also, with a holy pride, may triumph in Christ Jesus.”

The text which he selected was from the fifth of the second of Corinthians. He considers the sender of the message — the messengers — and the message of the gospel itself.

Many beautiful passages might be selected from these three divisions, especially the supposed address of Christ to Satan and to Death, and the final triumph of the Cross over all its enemies; as well as from the hortatory paragraphs at the conclusion. His prayer for the church has been generally admired. He concludes with a petition for the members of the church of Rome, which may still be offered with a devout and humble heart by the members of the church of England.

“And as the bishop of Rome is wont on this Good Friday, and every Good Friday, to accurse us as damned heretics, we here curse not him, but pray for him, that he, with all his partakers, either may be turned to a better truth: or else, we pray thee, gracious Lord, that we never agree with him in doctrine, and that he may so curse us still, and never bless us more as he blessed us in queen Mary’s time! God of his mercy keep away that blessing from us!

“Finally, instead of the pope’s blessing, give us thy blessing, Lord, we beseech thee, and conserve the peace of thy church, and course of thy blessed gospel. Help them that are needy and afflicted. Comfort them that labor and are heavy laden. And above all things continue and increase our faith. And forasmuch as thy poor little flock can scarcely have any place or rest in the world, come Lord, we beseech thee, with thy ‘It is finished;’ and make an end; that this world may have no more time nor place here, and that thy church may have rest for ever.

“For these and all other necessities requisite to be begged and prayed for, asking in Christ’s name, and as he hath taught us, let us say the Lord’s Prayer — ‘Our Father,’” etc.

A postscript to the papists follows, in which they are invited and urged to meet the weighty points of doctrine taught by the reformed Anglican church, relative to the sufficiency of Christ’s passion and atonement, either by refutation, or consent.

He says, that, having an empty page, he shall write a word or two to those who hold with the proceedings of Rome, craving them to refute his propositions, or yield to the truth of the doctrines contained in them. He

then lays down the chief points of the controversy which divides the churches, to the effect following: —

**I.** Whether they can find by the Scripture of God, or any approved doctor, that the sacrificed body of the Son of God, suffering once upon the cross on Good Friday, is not the only material and sufficient cause of our perfect salvation, remission of sins, and justification?

**II.** Whether the promise of God, which is to salvation, standeth not free, without any condition of work, or works, to be added to that effect, save only faith in the merits of Christ?

**III.** Whether faith in the Redeemer is not the only mean and instrument whereby his passion is made to us effectual?

He then calls upon them for proofs against this doctrine — to let the world hear their reasons; and to let railing, trifling, and scoffing be done with. “Persecution and blood are no *way*,” he says, “to find out truth, but serve to blind it. The Scriptures, in the matter of salvation, teach without trope or figure, and will quickly decide the cause.”

Repeating, then, the above three points of doctrine as undeniable verities of Scripture; “seeing,” he says, “our justification and remission of sins stand consummated by Christ, free by promise, and assured by faith, declare, then, I beseech you — you, who so magnify the religion of Rome — declare unto us, how standeth with God’s religion your auricular confession for loosing of sins — your satisfaction for the same — your works of perfection and supererogation, masses, trentals — your propitiatory sacrifice — praying of saints, and to saints departed — your pardons, purgatory for cleansing of sin; building and entering into monasteries for the remission of sins; pilgrimages; stations of Rome; jubilees; straitness of orders; with an infinite number of such like? All which implements of your church, to what use now do they serve? or, how can they stand with Scripture, but either they must derogate from Christ’s passion; or else the passion of Christ must needs make them void?”

“For the same Christ Jesus crucified, I desire you, therefore, if ye see these evidences true, then, be reconciled to the truth; and as St. Paul desireth you, be reconciled to God. Let the religion of God stand simple, as he left

it himself. In other matters add what ye list; but, in matter and cause of salvation, Christ left nothing behind him to be added any more, either by apostles, or martyrs, or bishops, or any other. He consummated the perfection thereof fully by himself, leaving nothing therein imperfect. Whereunto he that addeth blasphemeth; and doth no less than infringe the testament of our Lord.” These warnings and exhortations he then enforces by that strong admonition of St. Paul, (Galatians 1:9.) closing with hope that the Lord of grace might open their eyes to see, and their hearts to embrace the knowledge of his truth, to his glory, and their spiritual comfort, and their everlasting life in him.

Such was the Sermon on Christ Crucified, preached on Good Friday, by John Foxe at St. Paul’s Cross; and so long as the Liturgy of the Church of England is valued, or the holy Scriptures of truth are read, so long will this noble homily be esteemed, by the members of the catholic church, who can distinguish the inventions of man from the perfection and simplicity of the truth of the great atonement, which is the substance and the object of the revelation of the gospel of Christ.

The sermon at Paul’s Cross was preached on Good Friday, 1570, March 20th. The second edition of the Acts and Monuments was published in the course of the twelvemonth following. No parliament had now sat for four years. A parliament was called and met in. April, 1571. Before that time the work was printed. A letter from Mr. Norton would imply, however, that the Preface was not completed, and the work, therefore, was not published till the commencement of 1571. The letter is preserved among the Harleian papers. <sup>F199</sup>

The effect produced upon the public mind by the first edition of this great work, encouraged the martyrologist to render his second edition still more worthy the general attention. No railing, no indignation, no minor errors which might have been committed from haste or deficient evidence, could remove the effect of his authentic, undeniable narratives: that effect was deepened and increased by the exceeding imprudence of the church of Rome at this juncture. Not one prayer, not one doctrine, or sentiment, in the prayer-book of the church of England could be deemed heretical. The authority of the first four councils had been maintained by the act of the first year of Elizabeth; and the denial of the conclusions of those councils

was made the criterion of heresy, as among the christian emperors, and our Saxon ancestors. The reformers had retained as many of the prayers and services of the ancient liturgies and rituals as they deemed essential, both from the Sacramentary of Gelasius and the services sanctioned by Gregory. They never desired to separate from communion with Rome. They resolved only to reject its supremacy, and to act as an independent episcopal church. They, consequently, while they deemed the foreign Lutheran churches to be the dear sisters of the Anglican church, acknowledged the orders of the priesthood of the church of Rome; and permitted any Romish priest, on his professing his adherence to the church of England, to become a minister of the establishment. The laity attended their parish churches, whether they were attached to the theories of Calvin, or to the discipline of Rome. The former only believed that we had not rejected enough; the latter that we had rejected too much, of the long-controverted propositions which the people had been taught to believe. All were willing to condemn the severity of Mary; all were united in one national worship, which was framed with the express intention of including the whole people in one true and catholic church.

While the second edition of Foxe's work was being prepared for the press, the bishop of Rome, presuming still to act as if he were the ecclesiastical magistrate and supreme ruler of the universal church, violently broke up this union, separated himself and his church from their communion with the Anglican. church; and, daring to pronounce the queen "the pretended queen of England," deposed her from the throne, and declared the nation absolved from their allegiance. This bull alone was the true cause of the subsequent enactments against the priests who obeyed the pope, and against the practices also of the members of the church of Rome. The real meaning of the bull was, that, as princes deposed by the popes might be rightly destroyed by their subjects, and their dominions be granted by him to any more orthodox and approved invader — every effort would be made from this moment to overturn the throne of Elizabeth, and to subdue the people of England to the dominion of the bishop of Rome. <sup>F200</sup>

The republication, therefore, of Foxe's book, at this juncture, was most desirable; and the martyrologist spared no labor to render the work useful. He collected fresh materials from all quarters on which he could depend;

and prevented the possibility of indifference by his energetic eloquence, as well as by his indisputable narratives. <sup>F201</sup>

Those persons are much mistaken who suppose that the questions between the churches of England and of Rome were merely political, or ecclesiastical questions; that is, whether they referred only to civil liberty, or clerical discipline, or to any points of a mere earthly, temporal, or indifferent nature. Our fathers believed that the chief importance of the disputes between the two churches consisted in this — that the salvation of the soul was endangered by the wilful errors of the church of Rome. They were convinced that the Romanist priests and bishops knew, and believed, that the opposition made by the various reformers to the tenets and conduct peculiar to their church, was just, righteous, and true; and that inferior and worldly motives alone prompted them to defend errors, to continue ignorance to the people, and to prevent the extension of christian knowledge. The Romanist spoke of the church, its authority, dignity, and power; the reformer's spoke of Christ and his apostles, and defended their departure from the decisions of the church, by appealing to that higher tribunal. The Romanist appealed to tradition, antiquity, and the fathers; the reformer followed his antagonist into every dark page, pursued him through all the mazes of the recondite learning which revived on the discovery of printing, and demonstrated that the Romanist retained the errors, while the reformer retained the truths, which were sanctioned by these abused, yet venerable names. The Romanist demanded obedience to the most dubious councils; the reformer replied by pointing to the convocations of the Anglican church. The Romanist insisted upon the reception of every dogma which had been once sanctioned by the heads and doctors of the church; the reformer insisted upon the reception of those propositions only, which could be proved to be true, useful, and worthy of adoption, whether they were propounded, retained, or rejected by the most wise and most learned. In the course of the undying controversy, the stern pertinacity with which the church of Rome persevered in reforming no abuse — rescinding no error — prohibiting scripture, reasoning, doubting, or inquiry — commanding unlimited submission, and punishing with unrelenting severity the least resistance to its intolerable dominion, convinced the reformers, not only that the priesthood of the church of Rome were the enemies of liberty, truth, and

improvement; but that they were willingly and wilfully the servile, supple tools of the worst system of tyranny, falsehood, and ignorance. They believed that the Romish priesthood were the enemies of human happiness, and the destroyers of the blessings of redemption; and this deep and heartfelt conviction gave that loftiness to their motives, and strength to their language, which their degenerate children now treat with obloquy and scorn.

None of our great ancestors were more impressed with this holy conviction of the danger of the doctrines of popery to the salvation of the soul, and of the wilful adherence of the Romanist priesthood to known error, than John Foxe; and this conviction is nowhere displayed so intensely, as in the preliminary papers which he prefixed to his several editions of this work. We find seven introductory prefaces, each of which, "in thoughts that breathe, and words that burn," expresses the solemn conviction, that the souls of men were endangered by the wilful corruptions of God's revealed truth adopted by the priesthood, and by the church of Rome.

The first preliminary paper is an address, in the most devout spirit and language, to Jesus Christ. He calls it *an Eucharisticon*; and amply will it repay the labor and attention which may be devoted to its perusal. "The work," he says, "O adorable and supreme Savior, which I began and have completed under thy divine favor, contrary to the conviction which I entertained of my own strength and power, I now dedicate to thee. Thine omnipotent majesty cannot but know the labors, the watchings, the anxieties, which have attended the progress of the work, and which could not have been overcome unless thy divine grace had shone upon me. I thank thee, not only in my own name, but in the name of thy holy church. Thy favor is the proof of the value in which thou holdest the martyrs of thy church. Thy will it was that I should declare to all men how honorable it is to die, valiantly contending for the glory of thy name. Every nation, people, and language, to the most remote posterity, shall praise the names of Cranmer, and Ridley, and Latimer, and Hooper, of Bradford and others, who died preferring thy glory to their own safety; and all who honor them shall despise and abhor their persecutors and destroyers." He proceeds to lament the degeneracy of the day in which he and the sons of the martyrs lived; and commends his labor to the favor and protection of Him to whom

every knee shall bow, and whose glory, shall be confessed through all the churches of God. The cause of the reformers and of the reformation is identified throughout, as the cause of the apostles and of Christianity was identified at the beginning — with the cause of Christ. The same fearlessness of man, and the same devotion of heart to God, enabled each to conquer priestcraft, and to give both truth and freedom to the world.

The second preface was the dedication to queen Elizabeth. He notices in this, the abuse which had been heaped upon his work, and the motives of his accusers. “When I first presented,” he says, “those Acts and Monuments to your majesty, which your majesty’s rare clemency received in such gentle part, I well hoped that those my travels in this kind of writing had been well at an end: whereby I might have returned to my studies again, to other purposes, after my own desire more fit, than to write histories, especially in the English tongue. But certain evil-disposed persons, of intemperate tongues, adversaries to good proceedings, would not suffer me so to rest; fuming and fretting, and raising up such miserable exclamations at the first appearance of the book, as was wonderful to hear. A man would have thought Christ to have been new born again; and that Herod and all the city of Jerusalem had been in an uproar; such blustering and stirring was there against that poor book, through all quarters of England, even to the gates of Louvain. So that no English papist almost in all the realm thought himself a perfect catholic unless he had cast out some word or other to give that book a blow. They are ashamed,” he says, “to hear what they have done; though they were not ashamed to do, what they now blush to hear. <sup>F202</sup> Being unable to work by the secular arm (the Lord preserve your majesty,” he emphatically adds, “many years!), they renewed again the practices, by which they had opposed the circulation of the Bible in the reign of Henry VIII.; they decried the book and the notes, and declared there were therein as many lies as lines. The foundation of all this calumny was three or four escapes only, in that book committed; and yet some of them were in the same book amended: they neither reading the whole, nor rightly understanding what they read, inveighed and maligned so perversely the setting out thereof, as though neither any word in all that story were true, nor any other story false in all the world. But then concerning such matters related by me that were errors indeed,” he adds, (“for the satisfaction of all sober, unprejudiced readers, if not for the

silencing of those calumniators) that, nevertheless, in accusing these his accusers, he did not so excuse himself, nor defend his book, as though nothing in it were to be expunged or amended;" therefore he had taken pains "to reiterate his labors, in travelling out the story again: doing herein as Penelope did with her web, untwisting that she had done before: or as builders do sometimes; take down again their buildings, either to transpose the fashion, or to make the foundation larger:" so he, "in recognizing this history, had employed a little more labor, partly to enlarge the argument he took in hand, partly also to essay, whether by any pains-taking he might pacify the stomachs, or satisfy the judgments, of the importune quarrellers."

He then proceeds to congratulate the country, on the peace, quiet, and freedom from persecution which distinguished the time in which he wrote. Though the doctrine of toleration was not understood, and the will of the prince was still too much considered to be the criterion of truth acceptable to God, yet neither papist nor puritan was pursued with the severity which had marked the former reign; and the very cessation of the relentlessness of the still existing laws, made the martyrologist justly call this period of the reign of Elizabeth, the halcyon days of England. He declares, too, that his great object was not merely to commend his book to the queen, and to the learned, but to consider the necessity of the ignorant flock of Christ, to relieve their ignorance, and to instruct their simplicity. As the histories of the sufferers for the truth's sake in the olden times benefited the church, so he believes the church of his own day would be benefited by the histories of the modern martyrs. With some other observations of the same nature he concludes: — and he is right in the sentiment he here expresses. His work has hitherto imbued the more unlearned, yet not less wise, and clearly-judging christian commonalty of England, with a thorough dread of the laws and principles which could induce our rulers, on any pretense whatever, to identify the canon laws of the church against heresy with the statute laws of the country; and thus to render legal the cruelty of an erroneous priesthood. And that man, even in the present day, who shall endeavor, until the canon laws of Rome are expunged from its conciliar and papal codes, to lessen our horror at its crimes of persecution, or of the claims on which the right to persecute is founded, is a traitor to his Savior, to his country, and to the true catholic

church. If primitive Christianity was worth establishing, it was worth defending. If the reformation — which was only the restoration of the best portions of that primitive Christianity — was worth establishing, that also is worth defending, in all times, and through all dangers.

But, though the martyrologist was thus anxious to imbue the minds of his poorer and more ignorant countrymen with a right and holy detestation of cruelty and spiritual usurpation, he was too deeply learned to shrink from any criticism, or any inquiry, which the most profound scholar of that age of scholars could institute or demand. The object, indeed, of all clerical learning is to enlarge the knowledge of the poorer and ignorant classes, as the object of all medical knowledge is to benefit the peasant and the mechanic, as well as the noble and the prince. The next preface, therefore, of Foxe, was addressed to the learned reader — and it is at once a challenge to the critic to discover any intentional misrepresentations, and an apology for unavoidable defects. “When I consider,” <sup>f203</sup> he says, “the difficulty, in times when all things are misrepresented, of writing with such circumspection as to avoid calumny, I almost deem that those persons are subjects of envy, who live in ease and dignity, enjoying the labors of others, as spectators, rather than as actors in the great theater of life. Never has it been my lot to taste the sweetness of such leisure. I do not, however, complain, if my labors might be but useful: though I suffer under the disadvantage of not being able to render my subject interesting; for I cannot relate falsehoods without injustice to my history, nor speak the truth without the hatred and envy of many. What else indeed could have been expected, than that, after I had, by my indefatigable, though perhaps useless labor, ruined my health, lost my sight, brought on premature old age, and exhausted my strength, I should suffer from the contempt and scorn of my calumniators. No human aid, indeed, could have supported me; nothing but the divine power alone, to whom I have and do commend myself and my book. And to thee, also, learned and pious reader, in the same spirit I submit my labors.”

He goes on to observe on the impossibility of pleasing all, and especially those, who, even before the publication of his book, professed to anticipate a golden legend only. He relates the sacrifice of health, by which alone he had been able to complete his work. He contrasts the truth of his narrative with the falsehood of those real legends in which his adversaries

were accustomed to believe. He alludes to his framing the calendar, in which he substitutes the names of his martyrs for those which the Romanists had placed in their calendars; and he inquires, whether Cranmer was not as worthy of a place in their commemorations as Becket; whether Nicholas Ridley was not fit to be compared with pope Nicholas; or whether Latimer, Hooper, and Marsh were not as admirable, and as praiseworthy, as the best and greatest of those whom the Romanists esteemed? "I wish neither," he adds, "to diminish the honor nor extinguish the memory of any good or holy man, in whatever age he may have lived; and if my calendar of saints offend any, let it be remembered, that I arrange them in their places, in the days of the months, for the use of domestic reading, and not for any commemoration in the service and house of God.

F204

He concludes with a beautiful paragraph, expressing his consciousness of much imperfection, after all his efforts; and reminding the reader of the Greek proverb, that it is more easy to criticise than to imitate.

The next preliminary paper still more fully proves the true catholic spirit and temper of this once venerated father of ecclesiastical history among us. It is a protestation "to the true and faithful congregation of Christ's universal church, and to all and singular the members thereof throughout the whole realm of England, wishing to the same abundance of peace and tranquillity, with the speedy coming of Christ the Spouse to make an end of all mortal misery." This address may be called a national sermon, and a condensation into the briefest possible space of the work which follows it. It consists of twenty-seven paragraphs, and breathes throughout the spirit of peace and love. I will endeavor to compress this beautiful preface into the shortest compass, to enable all to judge whether John Foxe deserves the exchange of the former veneration which was paid him, for the cold ingratitude, or affected contempt of the day in which we live.

As the glory of God, he begins (par. 1), filled the temple which was seven years in building; so he prays (par. 2) that a blessing may be granted to this edition of his work, to which he had devoted seven years of labor. But, as in the temple of Solomon some came (par. 3) to buy and sell, to walk, and gaze, to find fault, and to destroy, so had many proceeded with his book. He desires all faults to be pointed out, and he will correct them:

but these men (par. 4), like Cicero's dog in the Capitol, who barked not at robbers but at honest men, blaspheme the martyrs of Christ, and canonize them for saints, whom the Scriptures would condemn as dishonorable and disloyal subjects. He leaves, however, these persons (par. 5) to address the well-minded lovers and partakers of Christ's gospel; and to beg them (par. 6) to judge that history which was written to profit all, and to displease none. He grieved to see the simple and the unlearned (par. 7) deceived by the histories which had been written by the monks and by the clients of Rome: who had so related all things to the honor of the church of Rome, that the generality believed there was no truth, but the doctrines which Rome taught, and no true church but that over which the bishop of Rome presided. He then (par. 8) enumerates the authors to whom he refers, and instances their partiality in the suppression of truth, and in their elevating the church, the see, and the bishop of Rome. When he considered this list of authors, and the intolerable corruption of history by their means, (par. 9), he deemed it to be his duty to endeavor to give a faithful history to the people; and (par. 10) to present to the world the double portrait of the church of Rome on the one hand, and the church of Christ, which Rome oppressed and persecuted, on the other. In the next six paragraphs he draws the contrast between that part of the catholic church of Christ which became corrupt, and inflicted persecution; and that part of the catholic church which was less corrupt, and which suffered persecution. He assigns the principal dates of the greater corruptions of the church (par. 17 — 19) to the ages immediately preceding and following the pontificate of Hildebrand; and then details the long and glorious list of witnesses, whom the providence of God raised up in every age to protest, before the days of Luther, against the corruptions and cruelty of the dominant usurpation over the bishops and churches of the catholic church of Christ. This list begins at par. 20, and continues through the seven which follow; and it is concluded by the triumphant affirmation, that the church, as it had been lately reformed, is not the new, but the old continued church, to which the promise of Christ had been given, and to which, by the providence of God, that promise had never failed. Thus far this preface is amply deserving of the approbation of the critical reader. The next paragraph (par. 28) contains a specimen of one of those faults which is justly alleged to be a great drawback from the value of his work — the fault of credulity. He affirms, but on insufficient evidence, that God sent

down from heaven, upon the garments and caps of men, in Germany, marks of his passion — as the bloody cross, the nails, the spear, and the crown of thorns — to denote the persecutions which were about to take place. I would have believed this, as I would believe all the tales in the Talmud, if I had sufficient evidence for doing so; but there is none: and I grieve that the authority of Foxe should be diminished by his credulity. The 29th paragraph, too, has some unre-eeivable notions derived from his interpretation of prophecy. The conclusion is an exhortation to the church of England, well suited, not only to the day in which Foxe lived, but to our own age also; to avoid the schism which alienates the heart of man from man; and it ends with a prayer that, in one unity of doctrine, we may gather ourselves into one ark of the true church together. He considered rightly that the enemy to the union of all our brethren and countrymen into one true church, was the church of Rome: while he deprecated, at the same time, the incipient schism of the puritans.

The next prefatory tract to this edition, is an address on the utility of this story. It consists of some general, though apt remarks on the value of history, and more especially on the usefulness of a martyrology; which he therefore published for the use of the common people. “In the lives and deaths of these men,” he observes, “we have the manifest declarations of the divine power within them; when we behold such strength to suffer, such readiness to answer, such patience in imprisonment, such godliness in forgiving, such cheerfulness and courage in suffering, with such manifold sense of the divine presence, the deaths of these saints do not a little avail to the establishing of a good conscience, to the contempt of the world, and to the fear of God. They confirm faith, increase godliness, abate pride in prosperity, and in adversity do open an hope of heavenly comfort. For, what man, reading the misery of these godly persons, may not therein, as in a glass, behold his own case, whether he be godly or godless? For, if God give adversity unto good men, what may either the better sort promise themselves, or the evil not fear? And as by reading of profane stories we are made more skillful, perhaps, in warlike affairs, so by reading this we are made better in our livings; and, besides, are better prepared unto the like conflicts, (if by God’s permission they shall happen hereafter,) more wise by their doctrine, and more stedfast by their example.” — “To be short, they declare to the world what true christian

fortitude is, and what is the right way to conquer, which standeth not in the power of man, but in the hope of the resurrection to come. In consideration whereof, me-thinks I have good cause to wish that, like as other subjects, even so also kings and princes, which commonly delight in heroical stories, would diligently peruse such monuments of martyrs, and lay them always in sight, not only to read, but to follow, and would paint them upon their walls, cups, rings, and gates.” — “ If martyrs, too, are to be compared with martyrs, I see no reason why the martyrs of our time deserve any less commendation than the other in the primitive church, which assuredly are inferior unto them in no point of praise; whether we view the number of them that suffered, or the greatness of their torments, or their constancy in dying, or also consider the fruit that they brought to the amendment of posterity, and increase of the gospel. They did water with their blood the truth that was newly springing up; so these by their deaths restored it again, being so decayed and fallen down. They, standing in the forward of the battle, did receive the first encounter and violence of their enemies, and taught us by that means to overcome such tyranny; these with like courage again, like old beaten soldiers, did win the field in the reward of the battle. They, like famous husbandmen of the world, did sow the fields of the church, that first lay unmanured and waste; these with their blood did cause it to batten and fructify. Would to God the fruit might be speedily gathered into the barn, which only remaineth behind to come!”

“If we ascribe such reputation, too,” he adds, “to godly preachers, (and worthily,) which diligently preach the gospel of Christ when they live, notwithstanding, without all fear of persecution, how much more reasonable cause have we to praise and extol such men as stoutly spend their lives for the defense of the same! All these premises duly, of our parts, considered and marked, seeing we have found so famous martyrs in this our age, let us not fail, then, in publishing and setting forth their doings, lest in that point we seem more unkind to them than the writers of the primitive church were to theirs. And though we impute not their ashes, chains, and swords, instead of relics, yet, let us yield thus much unto their commemoration, to glorify the Lord in his saints, and imitate their death (as much as we may) with like constancy, or their lives, at

the least, with like innocency. They offered their bodies willingly to the rough handling of the tormentors; and is it so great a matter, then, for our part, to mortify our flesh, with all the members thereof? They continued in patient suffering when they had most wrong done to them, and when their very hearts' blood gushed out of their bodies; and yet will not we forgive our poor brother, be the injury never so small, but are ready, for every trifling offense, to seek his destruction, and cut his throat. They, wishing well to all men, did of their own accord forgive their persecutors; and therefore ought we, which are now the posterity and children of martyrs, not to degenerate from their former steps, but, being admonished by their examples, if we cannot express their charity towards all men, yet, at least, to imitate the same, to our power and strength. Let us give no cause of offense to any: and if any be given to us, let us overcome it with patience, forgiving, and not revenging the same. And let us not only keep our hands from shedding of blood, but our tongues also from hurting the fame of others. Besides, let us not shrink, if case so require, by martyrdom or loss of life, according to their example, to yield up the same in defense of the Lord's flock. Which thing, if men would do, much less contention and business would be in the world than now is. And thus much touching the utility and fruit to be taken of this history."

The next prefatory introduction to this edition consisted in four questions, proposed to the friends and followers of the bishop of Rome.

**The first was**, whether that part of Isaiah's description of the church, that it should not hurt nor destroy, could be said to describe the church of Rome?

**The second**, whether the exceeding hatred which was borne by the church of Rome to those who withheld subjection to its authority was deserved?

**The third**, whether the description of the apocalyptic beast in the Revelations could refer to any other power than to papal Rome? <sup>F205</sup>

**The last question was**, whether the religion of Christ be spiritual or corporeal?

In answering this question he lightly values, I am sorry to say, not merely a large mass of the observances, ceremonies, and customs of the church of Rome, but many of the rites and opinions which are valued, regarded, or observed by the members of the church of England. He speaks scornfully, for instance, of the outward succession of bishops, vestures, fasting in Lent, and keeping the Ember-days. He forgot that some outward ordinances are essential to the upholding the inward and spiritual religion which he approved. He defends rightly the doctrine of justification by faith alone, as the instrumental cause of our acceptance, while the sanctification of the soul will ever be the result.

He ends his remarks on this question by briefly replying to the argument of Pighius and Hosius — that the church must be always visible, and that Rome alone, therefore, can be the true church. This reasoning was subsequently adopted by Bossuet; and it has been learnedly refuted by the greatest theologian and ornament of our age, Mr. Faber, who has proved that all the marks required by Bossuet and his brethren to meet in the true church are to be found in the churches of the Waldenses. The right answer to the supposed, not real, difficulty consists rather in this — that some portions of Christ’s church apostatized, and then persecuted those who did not follow their example. The members who did not apostatize are always discernible. They can be tracked in the blood of their martyrs. They can be discerned by the fires which consumed them. The results of their labors may be found in the establishment of the episcopal reformed church of England, and in the fearless toleration, sanctioned both by its ecclesiastical and temporal rulers. <sup>F206</sup>

The next preface consists of four considerations, addressed to christian protestants, exhorting them to loyalty to the government; congratulating them on their peace and repose from persecution; inviting them to gratitude to God for the contrast; and to study peace and holiness. He concludes by wishing peace to the preachers, grace to the hearers, and glory to Christ, their common Lord. It is in the first paragraph of this brief preface that the expression, “liberty of conscience” appears to have been used in its modern sense.

The martyrologist, after these several prefaces, proceeds at once to his narrative, which he commences with that most useful introduction on the contrast between Rome apostolical, when St. Paul alluded to its purity of faith, spoken of throughout the whole world; and Rome papal, corrupted with error, and stained with the blood of the martyrs and holy men of God. It was the custom among our fathers to prefix to their works any eulogistical verses which might have been presented to them by their contemporaries. Ten copies of Latin, and one of English verse, are prefixed to the editions of Foxe. The first is by Lawrence Humphrey, his fellow-exile, and now professor of divinity and president of Magdalen College, Oxford. The approbation of such men constitutes true fame. Dr. Humphrey was one of the best scholars, linguists, and theologians of that day. <sup>F207</sup> His verses, however, on Foxe must be said to be more distinguished for their friendly zeal for the author, than for their elegance. <sup>F208</sup>

The next copy of Latin verse was by Abraham Hartwell, of Cambridge. Hartwell translated from the Italian, Menadoi's Warres between the Turks and Persians; Lopez Kingdom of Congo, by Pigafetta; and the Ottoman Empire of Mahomet III, by Lazara Lorango. He translated from the Latin, Haddon's Answer to Osorius, and many other Italian and Latin works. He was the author also of *The Antiquity of Mottoes in England*, and of *The Antiquity of Epitaphs in England*, republished afterwards by Hearne.

The third and fourth are by an author who signs his name Robert R. This was probably Robert Rollock, born at Stirling 1556, who died in 1598. He is called by Spottiswoode a learned, wise and strong defender of the rights of the church. He was educated at St. Andrew's, when he went through a course of philosophy. He was made regent of his college, and was the first theological professor of the college of Edinburgh in 1583. He was greatly esteemed among the foreign reformed churches. He wrote, among other things, *In Selectos aliquot Psalmos Davidis Commentarius*; *Analysis Logica in Epistolam ad Hebraeos*, etc.; *In Daniele Prophetam Commentarius*; *In Sancti Johannis Epist. Secund. Commentarius*, etc.

The fifth copy of Latin verses was written by Thomas Drant, a distinguished poet and divine of the day. He translated and published two books of "Horace, his Satyres," the Epigrams and Spiritual Sentences of

Gregory Nazianzen, and Poetical Paraphrases of many parts of Scripture, the chief of which was on Ecclesiastes, published in 1572.

The sixth is an epigram only, in two lines, by T. J.F. I cannot ascertain the author thus designated. The epigram is not very admirable.

*“Si fas caedendo coelestia scandere cuique est,  
Papicolis coeli maxima porta patet.”*

The seventh was by Giles Fletcher, the father of the two poets, Giles and Phineas Fletcher. He was educated at Eton, and was admitted at King’s College in 1565. He was now residing at Cambridge. According to Anthony Wood, he became an excellent poet. He was employed by queen Elizabeth as commissioner in Scotland, Germany, and the Low Countries, and concluded a treaty of commerce with Russia in 1588, the year of the Armada, on terms which were deemed most advantageous to the interests of his countrymen. His account of Russia is printed in Hakluyt’s Voyages in 1643.

The eighth was by sir Thomas Ridley, a relation of bishop Ridley. He was one of the masters in Chancery, and educated at Eton and King’s College. He was vicar-general to the archbishop of Canterbury. He wrote a work on ecclesiastical and civil law, with a view to improve the practice of the courts by less rigor.

The ninth is by M.M.S. This signature baffles my attempt to discover the author.

The tenth is by Philip Stubbes, one of the most popular writers of the day. He was the author of “A Motive to Good Workes, wherein is showed how far we are behind our forefathers, etc. etc., with the difference between the pretended Good Works of Papists and Protestants;” 1591, 8vo.

The English verses prefixed to this edition were written by Hopkins, the versifier of the last ninety-nine Psalms of the well-known authorized version, printed by Daye, in 4to, 1559, with those of Sternhold and Whittingham, before the publication of the version of Tate and Brady.

This list of contributors of eulogistical verses, though it includes the names of statesmen, lawyers, poets, and theologians, will not, in the present day,

be considered as demonstrating the value of the Martyrology. Another tribute, however, was now paid to the book, which is more especially entitled to the attention of those who are disposed to submit their judgment to the authority of the church, and to receive its decisions with the respect and deference which are justly due to a tribunal, from which there ought, if possible, to be no appeal. The parliament met on the 3d of April, 1571. The convocation of the province of Canterbury, which was then considered, as it ought ever to be, an efficient, component part of the great national senate, met at the same time. The convocation of the province of York began also at the same time. It passed a resolution to deliberate upon some reformation in the churches of that province on Wednesday the 9th of May; and it sate, by adjournment, three weeks after the parliament was dissolved. I mention this circumstance, because it is one, of many facts, which proves that the meeting of the convocation was not necessarily dependent upon the meetings of the parliament. <sup>F209</sup> The convocation of the province of Canterbury, however, proceeded to business. They assembled on the 3d of April at St. Paul's church. They confirmed the thirty-nine articles, and enacted many canons for the better regulation of the churches, and ordering of the lives of the clergy and people. Among other decrees, the archbishop and bishops resolved, that the edition of Foxe's Acts and Monuments, lately printed at London, <sup>f210</sup> should be placed in the churches, and in the halls and houses of the bishops, archdeacons, and others, to be read and studied by the people. These canons were not, it is true, sanctioned by the queen, who seemed to be resolved to permit no power in England but that which emanated from her imperious self. Neither were they enacted by the parliament. They did not, therefore, become law. They were, however, strictly adopted as canons; that is, as regulations for the churches, proposed to the clergy, and adopted, both by them and their congregations, as rules, though not laws of conduct. The books of the Acts and Monuments were, consequently, placed in the churches and other public situations, and were generally retained there, till the time of archbishop Laud, by whose influence, as we shall see, they are supposed to have been removed. <sup>F211</sup>

The next great work on which we find our illustrious martyrologist to have been employed was the *Reformatio Legum*, the collection of regulations which were drawn up, after the church of England ceased to be subjected

to the church of Rome, for its better government, under its own princes and convocations.

Those infatuated men who are reviving ancient errors, and enforcing them in the name of the church, and who are endeavoring to quench the last spark of the old love of truth for the truth's sake, by stigmatizing it with the name of ultra-protestantism, will be, perhaps, surprised at the declaration, that the ultra-protestant John Foxe, with all those who resemble him, are as much entitled to be called Roman Catholics, as the bishop of Rome himself, with the whole college of cardinals. By the laws of Theodosius and Justinian, the epithet catholic was given to those Christians who adopted the decisions of the council of Nice and of the first four councils. The word "Roman" was commanded to precede the word "catholic," to denote that the subjects of Justinian, the head of the Roman empire, before the cession of the spiritual dominion to the bishop of Rome, were required both in the West and East, to profess the Trinitarian, Roman, or Universal Creed. Roman Catholics, therefore, originally denoted the episcopalian Trinitarians, who were subjects, not of the bishop of Rome, but of the emperor of Rome; and because Britain had not been formally surrendered by the emperor to the enemies of the state, this island was deemed to be a part of the empire; and the episcopalian Trinitarians of this island, therefore — and they were numerous before the flight of Theonas<sup>f212</sup> — were called Roman Catholics before Augustine was commissioned by Gregory. John Foxe was an episcopalian Trinitarian, living within the precincts of the old Roman empire; and he was justly, therefore, entitled, as all the members of the episcopal church of England still are, to be called a Roman Catholic. The bishop of Rome usurped the scepter; and, availing himself of the epithet "Roman," which appeared more peculiarly appropriate to him and his church, he gradually procured the identification of Christianity with the decrees and doctrines of the Italian church. The canon, pontifical, and conciliar laws, which upheld at once the doctrinal errors and political power of the bishop of Rome over states, princes, and people, became slowly, yet surely, the code of the universal jurisprudence of Europe. When the time arrived that the papal usurpation, and the code of laws which upheld it, became intolerable, the cities and states which rejected the doctrinal errors of the church of Rome, deemed it necessary to embody their faith in confessions, creeds, or

articles; and they found it advisable also to adopt some known laws of discipline, as their additional bond of union. Whatever be the agreement of any society or church in doctrine, among those who desire the best mode of worship, agreement in discipline is essential to the happiness, peace, and union of the worshippers. <sup>F213</sup>

The second diet of Spire (1529) occasioned the adoption of the word Protestant; not in a religious but in a civil point of view; in consequence of the emperor, Charles V., wishing to revoke the edict of a diet held at the same place three years before, which left the princes of Germany at liberty to manage all ecclesiastical matters in their respective dominions, without imperial interference, until the meeting of a general council. Against this revocation the princes *protested* in the second diet; hence the name, which was afterwards applied to all those who followed not Rome in its errors. The indefiniteness, however, of the word, as thus applied, rendered it insufficient to describe the conclusions both in faith and discipline, which the indignant representatives of the houses of Bradenburgh, Hesse, Lunenburg, Anhalt, and the delegates of fourteen imperial cities desired to uphold. Ultra-protestants they all were, because they were Christians resolved to maintain truth, whether scriptural, traditional, or novel, at all hazards; but the mere rejection of error does not constitute that truth; and Luther undertook to supply a compendium of rites and tenets for the congregations of the rejectors of error. He comprised his system in seventeen articles, which he delivered to the electors at Torgau. They are called, therefore, the Articles of Torgau. These were, unfortunately, considered too general. The imperial diet, in the following June, assembled at Augsburg, and there the celebrated confession was drawn up, which is the probable foundation of the chief articles of the church of England. <sup>F214</sup> They were principally prepared by Melancthon; who may be considered as injuring, however, rather than serving the cause of the union of the protesting seceders from the communion of Rome, by too great minuteness of detail. The primitive creeds were short and simple; and it would have been well for the reformed churches, if Melancthon had imitated their example. The fatal consequences of this minuteness was, that as Protestantism, or protesting against Rome only, could not be a sufficient bond of union; and as Zuingle and his adherents declined to adhere to the confession of Augsburg; a division began among the continental

reformers, which suspended the secession from Rome, and enabled that vigilant church to re-establish its influence in so many quarters where it had been either destroyed or weakened. In the year 1535, Luther endeavored, at the request of the bewildered controversialists, to revise his scheme of faith and discipline; and the articles of Smalcald were at length decided upon, as the creed and code of the Lutheran churches in Europe.

In the same year John Calvin published his Institutes, as another compendium of faith and discipline. This work is founded on the interpretations of Scripture which his own criticism or reason adopted, without sufficient deference to that universal institution of episcopacy which prevailed in the days of the last apostle; and which might fairly and philosophically have been presumed, therefore, to have been an indispensable bond of that union for which Christ prayed. The talent, erudition, fervency, and eloquence of this great writer, has rendered his work most influential even to the present day. The omission of all recommendation to his followers to restore episcopacy whenever it might be possible, together with his reducing the more difficult doctrines of Scripture into a system incompatible with certain other agreeing, though seemingly inconsistent truths, have already begun to sap the foundation of his authority, even in the presbyterian communities. He nobly recommended the appealing to Scripture as the ultimate and only arbiter of all controversies, as the church of England encourages its people to do at present — and that Scripture will as certainly induce the eventual rejection of that perversion of episcopacy which commits the power to rule the churches to those who have authority only to instruct, but not to govern; as well as that opposite perversion of episcopacy also, which commits the power to rule all churches to the bishop of Rome. Episcopacy will ever be found to be the best bond of union to a divided clergy, and to an inquiring people.

The example of the continental reformers was followed in England. The history of the several changes in the conclusions, in matters of faith, proposed and adopted by our convocations, princes, people, and the whole church of England, till the final revision of the thirty-nine Articles, must be left to the historian. The attempt to establish a code of ecclesiastical law, which should supersede the ancient, pontifical, and conciliar canon laws, whether those which were collected by Lyndwood, in

the reign of Henry VI. or others, is interesting to us, on account of the part which was assigned to Foxe in preparing it for the consideration of the queen and the legislature.

Before the great effort which was made in the reign of Henry VIII. to emancipate the church and people of England from the yoke of a foreign bishop, the clergy of the church, either with or without the king's permission, <sup>f215</sup> in conformity with the summons of the bishops or archbishops, were accustomed, according to the reasonableness of the ease, and the primitive practice of the eastern episcopal churches, to meet in councils, synods, convocations, and conventions, to make canons and laws for the general regulation of the community. When communion with Rome implied submission to Rome, these synods and convocations were unavoidably obedient to the foreign influence, and many laws were enacted which dashed with the allegiance of the subject to the temporal prince; it consequently became necessary, in order more effectually to complete the emancipation of England from Rome, that the temporal prince should wrest from the ecclesiastical authority, this portion of its power. This was done by the king's requiring from the clergy that the convocation should enact no laws for the subjects of the realm, without the consent of the king. The authority of the bishops to make regulations which were binding on the consciences of the clergy, but which were not a part of the law of the realm, suffered no interference. This obedience of the clergy to the king, was made by the convocation in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of Henry VIII.

For the satisfaction of those who may not have ready access to copies of the proceedings of the convocation and parliament relative to the final breach of Henry VIII. with Rome, I subjoin, in three parallel columns, *the submission of the clergy* assembled in the convocation of 1682, *the recital* of the same before the parliament, and *the final enactment*, in the parliament of 1534, founded on the submission and recital. These three together may be said to be the foundation of the *Reformatio Legum*.

### THE CONVOCATION'S SUBMISSION.

We your most humble subjects, daily oratours, and beadsmen of your *clergy of England*, having our special trust and confidence in your most

excellent wisdom, your princely goodness, and fervent zeal to the promotion of God's honor and Christian religion, and also in your learning, far exceeding, in our judgment, the learning of all other kings and princes that we have read of; and doubting nothing but that the same shall continue, and daily increase in your majesty;

### THE PARLIAMENT'S RECITAL.

Whereas the king's humble and obedient subjects, the *clergy of the realm of England*, have not only knowledged according to the truth, that the *convocations* of the same *clergy* is, always hath been, and ought to be assembled only by the king's writ; but also, SUBMITTING themselves to the king's majesty;

### ENACTMENT UPON THE RECITAL.

Be it therefore now enacted by authority of this Parliament, according to the said SUBMISSION and PETITION, of the said clergy.

### THE CONVOCATION'S SUBMISSION.

#### I.

**First** do offer and promise, *in verbo sacerdotii*, here unto your highness, SUBMITTING ourselves most humbly to the same, that we will *never from henceforth enact, put in use, promulge, or execute any new canons, or constitution provincial, or any new ordinance provincial or synodal, in our convocation or synod, in time coming* (which *convocation* is, always hath been, and must be assembled only by your high commandment or writ), unless your highness by your royal assent, shall *license us to assemble our convocation, and to make, promulge, and execute such constitutions and ordinances as shall be made in the same, and there to give your royal assent and authority.*

#### II.

**Secondarily**, That whereas divers of the constitutions, ordinances, and canons provincial or synodal, which *hath been heretofore enacted*, be

thought to be not only much prejudicial to your prerogative royal, but also overmuch onerous to your highness' subjects, your clergy aforesaid is *contented* if it may stand with your highness' pleasure that it be committed to the examination and judgment of your grace, and of thirty-two persons, whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether house of the temporality, and other sixteen of the clergy; all to be chosen and appointed by your most noble grace; so that finally, which soever of the said constitutions, ordinances, or canons, provincial or synodal, shall be thought and determined by your grace, and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons, not to stand with God's laws and the laws of your realm, the same to be abrogated and taken away by your grace and the clergy; and such of them as shall be seen by your grace, and by the most part of the said thirty-two persons, do stand with God's laws and the laws of your realm, to stand in full strength and power, your grace's most royal assent and authority once impetrate and fully given to the same.

## THE PARLIAMENT'S RECITAL.

### 1.

Have promised in *verbo sacerdotii* that they will never from henceforth presume to *attempt, alledge, claim, or put in use, or enact, promulge, or execute any new canons, constitutions, ordinance, provincial or other, or by whatsoever other name they shall be called in the convocation, unless the king's most royal assent and license may to them be had to make, promulge, and execute the same, and that his majesty do give his most royal assent and authority in that behalf.*

### II.

*And whereas divers constitutions, ordinances, and canons provincial or synodal, which heretofore hath been enacted, and be thought not only to be much prejudicial to the king's prerogative royal, and repugnant to the laws and statutes of the realm, but also overmuch onerous to his highness and his subjects, the said clergy hath most humbly BESOUGHT the king's highness, that the said constitutions and canons may be committed to the examination and judgment of his highness and of thirty-two persons of the king's subjects, whereof sixteen to be of the upper and nether house of*

parliament of the temporality, and other sixteen to be of the clergy of this realm, and all the said thirty-two persons to be chosen and appointed by the king's majesty. And that such of the said constitutions as shall be thought and determined by the said thirty-two persons, or the more part of them worthy to be abrogated and annulled, shall be abolite, and made of no value accordingly. And such other of the same constitutions and canons as by the said thirty-two or the more part of them, shall be approved to stand with the laws of God, and consonant to the laws of this realm, shall stand in their full strength and power, the king's most royal assent first had and obtained to the same.

## ENACTMENT UPON THE RECITAL.

### I.

That they or any of them from henceforth shall not presume to attempt, alledge, claim, or put in use, any constitutions or ordinance provincial, or synodals, or any other canons, nor shall enact, promulge, or execute any such canons, constitutions, or ordinance provincial, by whatsoever name or names they may be called in their convocations in time coming, which always shall be assembled by authority of the king's writ, unless the same clergy may have the king's most royal assent and license to make, promulge, and execute such canons, constitutions, and ordinances, provincial or synodal, upon pain of every one of the said clergy doing contrary to this act, and being thereof convict, to suffer imprisonment and make fine at the king's will.

### II.

*And forasmuch as such* canons, constitutions, and ordinances, as *heretofore hath been made* by the clergy of this realm, cannot now at the *session* of this present parliament, by reason of shortness of time, be viewed, examined, and determined by the king's highness and thirty-two persons, to be chosen and appointed according to the PETITION of the said clergy, in form above rehearsed, be it therefore enacted by authority aforesaid, that the king's highness shall have power and authority to nominate and assign at his pleasure the said thirty-two persons of his subjects, whereof sixteen to be of the clergy, and sixteen to be of the

temporality of the upper and nether house of the parliament. And if any of the said thirty-two persons so chosen happen to die before their full determination, then his highness to nominate other from time to time of the said two houses of parliament to supply the number of the said thirty-two. And that the said thirty-two by his highness so to be named, shall have power and authority to view, search, and examine the said canons, constitutions, and ordinance provincial and synodal, heretofore made; and such of them as the king's highness, and the said thirty-two, or the more part of them, shall deem and adjudge worthie to be continued, kept, and obeyed, shall be from thenceforth kept, obeyed, and executed within this realm, so that the king's most royal assent under his great seal be first had to the same. And the residue of the said canons, constitutions, and ordinance provincial which the king's highness and the said thirty-two persons, or the more part of them, shall not approve or deem worthie, to be abolit, abrogate, and made frustrate, shall from thenceforth be void and of *none effect*, and never be put in execution within this realm.

Such was the substance of the celebrated act of submission on the part of the clergy of the church of England to their temporal sovereign. They committed all questions respecting the canons, which should receive the force of law, to the secular prince. The review of the canon law, which was now contemplated, has, it is true, never been made; and therefore all canons, then existing, not repugnant to the law of the land, or the king's prerogative, are still required to be used. Such limitation, however, though the act was not carried into effect, at once superseded the old pontifical and decretal law,<sup>f216</sup> and thus severed the dominion of the papal, from the statute and parliamentary, law of England. The act which thus empowered the king to nominate commissioners, and enacted that the canons they approved, if sanctioned by the king under the great seal, should be the laws of the realm, was renewed in 1536 (stat. 27 Hen. VIII. c. 15), and again in 1544 (stat. 35 Hen. VIII. c. 16.) In the latter case it was so far carried into execution, that commissioners were appointed, a body of ecclesiastical law digested, and a letter of ratification prepared for the king's signature. But this signature was never affixed; and the powers granted to the crown having been limited to the lifetime of Henry VIII., a fresh act was passed with the same object in 1549. Commissioners are said to have been named shortly afterwards in pursuance of its provisions; but if this was the fact,

they seem to have made little progress in the business, for a new commission was issued in October, 1551, to eight bishops, eight divines, eight civilians, and eight common lawyers; of whom eight were selected to gather and put in order the materials. "But the matter," says Strype, "was in effect wholly entrusted by the king to Cranmer, the archbishop, who associated to himself in the active part of the work, Taylor, Martyr, and Haddon." And this account is confirmed by the numerous corrections in the handwriting of Cranmer and Peter Martyr, which may still be seen in a MS. copy of the projected code preserved in the British Museum. <sup>F217</sup> The commission (attached to the edition of the work, 1640,) is dated Nov. 11, 1551, and seems to have superseded that of October, for the sole purpose of substituting the names of Goodrich, bishop of Ely, William May, and Richard Goodrich, for those of Ridley, Traheron, and Gosnold. A reason may easily be found for the introduction of the bishop of Ely into this commission, as it had recently been determined, on the disgrace of lord Rich, to raise him to the office of lord chancellor. The code was completed by these commissioners, but not early enough to obtain the force of law before the death of king Edward. <sup>F218</sup>

The premature death of king Edward having thus rendered the design abortive, an attempt was made in the year 1571 to revive the plan. The parliament having met in April, seven bills for the regulation of the church were brought under discussion. Mr. Strickland was the principal speaker. He reminded the house, that the book of the *Reformatio Legum* still existed, and was now in the hands of Mr. Norton, a member of that house; and that Mr. Foxe, the martyrologist, had newly published the same. <sup>F219</sup> Parker had probably selected Foxe to edit the book, or he had perhaps directed his attention to it, on account of the uncertainty of the law on the subject of ecclesiastical discipline. It is certain that he had been engaged upon it for some time previously to its publication, as appears by a letter to Cecil in favor of Daye the printer, and another from Lawrence Humphrey to himself, dated 1566. The book was printed, and placed in the possession of the members of the house. The materials had been left by Sir John Cheke, Haddon, Cranmer, Coxe, Peter Martyr; by Taylor and May, the civilians; and by Lucas and Goodrich, common lawyers, who had been employed upon it in 1551. <sup>F220</sup> If any name would have commanded its adoption, it would have been that of Foxe as its editor, for his

popularity was now at its height. But the members of the House of Commons who desired to bring the book again into notice, belonged to the puritan party, which was now beginning to obtain influence; and it was found then, as it is now, that the most useful and undoubted truths which can be submitted to the approbation of a community, are regarded neither for their usefulness nor their truth, but are valued or despised, according to the estimation of the party which may propose them. So useful were the principal laws of the *Reformatio Legum* considered by bishop Burnet, that he earnestly desired their enactment.<sup>F221</sup> Elizabeth, however, jealous of their supposed encroachment on her supremacy, told the Commons, that she had seen their articles,<sup>f222</sup> and liked them well, but would do something of herself. This unjustifiable interference again put a stop to the proceedings. The subsequent canons of the convocations, in 1571; of James the First, in 1603; of archbishop Laud, in 1640, which excited so much opposition, have not supplied the omission; and the canon law of England still requires the alterations and revision which might recommend the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline to the convocation, which must eventually once more assemble, and to the government, which will receive with respect the decisions of that convocation. The book, however, was published by Foxe, under the direction of archbishop Parker.<sup>F223</sup>

The work was deemed to be of so much importance by our ancestors, and it has been considered by many, even in the present day, to be a system so valuable both as to doctrine and discipline, and to possess, also, so much claim to our veneration as one of the best digests of canon law, that I shall venture to insert here a brief abstract of its contents. The doctrine of Toleration, it must be remembered, was not then known. The only improvement which was made in the proposed laws which were to regulate the formation and publication of opinions, was a diminution in the severity of punishment: and these provisions would be justly considered in the present day to be utterly abhorrent to the spirit of Christianity, as it was propounded by our blessed Savior, and is rightly understood in modern times. The church of Christ in England understands well its high privilege and duty — first to persuade, and then to suffer. It never can fulfill its office as the imitator of Christ, by believing that it may teach, and punish. The abstract of the *Reformatio Legum*, is given both by Collier and Soames.

The whole compilation is digested under fifty-one heads, and is concluded by a supplementary chapter upon the rules of administering justice.

The first head asserts the doctrine of the Trinity, and denounces the penalty of death, with confiscation of goods, against such as should deny the catholic faith. The canonical books of Scripture are enumerated, those termed apocryphal being omitted; but these are pronounced useful for edification, though not for the proofs of any doctrine. It is declared that ecclesiastical authority is subjected to Scripture; that the first four general councils are to be received, and that the works of the fathers are to be highly respected, but that the decision of no council or father is to be admitted, unless found in unison with Holy Writ.

In the second place, certain opinions upon the Trinity, the Savior, the Scriptures, original sin, justification, the mass, and purgatory, are pronounced heretical. Thus our reformers boldly retorted the charges of Romanists upon themselves, and ranked religious opinions incapable of proof from Scripture, among heresies. They also censured such as taught the unlawfulness of the magistracy, the community of goods or of wives, the universal right of assuming the pastoral office, the merely symbolical nature of sacraments, the unlawfulness of infant baptism, the impossibility of salvation to the unbaptized, transubstantiation, the unlawfulness of marriage, especially in the clergy, the papal power, and apologies for a vicious life drawn from predestination.

The third and fourth divisions relate to the punishment of heresy and wilful blasphemy. Prosecutions for these offenses were to be instituted in the diocesan courts, with liberty of appeal to the archbishop, and from him to the king. Persons accused were to stand committed until trial, in default of giving security for their appearance when called upon. If they refused to appear after a lawful citation, they were to be excommunicated and committed. In case of recantation, they were publicly to renounce their heterodoxy, to swear against a relapse, and to profess their belief in the contrary doctrine. If after conviction they should refuse to do these things, they were to be delivered over to the secular arm. If a clergyman were convicted of heresy, his recantation was not to recover his preferment for him.

The fifth division asserts that Baptism and the Lord's Supper alone are properly sacraments; directs the imposition of hands in consecrating bishops and ordaining inferior ministers, the public solemnization of marriages, the confirmation of such as are capable of giving an account of their baptismal vow, and the visitation of the sick by parochial ministers.

The sixth imposes punishment at the ordinary's discretion upon persons admitting the practice of idolatry, witchcraft, and the like. Restitution also was to be made to any who might have been injured by these practices. Those who might refuse to submit, after conviction of such offenses, were to be excommunicated.

The seventh respects preachers, of whom two sorts were to be allowed: one licensed to particular parishes, the other to a whole diocese. Bishops were to take care that both sorts were sufficiently examined before a license was conferred, and to summon the itinerants before them, once in every year, in order to learn from them what parts of the diocese most needed spiritual direction. All preachers were to avoid novelties of doctrine or expression, needless questions, and superstitious conceits. Laymen, especially persons of consideration, are charged to be constant in attending sermons; and any who should disturb a preacher in the exercise of his duty were to be repelled from the church and communion, until they should have given him satisfaction.

The three following divisions relate to the intercourse between the sexes. Marriages were to be celebrated in the church after banns asked on three following Sundays or holidays, and were to be invalid unless solemnized according to the form in the book of Common Prayer. Seducers were to be excommunicated, unless they married their victims: or if that were impracticable, they were to confer upon them the third part of their goods, maintain the fruit of their amour, and undergo a discretionary punishment. The marriage of minors, unless allowed by parents or guardians, was to be invalid; but if the parties applying for such consent should encounter any unreasonable difficulty, they were to have the liberty of appealing to the ordinary. The impediments to marriage are enumerated, and that state is declared free to all; but it is recommended, that in contracting it, a great disparity of years should be avoided. Polygamy is condemned as contrary to the first institution of marriage recorded in Genesis. Forcible marriages

are pronounced null. Women are recommended to suckle their offspring, and preachers are directed to censure the contrary practice. The prohibited degrees are settled according to the Levitical law; and spiritual kindred, or the imaginary relationship derived from baptismal sponsors, is declared no bar to marriage. Adultery was to be punished in clergymen by the forfeiture of their benefices, banishment, or imprisonment for life, and the confiscation of their goods for the use of their wives and children, if they had any; if not, for that of the poor. A layman convicted of this crime was to restore his wife's portion to her, and to augment it by the half of his own fortune. Adulteresses were to forfeit their jointures, and also their pecuniary advantages accruing to them from marriage; besides being banished or imprisoned for life. The innocent party was to have the liberty of marrying again: but if there appeared a reasonable hope of amendment on the offending side, it was recommended that a reconciliation should be attempted. The criminal was to be restrained from a new marriage. Separations between married persons were not to be allowed until a divorce had been legally pronounced. This remedy was conceded in cases of adultery, desertion, long absence, deadly enmities, and cruelty. But mere separation from bed and board is pronounced unreasonable, and contrary to Scripture.

The next three divisions concern the clergy. Bishops were to be very particular in examining the qualifications of all coming for holy orders. Patrons were to consider their rights as a trust, not as a source of unworthy gain. Simoniacal contracts were to void the benefice, disqualify the clerk from holding another, and deprive the patron of that turn. Before admission to livings, clergymen were to be examined by the archdeacon, with the assistance of triers appointed by the bishop. Pluralities were to be wholly forbidden in future. Residence was to be strictly enforced, unless reasonable grounds for exceeding it could be shown to the bishop. Within two months of institution a clerk was to fix himself upon his benefice. Bastards, unless eminently qualified for the sacred function, were to be excluded from ordination; but on no account was a patron's presentation to a benefice of his own illegitimate son to be accepted. Natural infirmities, unless such as incapacitate the party from duly officiating, were not to disqualify for orders. Among such disqualifications, however, is placed highly-offensive breath. Before institution, clergymen

were to swear that they had made no simoniacal contract, nor would make any, nor abide by any made for them, and that they would do nothing to the prejudice of the church; also that they would adhere to the received doctrine and discipline; that they would renounce the pope, and acknowledge the king as supreme earthly head of the national establishment.

The fourteenth division provides, that persons injured in character by slanderous reports, or acquitted in a court of justice merely from insufficient evidence, were to come forward and clear themselves, or be excluded from the church. Such individuals were to make an affidavit that they were innocent of the crime imputed to them, and to bring, as compurgators, men of their own particular condition, and of unblemished fame, to swear that they considered this affidavit truly sworn. Those who suffered in reputation from frequenting any particular house, were to be inhibited from going thither. Duelling and superstitious ordeals of every kind, were forbidden.

Under the three following heads are arranged various regulations for the management of ecclesiastical property, and of capitular and collegiate bodies. The eighteenth division discovers a picture of rapacity in the patrons of benefices, amply sufficient to account for the extreme poverty which overwhelmed many clergymen in those days. Some mercenary trustees, for the spiritual advantage of a parish, appear to have presented a clerk under an agreement that they were to have all the profits of a benefice, a paltry stipend alone being promised to the degraded presentee. Others bargained, that their clerk should retain the tithes, but give up the glebe; others reserved the parsonage-house for their own use; but the bulk of these unworthy traffickers appear to have agreed that they should receive an annual pension from preferments in their gift. All these contracts were pronounced void: and whenever the ordinary should have reason to suspect the existence of such, he was to delay institution, until the presentee should clear himself of the imputation by the prescribed forms of canonical purgation. Any such agreement discovered after a clerk was in possession of a benefice, was to render him liable to ejection from it, and incapable of ever taking another.

The nineteenth regulates public worship. In cathedral and collegiate churches the common prayer was to be said every morning; to which the litany was to be added on Wednesdays and Fridays, and the communion-service on holidays. The evening prayer was to be said every day, and all persons maintained by the revenues of the church were to be constantly present at these services, unless they could fairly excuse their absence. In these large churches the communion was to be administered on every Sunday and holiday, and the bishop, together with all inferior members of the establishment, was to receive it. The service was to be performed in a plain manner, without needless refinements in the music, so that the people might understand it, and join in it. Sermons were to be preached only in the afternoon, lest they should draw the people from their own parish churches. In these, unless the parish were very large, was to be no sermon, except in the morning. In the afternoon, an hour was to be spent in explaining the catechism. After evening prayers, the minister was to consult with his principal parishioners upon relieving the poor, censuring scandalous livers, and exercising penitential discipline. Persons desirous of receiving the communion were to come on the day before its administration, to the minister, in order to give an account of their consciences, and their belief. Divine service was not to be said, or the sacraments administered in private houses, without necessity, unless in the families of peers, or in other very large establishments.

The twentieth concerns the ecclesiastical order. Unmarried clergymen were not to retain as housekeepers any woman under sixty years of age, unless their own near relations. A rural dean was to be chosen every year for each deanery, who was to lay the behavior of both clergy and laity within his district before the diocesan. The archdeacon was always to be a priest resident within the archdeaconry, who was to visit twice in every year, and to report the results of his observation to the bishop, within three weeks after his rounds were completed. Deans were to reside constantly at their cathedrals, unless excused by the bishop, and were to take care that every thing within their jurisdictions should be properly conducted. Prebendaries were to read in their respective cathedrals some portion of Scripture, thrice in every week, or at all events, they were to procure some divine to do this for them. The bishop was to preach in his cathedral; not to ordain either at random, or for reward; to receive complaints against

irregular clergymen, and to deprive such persons, if necessary; to reconcile quarrels between his clergy; to visit his diocese once at least in every three years, and to overlook the moral conduct of all classes of persons within the limits of his authority. He was to admit into his family serious and sober people alone; to make his house, as did the primitive prelates, a kind of seminary for the instruction of his diocese; his wife and children were to be moderate in apparel, and correct in demeanor; and everything likely to draw down upon him an imputation of levity, luxury, or pride, was to be carefully avoided, he was to reside within his diocese, unless when called away by urgent affairs of church or state; and when disabled by age or infirmity from discharging the duties of his function, a coadjutor was to undertake his business. The archbishop was to visit his whole province once a year, if practicable; he was to perform the diocesan's duties during the vacancy of a see, to receive appeals, to inspect the management of his suffragans, reconcile their quarrels, and deprive them, if necessary. Any disagreement arising between him and them was to be decided by the king. He was also to convene provincial synods, to which all his suffragan bishops were bound to come, or to send their proxies. The bishops were to convene diocesan synods annually at the beginning of Lent, at which were to be examined all religious controversies, and clerical irregularities. Every clergyman present was to be asked for his opinion upon any difficult question, and the bishop was to report the judgment of the most learned, but to decide the point himself.

The four following divisions relate to churchwardens, universities, tithes, and visitations. The twenty-fifth division prescribes rules concerning testamentary matters. The privilege of making a will is denied to married women, slaves, children under fourteen years of age, insane persons, and those who are deaf and dumb, unless there is sufficient reason to believe that they understand what they are doing; also to heretics, to persons under sentence of death, or of imprisonment, or banishment for life; to those who refused to part with their kept mistresses until just upon the point of death; to libellers, strumpets, panders, and usurers. Individuals thus proscribed were, however, allowed to bequeath money to charitable uses. With respect to disinherison, a father was not to inflict this penalty upon his son, unless the latter had assaulted him, had purposely done him some signal injury, had subjected him to a judicial process out of mere

malice, had been engaged in any dangerous practice against either of his parents, had debauched his mother-in-law, had calumniated or nearly ruined his father, had refused to be his bail, or had hindered him from making his will.

The twenty-sixth division treats of ecclesiastical censures; concerning which it is laid down as a general rule, that where no particular punishment is assigned, offenses are to be visited at the judge's discretion.

Commutation of penance was not to be allowed unless in extraordinary cases, on the occurrence of which, the money paid was to be distributed among the poor. In case, however, of a relapse into fault, no pecuniary penalty was to screen the guilty party from undergoing personally, the exposure appended to his transgression.

The twenty-seventh and two following divisions treat of suspension, sequestration, and deprivation. This last penalty, when awarded against a bishop, was to proceed from the metropolitan, assisted by two bishops, whom the crown was to nominate for the purpose of trying the cause.

Under the thirtieth head it is asserted, that the power of excommunication is scripturally conferred upon the church, for the avoiding of great scandals. By it guilty persons were to be cut off not only from the public worship and sacraments of God, but also from the ordinary intercourse of society, until they should have repented of their evil courses. But as this penalty is extremely severe, it was to be inflicted only on great emergencies, and never upon a whole society, forasmuch as guilt could hardly attach to such a body in all its parts, and it is not reasonable that innocence should be confounded with criminality. When the ordinary had thoughts of excommunicating any person, he was to send for the minister of the offender's parish, together with two or three clergymen of reputation, and a justice of the peace in his neighborhood. After mature deliberation by this assemblage, the sentence of excommunication was to be pronounced, engrossed, and a copy of it delivered to the party affected by it, on his demand. It was then to be certified to his parish and neighborhood, and read in his church on the following Sunday, when the clergyman was to animadvert upon his offense, in order that all intercourse with him might be broken off. If, after these severities, the offenders continued unmoved during forty days, the excommunication was to be

certified into chancery, and a writ issued for his imprisonment. If his caption were delayed by the corrupt connivance of the sheriff, or any other officer, that person was to be amerced in treble the costs of the process, for the benefit of the poor. A continuance of such delay was to render public functionaries liable to double the same fine. A pardon from the crown after a capital conviction, was not to excuse any person from undergoing ecclesiastical censures. When, after excommunication, an individual became penitent, he was to dress himself according to the ordinary's direction, and present himself at the door of his parish church. There the minister was to receive him with words combining reproof and encouragement. The penitent then, either kneeling, or lying prostrate, was to confess his unworthiness, and implore God's grace to protect him from a relapse. This being done, he was to be led to a conspicuous place, for the purpose of acknowledging his offense to the congregation, of entreating their pardon, and their consent to communicate with him again, and of praying to God that his ill example might not prove injurious to others. It was now to be inquired of the people whether they were willing to readmit this repentant sinner among them, and on the affirmative answer being given, the priest was to lay his hand on his head and absolve him. He was then to embrace him, salute him on the cheek, and lead him to the communion-table; where an hymn was to be sung, and a thanksgiving offered for his recovery.

The remaining divisions of this work are devoid of general interest, being chiefly directed to the regulation of ecclesiastical courts. The whole compilation bears evident marks of a mind well acquainted with the antiquities of the christian church, and estranged from the ordinary habits of secular thinking.

The rejection, or rather the non-enactment of these canons has been imputed by various writers to various causes. Mr. Hallam considers that as the code is founded on the principle current among the clergy, "that a rigorous discipline enforced by church censures, and the aid of the civil power, is the best safeguard of a christian commonwealth against vice" — its severity never would have been endured in this country: and that this was the true reason why they were laid aside. <sup>F224</sup> Mr. Hallam is right in the supposition that they would not have been long or eventually endured on this account, for they are more severe in many respects than the

Laudeau canons of 1640, the enforcement of which excited so much clamor against their author: but it may be considered very doubtful whether they would not have been welcomed by the people, if they had passed into laws, in the reign either of Henry, Edward, or Elizabeth; however they might have been changed or moderated in the progress of the theory of toleration. Bishop Hurd published three volumes of Dialogues on many interesting subjects; and he had intended to have added to them, one, on the subject before us, the effect of transferring supremacy in religious matters. <sup>F225</sup> He has not written this projected essay; but in his Sixth Dialogue on the Constitution of the English Government, he imputes the rejection of these canons to the preference of the crown to the old canon law, as the more influential supporter of the royal prerogative; and that if the crown submitted a body of new laws to the parliament, the parliament would form them altogether in the genius of a free church and state; as Burnet, also, supposes they would have done; and would perhaps assume a share in the supremacy itself. <sup>F226</sup> Hurd derived the idea from Warburton, whose letter was written in 1755; as he not only uses in his essay the very expression to be found in his friend's letter; but in a subsequent letter, <sup>f227</sup> he says, "I thank you for your fine observation on the neglect to reform the ecclesiastical laws: it is a very material one, and deserves to be well considered. The true cause of their being passed by, after so much attention had been paid, and so many learned persons employed on the subject, cannot be now ascertained." <sup>F228</sup>

One expression in the *Reformatio Legum* has given rise to a controversy whether the punishment of death for heresy was intended to be continued. They extended the name and penalties of heresy to the wilful denial of any part of the authorized articles of faith. Burnet affirms that these penalties were laid aside. Collier and Lingard affirm the contrary. It is difficult to decide this question also. Those who denied the truth of any one article of faith, might certainly be delivered over to the secular power: yet infamy, and civil disability, seem in one passage <sup>f229</sup> to be intended, only, excepting in the case of the total denial of the christian religion: for, if a heretic were to be burned, as a matter of course, it would seem needless, as in this chapter, to provide that he should be incapable of making a will, or of being a legal witness. Dr. Lingard, on the contrary, affirms that the heretic, by the new code of laws, was to suffer death for heresy. <sup>F230</sup> He exults in

the supposition that the reformers also were persecutors to the death for opinions; and seems to imagine that the guilt of persecution being attributable to the reformers, as well as to the church of Rome, the crime is also equal, and that the former are consequently to be condemned equally with the latter. They would indeed have been equal in guilt and crime, if they had continued to punish opinions with death: but while the church of Rome retains all the objectionable canons, which commits the heretic to the secular arm, the church of England has expelled every such law from its statute and ecclesiastical code. When we are taunted with having once imitated a bad example, we reply that we now follow it no longer. Can the church of Rome say the same? How long — it has been, and is said how long must the warfare between the protestant and papist continue? We answer in one word. It must continue, till Rome changes! “It was the lot of Mary,” says Dr. Lingard, “to live in an age of religious intolerance, when to punish the professors of erroneous doctrine was inculcated as a duty, no less by those who rejected, than by those who asserted, the papal authority. It might perhaps have been expected that the reformers, from their sufferings under Henry VIII., would have learned to respect the rights of conscience. Experience proved the contrary. They had no sooner obtained the ascendancy during the short reign of Edward, than they displayed the same persecuting spirit which they had formerly condemned, burning the anabaptist, and preparing to burn the (Roman) catholic at the stake, for no other crime than adherence to religious opinion. The former, by the existing law, was already liable to the penalty of death: the latter enjoyed a precarious respite, because his belief had not yet been pronounced heretical by any acknowledged authority. But the zeal of archbishop Cranmer observed and supplied this deficiency; and in the code of ecclesiastical discipline which he compiled for the government of the reformed church, he was careful to class the distinguishing doctrines of the ancient worship with those more recently promulgated by Muncer and Socinus. By the new canon law of the metropolitan, to believe in transubstantiation, to admit the papal supremacy, and to deny justification by faith only, were severally made heresy; and it was ordained, that individuals accused of holding heretical opinions should be arraigned before the spiritual courts, should be excommunicated on conviction, and, after a respite of sixteen days, should, if they continued obstinate, be delivered to the civil magistrate, to suffer the punishment of death. Fortunately for the

professors of the ancient faith, Edward died before this code had obtained the sanction of the legislature; by the accession of Mary the power of the sword passed from the hands of one religious party to those of the other; and within a short time, Cranmer and his associates perished in the flames which they had prepared to kindle for the destruction of their opponents.” In the note appended to these remarks, the words of the obnoxious chapter are cited, and much acute reasoning is exercised to prove that sir James Mackintosh <sup>f231</sup> is wrong in making a distinction between the infliction of punishment and the privation of life, and that Cranmer, by the word *puniendus*, meant the punishment of death. We may wisely adopt the conclusion of Mr. Hallam, and avoid forming a decided opinion on the matter; and we may remember the justice of Mr. Soames’ remark, that those who framed the *Reformatio Legum*, lived in an age of fierce intolerance; and they remark, in vindication of their own severity, that blasphemers were stoned under the Mosaic law. Had no extraordinary rigor too been denounced in cases outraging the catholic faith, it is scarcely doubtful, that the Romish party would have represented our reformers as indifferent to the vital interests of Christianity. Nor, whatever may be now thought of death as a punishment for glaring offenses against true religion, will serious men generally deny, that such transgressions are properly visited by (some) civil inflictions. It is most important that youth and ignorance should be shielded from exposure to the contact of such baneful opinions as undermine the best principles. The moral discipline proposed for England in the *Reformatio Legum* is obviously unsuited for a national church. It is derived from the earliest records of ecclesiastical antiquity, and is adapted only for a community very limited in extent. From such a society every member might be excluded who should be found unwilling to exemplify the christian character in all respects. Any attempt, however, to render a community so regulated co-extensive with a numerous people, would lead at once to intolerable tyranny, and would quickly fail altogether. <sup>F232</sup>

Some light may be thrown on this controversy, and on the manner in which John Foxe anticipated, in some measure, the axioms of a future age on the subject of toleration, by a brief analysis of his learned preface. He commences by showing the utility and necessity of laws which shall promote the establishment of religious truth in principle, and outward

discipline in practice. Such laws should be enacted with prudence. They should not breathe cruelty, as those of Draco or Phalaris, or the persecuting bishops of Rome. They should not be too numerous, lest the number of their enactments be rather burthensome than useful.

If all were Christians, laws would not be required; but now, the universal experience of mankind, whether in ancient or modern times, proves their necessity. "No nation, no state," he observes, "was ever so savage and barbarous, as not to have some laws, by which, if every vice was not driven away, at least some decency of manners was retained. Even our own England has not wanted her laws and statutes, wisely framed by our most prudent ancestors. This is proved by the laws of Ina, Edward, Athelstan, Eadmund, Edgar, Alured, Ethelred, Canute, and those under the auspices of other princes. These laws prevailed for a time. Afterwards, a comedian entered the stage, about to play his own production, and he was the bishop of Rome; who, having gotten rid of all others, was to have the whole stage, and every character appropriated to himself. At first leaving to the secular magistrates what appeared to appertain to secular affairs; but all the rest, which pertained to morals, he transferred to himself and his ecclesiastics, by a most ingenious device, whilst he gave out that he was the vicar of Christ upon earth, and the hereditary successor of the apostolic office. This he impressed upon rulers and magistrates by little and little, and thus secured opportunities of attempting greater things. Nor was his daring deficient on any occasion. Proceeding, therefore, in the comedy undertaken, after he had acquitted himself thus satisfactorily in the prologue, he applies himself to the rest of the acts, which he undertakes with no tardiness. First of all, with respect to kings and supreme monarchs, he endeavors, by little and little, to lessen their authority; then to raise his own on an equality with theirs; afterwards to surpass it; and, as a climax, to subject them to himself. When he had succeeded in this, he still proceeded onwards. He, who first walked with the humble sandal, now struts in the lofty buskin, and, from a bishop, comes out a tragic king. At length, the ecclesiastick swells to such a pitch, that he who at first was wont to receive laws from others, and be ruled by them, now, the scene being changed, himself imposes laws upon them, and prescribes those enactments for the world which we now designate the canon law. In which law, his presumption knows no bounds, so that he

adds law to law, decrees to decrees, and to these again decretals, and others to others; neither is there any end of it, until, at last, he has so crammed the world with his *Clementines*, *Sextines*, *intra* and *extra-vagantes*, *provincial constitutions* and *synodals*, *small glosses*, *sentences*, *chapters*, *summaries*, *rescripts*, and *infinite rhapsodies*, that even Atlas himself, who is said to have sustained the whole heavens, would have sunk under this burthen.

“Thus he proceeded, till he seized upon both swords, and all became worse, till, under the present pontiff (Leo X.), the ecclesiastical state is so governed, that there is almost *nothing upright in religion, nothing sound in morals, no freedom for conscience, no sincerity in worship, neither is there any thing in his laws, except what pertains to certain useless ceremonies, or absurd dogmas, or to increase the privileges of the ecclesiastical order.* And if there should be the appearance of justice, or an inspection of morals, yet exemption may be purchased. To such a pitch had this proceeded, that from such tribunals all political authority was driven away, and the business of the courts was centred in, I know not what, canonists and officials, the greater part of whom, living by litigation, looked more to their own advantage than to rectitude of virtue and morals.

“Such a state of things,” says Foxe, “required correction, and Henry VIII. appointed a commission of thirty-two to revise the laws. The king’s wish was praiseworthy, so were the endeavors of those appointed, but the attempt was unsuccessful.” <sup>F233</sup>

He then proceeds to relate the details respecting the mode of compiling the *Reformatio Legum*; and concludes by passing no opinion on the severity or the policy of the enactments. The time had not arrived when the union of laws, on the part of the state, to uphold that which the state believed to be the best form of worship, faith, and discipline, and to uphold also, at the same time, the duty of toleration, could be understood. The best and wisest of that, and many subsequent generations, were unable to fix the limits to authority, and to understand the origin of all civil power, as divine in its source, but human in its details. The double scepter, over soul and body, had been claimed by the foreign bishop. It was now transferred to the temporal prince. Non-resistance to the pope had long been an axiom in

the universal law of Europe. Opposition to this axiom was death. Non-resistance to the king succeeded, as a political axiom, till a future age modified the principle, by making the legislature, or the king, with his represented people, the sovereign of the state, and not the king as an individual person; and John Foxe did not, in this instance, advance beyond his age. He concludes his preface, therefore, as if he was conscious that some of the enactments were too severe; but he could not provide, or he dared not suggest, a remedy. “The word of God,” he adds, “is alone to be taken as our guide in worship, and in matters of religion.” He eulogizes the memory of Edward, and trusts that Elizabeth will consent to the enactment of the laws which had been proposed to, and sanctioned by, her brother and her father; and he concludes by apologizing for his boldness in editing the volume. The result is known. **The queen forbade the commons to proceed, and the design fell to the ground.** <sup>F234 L9</sup>

The next transaction of a public nature in which we find the name of John Foxe was the execution of his constant friend and patron, the duke of Norfolk. <sup>F235</sup> In September, 1568, the duke was appointed one of the commissioners to hear the accusations against the queen of Scots; and at that time the intrigue for their marriage commenced. The duke, when on the scaffold, declared himself to be a protestant; and this was so well known, that, though the earl of Westmoreland, his brother-in-law, promoted the scheme, it was condemned by the earl of Northumberland and others, on the express ground, that the duke was not considered a good Roman catholic. <sup>F236</sup> It appears to me most probable, that the duke of Norfolk, who lost his third wife <sup>f237</sup> in the year preceding his being made one of the commissioners, was deeply interested in the beauty and sufferings of the queen, and was totally ignorant of the extent to which she had pledged herself, both to the cardinal of Lorraine and the pope, to exert her utmost efforts, by all the means in her power, to restore the church of Rome in Scotland, and to lay down her life in that cause. <sup>F238</sup> He did not even suspect, probably, the deep-laid schemes by which the foreigner was endeavoring to re-establish the old superstition. He confessed that he deserved to suffer because he had broken his promise to the queen. He confessed, too, that he had conversed with the papal emissary Ridolphi; but that he never consented to the political projects of the pope, nor to the invasion of England. “With respect, also,” he said on the scaffold, “to my

conscience and religion, I know that I have been suspected to be a papist. I must confess, that divers of my familiar friends, and divers of my servants and officers under me, were papists. But what meaning I had in it, God, who seeth above, knoweth it. For myself, God is my witness, I have always been a protestant, and never did allow of their blind and fond ceremonies. And now, before God and you all, I utterly renounce the pope, and all popedom; which thing I have always done, and will do to my life's end. And to that which is the chiefest point of our belief — I believe and trust to be saved by faith in Jesus Christ only, and by none other means. For if I did, I should be greatly deceived at this instant.” <sup>F239</sup>

Whether this confession is fully to be believed, we know not; but every circumstance related of his character, and developed in the history of Mary, render it worthy of credence. he acted, however, with the greatest imprudence. He was influenced by the earl of Leicester, who betrayed him. The advice of Cecil was not heeded; and he must have been aware that the promoters of the marriage were ever the most bitter enemies of the queen; nor can any reason or motive whatever justify a religious protestant for upholding the supporters of the spiritual supremacy of a foreign prelate against his own sovereign. During the rumors relative to the intended marriage, Foxe addressed to the duke the following letter:-

“May it please your grace, ther is a great rumor with us here in London, and so farr spread, yt it is in every man's mouth almost, of your marriage with the Scottish Queene: which rumor, as I trust to bee false, for I would be very sorry that it should be true, for two respects. The one for ye good will I beare to you, the other for ye love I beare to ye common wealth, for yt I see noe other, and many besides mee doe see hoe lesse, butt ye day of that marriage when soever it beginneth, will end with such a catastrophe as wilbee ether ruinous to your selfe, or dangerous to ye tranquillity of ye realme; the peace wherof standing for long amongst us through ye great mercy of God, God forbidd it should nowe beginn to break by you. Your grace knoweth what enimies wee have both within and without: against whome wee have always trusted and doe yet trust, next under God and the queene, to have you a sure Scipio unto us: to ye contrary wherof, thes rumors cannot perswade mee, butt yt as you have vertuously begunn, soe by ye

Lord's grace you will constantly continue still. Howbeit since yt noise and clamor of ye people maketh me somewhat to muse, and bycause true love is always full of feare, I beseech you lett mee say to you what I thinke in this matter. That in case you take this way to marry with this lady in our Queene's days, it will in ye end turne you to hoe great good. I beseech you therfore for God's sake bee circumspect and marke well what they bee, yt sett you on this worke, and whetunto they shoote. Ther ys hoe greater cunning in these days, then to knowe, whome a man may trust. Ensamples you have enough, within ye compasse of your owne days, wherby you may learne, what noble men have bin cast away by them, whom they seemed most to trust. Remember I pray you the ensample of Mephibosheth. wherof I told you being yong; how first hee was under-foote, then again" <sup>f240</sup> ...

The letter is unfinished, which is much to be regretted. The duke, it would appear, was not in London, being, in all probability, still at Kenninghall, as his last duchess had not been dead a year. The incidents of his trial and execution are well known, as well as the fact, that, after Leicester had betrayed him to the queen, and procured her pardon for the share he had in the conspiracy, the queen commanded the duke to make a full confession, which he did, and Elizabeth made use of it against him. During his confinement, he made application to speak with some persons, and also to receive spiritual comfort from his old master Foxe. Sir Henry Skipwith, under-lieutenant of the Tower, writes to sir William Cecil on the occasion.

"Right hon.," he says, "may it please you to understand, that the Duke of Norfolk hath required me to wryt to you, for one cause more then he hathe required Sr Peter Carewe to saye to you, which is, to desyre your Honor as his last request that you will helpe him to speke with Dix and Hassat, and I to here what he saiethe to them, or whom els shall please her Majestic, or your honors to appoint. I think yt be for his detts. He also longethe muche for Mr. Foxe his old scholemaster, to whom he much desyres to performe that faithe which he first grounded him in, and sure I fynd him little altered, but lyveth now in such order as he before dyd, determyned and verie well settled towards God, as ever I sawe any. And thus

with my most humble dutie to your honor I take my leave: from the Tower this 17th Jan. 1571-2.

“Yf yt pleased you so to lyk of yt, the soner he were satisfied of this yt were the better in my opinion; because he might settle himself hollye towards God and frome the world.” <sup>F241</sup>

The duke was executed 3d June, 1572, and attended to the scaffold by sir Henry Lee, by Nowel, the dean of St. Paul’s, and by John Foxe, with other gentlemen. <sup>F242</sup> After his address to the people was concluded, he spoke to sir Henry Lee; and after taking off his gown and doublet, embraced Mr.: Nowel, bowing to him even to the ground; and with him also he spoke apart. It is not said that he conversed with Foxe. He had however written to his children, before his execution, and addressed it specially to “Phillip and Nan.” In that memorial, when disposing of certain presents, he mentions his request that “twenty pounds a yeare be allowed to Mr. Foxe.” We do not, however, know whether this pension was ever paid. <sup>F243</sup>

Many other letters in the Harleian collection, illustrate the influence of Foxe at this time. They are addressed to him in Grub-street; and must, therefore, though no date appears on them, have been written after 1572. A letter from Foxe to one of his neighbors, who had so built his house as to darken Foxe’s windows, is curious as a specimen of religious expostulation, for an injury which possibly he could not afford to remedy by law. <sup>F244</sup>

About the end of this same year, Foxe was applied to for the exertion of his interest with Dr. Pierce, in favor of a young man anxious to obtain a studentship at Christ Church, Oxford, so that he might be no longer a burden to his father. The letter is from the young man himself.

“I have before troubled you ynoughe and to touche: yet consyderinge the singuler benefite that your letters maye procure me, I ame enforced (through meare neade) to write these fewe lyrics unto you, gevinge you most hartiest thanks for your gentlenes bothe to my father and me (whiche indeede should have ben in latine after a simple sorte but for the shortenes of time) desyringe you for Godes sake to write your letters to Doctor Pierce in my behalfe, that he would be so good unto me as to electe me scholer of

Christchurche at this election. Nowe is the time yf ever I shall come in, for by reporte Mr. Doctor Pierce shall bring in iiij scholers and everye Cannonne ij, there be so manye places voyde. I thinke therefore throughe your letters (consideringe his promise made to my father that I should be the thirde that he would chose in) he will remember me yf he shall electe 4. I beseche you therfore that you would by your earneste letters put him in mynde of my ease, that surely, unlesse I maye gett in by his meanes, all that my father hathe bestowed upon me shalbe to noe purpose, for I shalbe put to some other trade, because my father of himself is not able to kepe me at the universyte any longer, he hathe done for me alreadye more than he was well able consydeyrnge his povertye. At my firste comminge to Oxforde Mr. Doctor Cooper then beinge deane promised to bringe me in scholer, and because that at the firste election he coulde not, sendyng for my mother, promised to geve me iiij markes everye yeare tyll suche tyme that he could electe me, but howe these iiij markes beinge taken awaye, by reason of his absence, I am enforced to chardge my father, whome I have chardged to muche alreadye. Yt is therfore hyghe tyme that I shoulde (unless I did meane altogether to forgo the universitye) seeke some further ayde, wherby my father myghte be eased of this burthen, and I by suche meanes styll applye my learninge. These thinges have moved me to trouble you with this my requeste for your letters, and because that bothe in writinge and in sendinge them I thoughte it not conveniente or mete to trouble you, I have desyred on (one) of my frendes the bringer heareof to be readye (yf yt shall please you to write) to receive them and bringe them to the carriars. Thus with my hartye prayers for you, I cease to trouble you any further, desiringe the eternall God to protecte and kepe you in all your doinges. From Oxforde the xx of November, 1571.

“Yours to commaunde at all tymes, “*Thomas Torporley*.”<sup>F245</sup> “To the worshipfull and his singular good frende Mr. Foxe, dwellinge in Grubb Street, this be given with speed from Oxford.”

Foxe appears at this time to have been generally consulted by those who were most deeply interested in the discussions or controversies of the day. He had, some years before, been requested to answer certain questions

respecting the sacraments. Application was now made to him, for his opinion on the lawfulness of sponsors.

“Mr. Fockes after my herry comendaeyons this shalbe to thanke Gode for youre benevolles and lovyng leter in Chryste jesus, sent unto me, whiche leter hathe mynistred unto me greate comfort in the mereres of jesus Chryste, desyerynge youe, even for the same jesus Chrystes sake to praye unto god for me, that the cornforte and faythe whyche I nowe have in the swete and comfortable promyses of jesus Chryste, maye dayly more and more be incresed in me, that I maye growe from emparifeccon to perfeccyon, from weecknes to strength, and that god maye gyve me a thanckefull harte for his great mercys and provydence in kepyng me in all my troubles from all the weckede and mallyshyous asaltes of the spirytall enemye Sattan, for he hath gone about to desayve me by spirytall craftynes in heavenly thynges; God be thanked for his mercyes that hathe kepe me from consenttynge unto him. Oh that my mouth myght be filled with the praises of God that I myght synge of his honor and glorie all the dayes of my lyre; and further more this shalbe to shewe you that my troubles are not so ended that howe I feell nothyng of them. But greate and manyfowled are the troubles whiche manye tymes, I have yet, yea even in the same trouble wech hath been most troublsom unto me, but I thanke my God that hath gyeven me more strength to bare then in tymes paste I have felt. The Lord increase it for his great mercye sake. I will not at this tyme, nayther can I as nowe expresse all the thyng that hathe troublede me, but on thyng I beseche you expresse your mynde unto me, yf you have any conveneant tyme to wryt unto me, and that as tuchyng babtysinge with godfathers and godmothers, for that hathe bene troublesom unto me, and many ther be in the contrye aboute us that hathe ben greatly troublede for not usyng them. The causes whye they are not used are these, fyrst for that by Godes word ther is no exsample so to doo; seconly, for that the vowes demanded of the childe cannot of the standers by be parformed; and thurdlye for that of manye they are supurstecyously howlden as thynges appartayninge to the sacraments, and for that as some thynke, is a seremony brought in

to the church by the byshope of Rome, and for these causes no to be usede. And my desyer ys to knowe howe by the worde of God they maye be usede, whether the word be eyther with them, or not agaynst them. In those thynges I beseche you shewe me your mynde yf you convenyently can, and chuse levyngge at this tyme anye further to trouble you. I woulde have writen more unto you yf I did not wante wordes to expresse my mynde, I praye God gyeve you the assestance of his Holy Spyryte to the increase of youre cornforte and joyes in Chryste Jesus, whyche that it maye lycke wyes be increased in me, I beseche you praye for me, and God willynge I will not forgete you in my prayers. Oh praye, I beseche you, for the increase of my faythe. From Byckingham in Suffucke the 4 daye of January, 1572. “Your in Jesus Chryst,  
**“FRANCIS BAXTER.”** <sup>F246</sup>

The following letter was written in defense of a narrative in his *Acts and Monuments*. Foxe having been accused by Thomas Thackham, of Reading, of having inserted into his history a calumny against him in the relation of the troubles and death of Julius Palmer, <sup>f247</sup> Thackham drew up his own account of the transaction, and gave it to Foxe, who sent it to Mr. Perry, a grave minister in Gloucestershire, desiring him to inquire diligently into the truth of the matter; the result was the accompanying letter bearing witness to Foxe’s accuracy, and testifying against Thackham.

“Right reverend and beloved in the Lord, I have received your letters together with Thackham’s answer, which I perceave you have well perused, and do understand his craftye and ungodlye dealing therein, that I may not say fond and foolish, for he doth not denye the substance of the storye, but only seeketh to take advantage by some circumstancyes off the tyme and place, wherein yt may be ther was an oversyght for lacke off perfect instructions or good remembrance at the begynnyng. He confesseth that he delyvered a letter of Palmer’s owne hand to the maior of Readinge, which was the occasyon off his imprisonment and death. Onlye he excuseth hym selfe by transferring the cryme *a seipso in martire*. Briefly his whole end and purpose ys to geve the world to understand that the martir was gyltie as well of incontincye, as also of wylfull casting away of hym selfe. O impudent man. The

wyse and godly reader may easily smell his stinking hart. He careth not though he [out] face <sup>f248</sup> the godlye martir and the whole volume of marfirs, to sa[ve] (as he thinketh) (it is torn in the MS.) his own honestye and good name. Howbeyt I d[oubt] <sup>f249</sup> not but God wyll confound him to his utter shame, and reveale hys clokod hypocrisie to the defense of his blessed mar fir and the whole storye. Though many of them be dead that gave instructyons in tymes past, and now coulde have borne witnesse, yet thankes be to God ther want not alyve that can and wyll testyfy the trueth herein to his confusyon. No dyligence shall be spared in the matter, as shortly, I trust, you shall understand. In the meane while Thackham need not be importunate for an answer. He reportethe hym selfe to the whole towne of Readinge; therefore he must geve us some space. The God of trueth defend you and all other that mayntayne his trueth from the venemous poyson of lyers. Vale in Christo qui ecclesiae suae to diu servet incolumem. From Beverston in Gloc.shire. Maii 4th. “Yours in the Lord, “*THOM. PERRYE*, Minist.”

To the right reverend in God, Mr. Ihon Ffoxe, preacher of the ghospell in London, be thes, at Mr. Daie’s the printer, dwellyng over Aldersgate, beneath S. Marten’s. <sup>f250</sup>

A letter of John Meyer of Corsley, dated the 18th May, the same year, to Mr. Perry, verifies also the truth of Foxe’s statement respecting Thackham. <sup>F251</sup> The whole account is given in Strype. <sup>F252</sup>

That Foxe was now held in great esteem by his ecclesiastical superiors, is evident from the many attentions he received from them. Before Parkhurst was removed from Norwich, he invited him to pay him a visit, from which Foxe excused himself in consequence of ill health; yet confessing that there was none of the episcopal bench from whom he had received more kindnesses, or to whom he would come with more delight. He also states that he was compelled to put off the bishop of Lincoln, who had even sent a servant and horse for him, but he was obliged to send both away empty. <sup>F253</sup>

We have frequently observed, in reply to the charge that the church of England has persecuted as well as the church of Rome, and therefore that

the cruelty of the latter is to be forgotten, because of the same error in the former, that the great difference between the two churches in this matter consists in this — that the church and state of England have rescinded all claims to persecution, and made the duty of toleration an axiom in christian government: while the church of Rome has not rescinded one decree, or canon; one papal bull, one conciliar or pontifical law, which affirms the right of the church to govern conscience, without conviction; and to punish, coerce, and compel, even by death, the resisters and oppugners of that authority. The charge of persecution against the protestant church of England has been defended by the conduct of Elizabeth to some wretched sectarians in the year 1575. In the beginning of that year a conventicle of Dutch anabaptists was discovered in Aidgate; of whom twenty-seven were seized and committed. Four recanted. Some were so firm in their opinions, that neither instruction nor punishment could make any impression upon them. They were, however, treated mercifully, and banished, without any farther punishment. This encouraged others, and it was at length thought necessary to proceed to greater extremities. Foxe interceded for two of these when under condemnation; and while he expressed his hatred of their principles, he strongly reprobated the putting them to death. “I have never,” says he, “been annoying to any, but now I am compelled to be importunate even to the queen herself, not on my own account, but on that of strangers. I understand there are in this country, not English, but strangers, Belgians, brought to judgment for wicked opinions. They have been condemned to death by burning. In this case there are two things to look at, one pertains to the heinousness of their errors, the other to the rigor of their punishment.” He wonders that any Christians could fall into such errors: but such is human infirmity without divine grace; and he is thankful that no Englishman has fallen into them. “They ought,” he says, “to be restrained; but to consign them to the flames is more after the Roman example, than a Christian custom. I would not countenance their errors, but I would spare their lives, because I myself am a man; and that they may repent.” He beseeches the queen to spare their lives, because there are other modes of punishment into which their condemnation can be commuted banishment, close imprisonment, bonds, perpetual exile, reproaches, stripes, or even gibbets. But this one thing I deprecate, that the fires of Smithfield, which have slumbered so long under your auspices,

should now by you be rekindled. Wherefore, spare them a month or two, so that means may be tried for their conversion.” <sup>F254</sup>

The exertions of Foxe, in favor of these persons, were not confined to the queen alone; he addressed the lord treasurer and other counsellors, as well as **chief justice Monson,** <sup>L11</sup> and also **the individuals themselves.** <sup>L12</sup> In the former of these, after stating that the business upon which he was about to address related not to himself, he mentions the unhappy anabaptists, and their detestable madness, in whose case the bishop of London had decided, after great care and diligence, as he ought to have done. “All were agreed that some punishment should be awarded them in consequence of their errors, but they were not agreed as to its kind. Some, chiefly papists, exclaimed, To the stake, to the stake! Others of more clemency, did not think it requisite to proceed to such extremity under the Gospel, which had been exercised under the influence of Rome: and had rather resort to some other remedy for the healing of wounds, than the destroying of men for ever, and which would unite the rigour of law with the mercy of the gospel. But, we know not, how you, who are secular, will exercise your power, unless from the prescript of law, which if you do, I will first vehemently desire you, and appeal chiefly to your prudence, that you should consider how far you are allowed by public enactment, or the authority of law, to condemn to fire and flames those who have erred only in doctrine. Because if you appeal to the law passed under Henry IV. (for you have no law for burning), that enactment has not sufficient force, because in the framing of it, the common consent of all was wanting, without which every parliamentary enactment is void. Although that law did once much prevail, yet I understand that in the beginning of the reign of her gracious majesty it was repealed; and even if not so, I have proved from authentic public records in my Acts and Monuments (where I answered Alan Cope in the life of Lord Cobham), that it has no precedent.” He proceeds to say, as in his address to the queen, that the fires of Smithfield should not again be roused; and begs them not to proceed to extreme punishment which the law will not justify, as so doing they would be establishing more than papistical tyranny. He begs them also to consider that he is a suppliant, not an adviser.

To the individuals he writes that he had brought their case before the queen and her council without effect. He says that by their pertinacity they

appear to fight not only against the will of God, but against his plain word, the pious and sacred institution and true faith of all Christians; raise foolish factions, produce scandals, bring in deadly errors, injure the church of God in no small degree, and afford matters to enemies and papists to insult and calumniate. “And by the error of your doctrine you offend not the church of God only, but even God himself, when you acquiesce not in his word, nor bow to his truth, nor seek for his Holy Spirit promised in the Scriptures, but cultivate certain fanatic conceptions, nay, rather deceptions, of your own minds; and while you contend so obstinately about the humanity of Christ, ye in the mean time hold not rightly or care not for your own salvation and remission of sins through the humanity of Christ, proposed to us by faith only.” He then proceeds to argue against their opinion, and concludes by exhorting them to look again and again to what they are about; “for it is sufficiently apparent that for long you have disturbed the church by your great scandal and offense. May the Lord Jesus by the most holy guidance of his Spirit open the eyes of your mind, and draw your hearts to the knowledge of his truth. Amen.”

Foxe, after this, addressed himself to the lord chief justice, to whom, as he says, was left the decision of the case. He sent him copies of his letters to the queen and the council, and informs him that he had written to them in their own language. He uses the same argument as he had done to the lord treasurer, Burghley, reprobating the punishment of death, and advocating milder measures; for, says he, we often fall into diseases which kindness does more to cure than harshness, and a day’s delay sometimes effects more than the hand of the medical attendant; but now I speak of those diseases which require spiritual medicine rather than corporal, since erring faith can be compelled and taught by no one; and many die true believers, who had long lived in heresy. He entertained hopes that they might be brought to the true faith if delay were granted, and hopes he would decide in such manner as that all should perceive his desire to mingle mercy with justice, that not only the language, the writings, the histories of all good men might testify his clemency, but that even the unhappy persons themselves, being converted, might thank him. <sup>F255</sup>

These writings prove how much of the spirit of the Gospel Foxe had imbibed, and that how much soever he condemned the errors into which these persons had fallen, yet he still knew that the Scripture breathed the

same intentions as its divine Author expressed to his disciples, when they were desirous of inflicting punishment upon the heads of the Samaritans,

“Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives but to save them.”

(Luke 9:55, 56.)

Every effort was useless. The sentence of death by burning was executed: and the murder of these poor anabaptists is as disgraceful to the memory of Elizabeth, as the other martyrdoms were disgraceful to her sister Mary.

It may be doubted, however, whether the refusal of the application thus made by John Foxe to the queen, did not proceed from political rather than religious motives. She wished to intimidate the puritans by reminding them that the law for burning the opponents of the religion of the sovereign, was still in existence. I have examined the writ, by virtue of which they were burnt: and am sorry to say that it is worded as the old writs for burning the episcopal, and other protestants in the reign of Mary. <sup>F256</sup>

It was in this year that the sermon preached on Good Friday, 1570, at Paul’s cross, was printed. Its more extensive dissemination was entrusted to Andrew Weckel at Frankfort; who acknowledged the receipt of it, this year, stating, that he thanked Foxe for his good opinion of him; and that he would follow the advice he had given him; and would take such counsel with his friends, as the utility of the church seemed to require, and the aspect of the times would allow. <sup>F257</sup>

The third English edition of his Martyrology appeared in the year 1576: and few events subsequently occurred, which can be deemed interesting, to a modern reader. These may be included under those which relate to his son — to his controversy with Osorius — to some other long-forgotten publications, to his general character; and to the anecdotes which illustrate it, collected by his son.

However great might have been the success of the labors of the martyrologist, his domestic and family affairs never appear to have been in a very satisfactory condition. His eldest son, who was born at Norwich, and educated in London, was entered at Magdalen College, Oxford. On this occasion, his father wrote to his old and dear friend Laurence Humphrey, and tells him that he has sent his little Foxe to him, that he may become an

academic, and make merchandize in that most celebrated mart, Oxford, — not that he should increase m riches, but that he might store his mind with the sciences, and cultivate his talents. He begs him to take his son under his especial care, and to extend that kindness to him which he had done to many others, if not for the merits of his father (which are nothing) or for his kind offices (*muneribus*) which are. none, at least for his own sake. Perhaps, he proceeds, I may appear too importunate, thus loading with duties a friend engaged in so many and so great public and private affairs: but to this necessity, a sharp spur compels me. He requests that his son may be admitted into their college, and suitable rooms attributed to him, and a proper tutor appointed. Whatever else may be wanting to defray his expenses, he himself would meet it, as well as he could. <sup>F258</sup>

His son was elected a demy. Two years after, however, he went to France without acquainting his father with his intention. Foxe being anxious for his welfare, and not knowing the reason of his leaving Oxford, wrote to a friend abroad complaining of the manner in which his son had acted. Necessity, he says, compels him to write, and request his friend to assist him in his search for his son, whom he had educated to the best of his power, and who had made some progress: but he had left his college, never having consulted either president or tutor, leaving his books and letters behind, his parent ignorant of his proceedings, all his friends and relatives in sorrow. He knows not in what land he is, and conjectures from the letter of a merchant, that he is at Paris. Still he supposes his wants may drive him to his excellency, in which case he implores him to assist in the recovery of his fugitive son. His name Samuel, and his stature for his years somewhat large. With these marks, he again implores him, if he should discover him, to let him know where he can find him.

The letter is full of deep feeling and anxiety for the welfare of his son; <sup>f259</sup> who appears to have returned soon after, and to have been again kindly received by Dr. Humphrey. He was elected a probationer in 1581. <sup>F260</sup>

We cannot now ascertain the circumstances of this case. In the life of Foxe by his son, we are told that when the young man on his return from the continent presented himself to his father in a “foreign and somewhat fantastical garb,” he addressed him, “Who are you?” “Sir, I am your son Samuel.” “Oh, my son!” said the father, “what enemy of thine hath taught

thee so much vanity?" This anecdote must be true, as it is related by his son to whom the words were spoken. We may infer from it, that the young man was guilty only of the fondness of a more gay and fashionable appearance than his father approved; but it is possible, also, that the same attachment to the external was deemed inconsistent with the gravity required by his college from their fellows. We find that his son was expelled from Magdalen, on a charge of popery, in the same year in which he had been restored. The discipline of the college at this time is said to have been very strict: so much so that by many it was deemed to be puritanical.

We learn from Fuller that the charges against him were vague and indefinite. He was accused of an inclination to popery, and by the power of the puritanical party was expelled from college. A letter still remains, in which Foxe addresses the president of the college in the most grateful terms for the kindness which his son had received from him. He tells him, that if he had himself been president of Magdalen, and the president had been father to his son, neither of them could have wished, that the duties of their respective offices could have been better performed. <sup>F261</sup> Yet Foxe, on his son's expulsion, does not seem to have made application for his restoration to Dr. Humphrey. He addressed a bishop in behalf of his son, whom he did not defend as faultless, but urged that he was dismissed without previous admonition, or any cause assigned, and the harshness of this proceeding, rather arose from internal dissensions in his college, and opposition to their president, than to freedom from faults greater than those they censured in his son. The letter is penned in a very able manner, and he speaks in it in moving terms of his own age and poverty. <sup>F262</sup>

His son was restored to the fellowship by the royal mandate. It is, consequently, difficult to suppose that he was a papist, or a puritan. He was probably at this time a strict conformist to the services; and being of frank or thoughtless habits, was offensive to his puritan coadjutors. Not one word, or fact, can be found which sanctions the charge of his attachment to popery.

The poverty of which Foxe complained continued, we must believe, till his death. Some years after his son's restoration to his fellowship, the martyrologist endeavored to make provision for him, by obtaining for him

a lease of the prebend of Shipton. This could not be done without the consent of the crown, and his diocesan. The following letter of bishop Piers informs us, that the bishop had obtained the lease, to transfer it as Foxe requested.

“Grace and peace from God the Father, etc. I have received yor Gr. Ire the xiiij of this prsent monthe in the behalfe of Mr. Foxe his sonne for the prbend of Shipton, the graunt wherof allreadie her Matie hath made unto me, because yt is a prbend belonging to the church of Saturn in respect whereof I doe lay claime unto yt, I thoughte good to procure the disposition of yt into my owne handes. Nevvrthesse readie I am to the uttermost of my power, to pleasure that good man, Mr. Foxe. And to this point his sonne the bearer herof and I are growne. First because he thinketh some blemishe to be in the lease, for want of a confirmation of the deane and chapter before the death of Mr. Randall, to whom the lease was made. I have promised him to confirme either the same lease againe, or a newe one if this doth mislike him. For he uppon whom I meane to bestowe the prbend is my domesticall chaplaine, and to marie my neece verie shortlie. At my comandmet I am sure in this matter, and hath alreadie promised the prformance herof before me unto Samuell Fox. I have moreovr promised him to bestowe some other prbend uppon his yonger brother as soone as anie falleth royal, after he is capable of it. And in the meane season to geve him some exhibicon quarterlie toward his maintenance in the universitie. And this I trust will satisfie yr Gr. and Mr. Foxe, if not, uppon the understandynge of yor Gr. further pleasure geven, I shalbe content to yeld further to his better contentment. Mr. Walvard as yett continueth with me, the same man as he was. Thus I leave you to God’s mrciful tuicon. From my house in Sury the xiiij of Julie, 1586.

“Yor Sr to comand in Christ, *JO. SARUM.*” <sup>F263</sup>

This is addressed to Dr. Whitgift, then archbishop of Canterbury. The application was successful. The provision for his son was procured, <sup>f264</sup> and the lease continued in the family. Samuel Foxe possessed it at his father’s death, 1687; and in the 35th of Elizabeth, made a grant of the

tythe of Shipton to Richard Wisdom, enjoining him to the observance of the covenant relating to the poor. This covenant refers to the clause in the original grant in the lease respecting the entertainment of the poor, viz.: “And furder yt the said Samuell Foxe his executors and assignes shall and will every Sunday and festivall day during the said terme, invite entertaine and have to his table at dinner and supper two couple of honest and neediest persons (being dwellers within the said parish) allowing to them sufficient meate and drinke for their relief. To the intent good hospitality may be kept and mainteyned within the same mansion place.

“This first lease made by Foxe to his sonne, Samuell Foxe, has been the patterne of all the leases renewed since, which have been alwayes exactly transcribed in the same generale words and covenants, without the least alteration of that sort, and particularly this article relatyng to the poure ever preserved entire.” <sup>F265</sup>

“Samuel Foxe died in 1629, about Christmas, and left his lease, and tenant-right of the said parsonage of Shipton, etc. to his son Thomas Foxe, master of arts, and fellow of Magdalen College, in Oxford, and doctor in physic, who enjoyed it, by renewing, above thirty year’s, and in his time made severall short leases of the tythe of Shipton, etc. to one Thomas Skay, yeoman, who from time to time held the said tythes of Shipton, etc. above twenty years, being tied to the very same words and covenant conferring the poor’s entertainment, as appears by the leases plainely and particularly by the last lease made by the saide Thomas Foxe to Thomas Skay, bearing date the 7 of June, 1660. And heer it is observable that Thomas Skay was by all his leases bound to the very words of entertaining 2 couples of poor people every Sunday and festivall day at the parsonage house in Shipton still and no where else, without the least obligation of paying any sume of money to any other place upon that account.

“On the 20th of November, 1662, Doer. Thomas Foxe died, and left his present lease and executoriall right of the said parsonage of Shipton, with all its members and appertinences, to his only daughter and sole executrix Dame Alice Willys, wife to sir Richard Willys, of Shipton in the county of Oxon, knt. and bart.” <sup>F266</sup>

We learn from the letter of bishop Piers that Foxe was now (1586,) in a declining state of health. This appears also from another letter addressed at the same time from Mrs. Foxe to her son; and which confirms the account of the state of poverty in which, in spite of all his intense labors, Foxe was still placed.

“Samuell we have us comended unto you desyringe the Lorde Jessus to blesse youe. Conserninge the Boucke which you wryghte for, the Boucke of Marters, youre father wolde hare youe to wryte to the fellowe of Salsberye to knowe yf he wyll staye tell the Boucke comme forthe, which is halle dun all redye, and wylle a gret dell, and for the cronycle yt wyll not be longe before you comme bether youreselfe for I promyse youe I have no money for I have borred xli all redye, and for the boucke which youe wold have of youre fathers, I cannot fynde yt in his stoudye. As for youre father he is so weicke yt he cannot gooe into his stoudye, therfore I praye youe to praye for him, we wer with youre Aunte Randall for the letter of attorneye, and she wyll not doo yt withowte her Brothers Harryes counsaile and he is not at home as yet. But her she hathe sente youe a letter. No more to youe. But the Lorde Jessus blesse youe and us all. Amen. “Your lovinge mother, “*AGNES FOXE.*”

Foxe adds a postscript to this letter: —

“Samuell I marvell that you were so unwyse to blabbe out any thyng of ye bok of ye Apocalypse to Doet. Humfrey. Such is my weaknes now, and hath been this moneth, yt I can nether cate, sleape, nor wryte, nor goo up yett to my study, wherby ye boke standeth yett att a stay, in pryntyng. The Lord knoweth how I shall goo forward eyther for *fynyshyng* ye boke or dedication therof. Wherof I pray you to make no wordes to any person. Pray to ye L. Jesus for me. He graunt you hys blessyng. Amen.” <sup>F267</sup>

Though the third edition of the Acts and Monuments had now been published, Foxe still continued to collect fresh materials for a new and improved edition. He continued to attend also to the duties of the ministry, and the management of a laborious correspondence. He was influential in the conversion of a Spanish Jew, who was baptized and received into the christian church in 1577. The confession of the faith of

the convert was written in Spanish, and translated afterwards into English. John Foxe preached upon this occasion a sermon entitled the Gospel Olive. It was preached in Latin, but afterwards published in English. It was translated by W. Bell. The subject of the sermon is, The Gospel Olive Tree, spoken of by St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. It notices the principal prophecies relating to the Messiah, refuting the arguments in favor of the Jewish opposition to the gospel. It contains many beautiful passages, especially those in which he proceeds through the succession of prophecies which prove Jesus of Nazareth to be the first of the prophets. The paragraphs in which the contrast is drawn between the expectations of those who deemed Christ to be a temporal, and not a spiritual Prince; those also in which he anticipates the future glory and majesty of the kingdom of Christ, and the final conversion of some to Messiah, their Pt;nee, are judiciously treated. It was dedicated to sir Francis Walsingham, who had requested the discourse to be repeated to him during an illness in his sick chamber. John Foxe thanks sir Francis, in his dedication, for the benefit he had derived, in his own infirm state of health, from his French wine; and begs him, in return for this fruit of the vineyard, to accept this branch of the evangelical olive tree. He wishes every earthly and heavenly blessing to him, and to the little plants of his domestic olive tree. This sort of play on words, which our modern notions of wit would treat with disdain, was then highly esteemed. The confession of faith by the converted Jew is appended to the sermon. Both have been lately republished in London. <sup>F268</sup>

While this sermon was going through the press, the following letter was addressed to Foxe by C. Barber, who was probably a printer in the service of Daye.

“Sir, for as much as I can nott here of Mr. Bell and yt my presse standeth still for want of this Epistle to my Mr. I besech you lett me crave so much of you as to english the same: as for the residue of the Boke, I dare nott fynde faultt wth him yt haith doone his good will, neyther can I juge by the latin, But I am sure it is translated in manye placis quyt frome yor meaning and in some farr from Christianitie. But so soone as we fownde it we have bene sireumspeckt. Thus I umblie co, end you to the L. Jesus and to the comfote of his holye Spiritt this 23 of June 1577.

“Yors to his power “ *C. Barber.*” <sup>F269</sup>

Whether Foxe altered any part of his discourse in consequence of this criticism is uncertain.

He continued to receive, at this time, from all quarters, letters on public matters, as well as on the private and domestic affairs of those who were anxious to consult him. His son alludes to the manner in which he was now regarded as the common friend of the friendless; and so far as his means allowed him to be, the common benefactor to the poor. Many of these letters are still preserved. One, for instance, is sent him from Hamburg by his friend Langerman, with a work entitled “Ecclesiastes; “ and an account of what would appear to have been a public wish, viz. the desire that some commercial communications might take place between that city and England; “not,” he adds, “that a kingdom so opulent, and abounding in wealth, can require any assistance from a city so poor as this; yet, it sometimes happens that the eagle is benefitted by the beetle.” <sup>F270</sup> He receives intelligence from Thomas Barwick at Lambeth that the duke of Northumberland was reported to have died a papist; and to have used the words, “O bone Jesus, O dulcis Jesus, O Jesu fili Mariae.” <sup>F271</sup> At the same time the bishop of London sends him information, that the queen of Scots had been grievously afflicted with paralysis, and that great hopes were entertained of the young king being a good protestant in Scotland. <sup>F272</sup> While he is thus made the repository of information of every description, applications were made to him, as the intimate friend of the patrons of the day, to assist in the obtaining patronage for others. The following is selected as a specimen of these applications.

“To the right worshipfull and his deare brother in lorde Mr. Jhon Foxe, a painfull professor and preacher of the worde of God Fraunces Shakelton person of St. Mildreds in the Pultrie, (and preacher of the same word of truth) doth wishe grace and peace from God the father and from the lorde Jesus Christe.

“These are to besech you and require you (in the lorde right worshipfull and dearlie beloved) yt you will not faile to do ye best you can in the preferringe of the suite of the bairer hereof Antonie Watsone, who as I am persuaded is a deare childe of God and is verie desyrous to be a proffittable member in his churche. If he

may have your favor-able and readie speches or letters of recommendation unto yt rare and painfull (pains-taking) pastor of our tyme Mr. Nowell the deane of Pawles. Beseeching him to retaine him and to receive him unto his chardge and tuicion as his servaunt during his liffe, with this petition, (for yt he is desyrous to learne ye latine tonge) that he will vouehsaffe of his wonted bountifulnes and accostomed clemencye to kepe him at some grammer schole or els to trayne him up in his owne howse till such tyme as he shalbe able to understand what he readeth in the latine ronge, for he is very earnestly bent to heare ye word of God, and he is also verie forward in ye principall points of ye Christian religion, which maketh me the more readie to be a suiter unto your worship for him, desyringe you againe and againe to preferre his cause so much as in you is possible. And thus I commend you unto the tuicion of God who ever kepe you from all evle. From my house in the Pultrie this present Fryday the 26 of Februarie 1680. “Yours in the lorde to commaunde in anie thinge I am hable,

“*FRAUNCES SHAKELTON.*”

“To the right worshipfull and his deare frende and brother Mr. Foxe professor of divinitie geve these.” <sup>f273</sup>

A little before this he received one from Mr. John Lond, containing several new materials for his Martyrology, and insisting more especially on the miserable end of divers Romish priests, as of Dr. Wylyams; the priest of St. Margaret’s, Eastchepe; etc. <sup>f274</sup>

His labors were now drawing to a close, and he was superintending the last edition of his great work, that appeared under his own correction. Hints he had from many; among them the following: —

“I have mee hartely comended. I doo understand you doo mind (to) enlardge your booke of Martyrs, and to have it newly printed: God grant yt yr good purpose therein may take good successe according to your expectation, and our hartye desire is, yt it may be printed in good paper and a faire and legible print, and not in blacke blurred and tome paper, as ye last edition is: being nether good paper or good print. I write thus much, for ye good will I beare unto you

rayne old frind, and acquaintance in magdalen college, and also for that it is pittifull to see such a notable pece of woorke to be darkned with foule paper and obscure print: and thereby haulfe cast away. Thus I am bold to open my mind unto you, trusting yt you will accept my good meaning therein. I woold hartelye wish further that you woold set out all your whole discourse at lardge in two faire volumes; leaving out nothing ether Latten or English, as you have done in many places in your latter edicion referring your reader unto ye fyrst edicion, as though every man hath or can have all the edicions. Moreover I woold wish that you woold quote the booke and ye chapter of everye perticular authoritye which you doo alleadge in your woorke: as also in what tyme everye writer was: as nighe as you can: the table also is not perfecte for divers names of martyrs are left out in the table, namelye: fo. 1105 Collins, Cowbridge, and Packington, likewise Puttdew: and Peke fo. 1106, wherof there is no mencion in the table. I was present at the burning of Cowbridge at what tyme doctor Brinknell doctor of divinitie in Cambridge and at that tyme schoole master in Banburye, under longland, bishop of Lincolne, did preaehe in the same place before balioll colledge where the late bishops were burned. I have delivered unto this bearer my sone, the names of many whome I did knowe, which if they may pleasure you I pray you to use them. Thus I take my leave wishing unto you to my selfe. Oxon. the 3d day of February, 1582. “Yor old acquaintance & ffrende to my power, “*SIMON PARRETT.*”

“Mr. Parrett yr old eleemosynarius for your groate and worde, not only diligens lector, sed avidus Helluo tuorum librorum, hath many times wished the thinges reformed: whereunto I subscribe, desiring you to make it nowe a full monument of Actes for all posterite. Co, end me to good Mrs. Ffoxe. Your sone requests... daies to goe beyond ye seas, wh I graunte conditionally, if you write him.

“Tuissimus, *Laur. HUMPHREDUS.*” <sup>F275</sup>

Among other letters addressed to Foxe at this period, is another from the same friend and fellow-exile, Laurence Humphrey, exhorting him to proceed with a work, which he had long before undertaken, the completing

of Haddon's answer to Osorius, which had appeared in 1577, and again in 1581. Dr. Humphrey entreats him to go on, and confute Osorius, even to slaying. <sup>F276</sup> Foxe, though now continually occupied with the fourth and last edition of his Acts and Monuments, still found time to comply with this request. The controversy to which the president of Magdalene refers, may even now be interesting to the theological student. It relates to that most agitated of all questions, the justification of the soul before God.

Jerome Osorius, the author of the book to which Foxe replied, was surnamed, for the elegance of his Latin style, the Portuguese Cicero. After studying at Salamanca, he proceeded, at the age of nineteen, to Paris, where he became the intimate friend of Peter le Faire, one of the earliest associates of Loyola, whom he introduced to the patronage of his sovereign, John III. He thus procured the early establishment of the Jesuits in Portugal. From Paris he proceeded to Bologna, where he became distinguished for his knowledge of Hebrew and theology; as he had before distinguished himself in Latin, Greek, and the civil law. He was made professor of theology in the university of Coimbra, where he lectured on Isaiah, and on the Epistle to the Romans. He was subsequently made bishop of Selves, and performed his duties with great exemplariness and fidelity. He was much beloved by Sebastian; whom he in vain endeavored to dissuade from the expedition in which he perished. He was no less esteemed by pope Gregory XIII. He died in 1580.

I mention these details, not only because of the controversy of Osorius with the English church, but because his library was captured at sea, by the earl of Essex, in 1596, and a great portion of it is now placed in the Bodleian at Oxford.

The church of England, on account of its maintaining so tolerantly, so scripturally, so holily, the union of discipline and truth, which not only permits, but encourages the freedom of inquiry, and even inculcates inquiry as a duty, by the manner in which it so uniformly appeals to Scripture — the church of England, which has adorned its altars and services with all that is truly useful or ornamental from either antiquity, tradition, or the Fathers — the church of England, which combines in one acceptable ritual, all that a papist might demand for regularity and order, and all that a puritan might demand for the spiritual homage of the soul to

its Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier — this church of England has ever been, and, until Rome changes, will ever be, the chief object of attack with such men as the learned and zealous Osorius. In the year 1562, Osorius published what Strype <sup>f277</sup> calls a malicious libel against England and the reformation, in an epistle to the queen. This was answered by Haddon, the master of requests to Elizabeth; and the reply of Haddon is esteemed by Strype <sup>f278</sup> to be equal to Jewell's Apology. Haddon would compel us to believe that the work of Osorius was but a medley of impertinences and absurdities, and a mere declamation against the reformation. He seems to have indulged in much personal invective against the Reformers, contrasting them with the Fathers, and assailing, with much vehemence, their uniform appeal to Scripture, as their sole criterion of truth in religion. It laments the demolition of the monasteries and nunneries, and the removal of images and pictures. He affirms that all things sacred were overthrown in England. He condemns the separation from the pope — the manners of the people — the preaching — the liturgy — the sacramental forms — and the want of union, among the members of the reformed church. He contrasts England with the continent, to its disadvantage; and expresses his deep pity for its miserable and unfortunate condition; and he concludes his treatise by imploring her majesty to relinquish the religion of England, and to adopt the conclusions of Trent, and Osorius. He eulogizes the church of Rome with much eloquence; and urges the queen to banish what he called, in common with his brethren, the novelty of error; but what Haddon called, in common with the better informed theologians of his church, the antiquity of truth. The answer of Haddon to this remonstrance was printed, and circulated on the Continent.

The reply of Osorius <sup>f279</sup> was published soon after. It repeated his invectives. The book was eulogized by his brethren. Haddon was threatened with death, if he continued the controversy. To this he answered that so long as he breathed he would persist in the defense of his country. Whether he was destroyed by poison or not is uncertain: but so it was that he died at Bruges, in Flanders, while on an embassy from England, before his second answer to Osorius was concluded, in the year 1566. John Foxe was requested to complete the unfinished essay. He was thought the fittest, both for his learning and theology, as well as for his excellent Latin style, to go on with the work. He did so; and added three

more books. The work thus completed was published in London by John Day, in quarto, in 1577. It was translated into English by James Bell, and printed again in 1581, one year after the death of Osorius.

One of the chief doctrines which distinguishes the church of England from the church of Rome, is the doctrine of justification. **The work of Foxe** <sup>L16</sup> is a defense of the evangelical view of justification, as it is so clearly expressed in the eleventh article of the church of England. These pages of Foxe are still most interesting to all who have studied the works which have lately appeared on this subject. Whether we adopt the conclusions of Newman, or the definitions of bishop M'Ilvaine, <sup>f280</sup> that justifying faith is a principle beginning with knowledge, going on to love, and ending in action; or the definition of Holden, that justification is an act of God, acquitting from guilt, receiving into favor, communicating the Holy Spirit, accepting men as just, and conferring eternal life, of which act faith is the condition, and baptism the beginning; or whether we receive the definition of the council of Trent — that justification is constituted by an infused and inherent principle of holiness, conferred at baptism, preserved, and augmented by faith and works — diminished and lost by sin — recovered by the sacraments — partly effected by good works — through the grace of the Holy Spirit, made meritorious by the merits of Christ, and that a man is justified by this inherent, divinely-infused righteousness — whether we define faith to be the formal cause of justification — or whether justifying faith is a principle of action only, or action combined with principle; whatever be the conclusions, or opinions, or deliberations of the student of the works of Newman, Alexander Knox, Faber, bishop M'Ilvaine, Holden, and others; the doctrine of justification by faith, as the church of England teaches it in the eleventh article, will ever remain the light which gilds the valley of the shadow of death. “We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or descryings; therefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort.” Every student of this portion of our controversies will be benefited by the perusal of Foxe's answer to Osorius. The one doctrine he opposes, against the church of Rome, is the doctrine of inherent righteousness. He calls the members of the church of Rome who maintain this doctrine against the true catholic church, pseudo-catholics, and

catacatholics, as being opposed to the true catholicism of the church of Christ. He concludes his preliminary address by a beautiful prayer to Christ, that he would still the disorderly tumults, and vain janglings in the church — (the prayer may be now offered with propriety, and may it be accepted!) — that Christ would grant peace to our times, pardon to our sins, strength and victory to our faith, skillful workmen to the church, and dexterity in working and teaching to the workmen; and especially that he would refresh and comfort with the gracious favor of his Divine Majesty, the pious and perplexed consciences of believers, combating with death and Satan, or exercised with sharp affliction, for the glory of his own name. He then proceeds to the general discussion of the subject with his usual skill and eloquence. He is, as he ought to be, not Calvinistical, but rightly evangelical, in the proper sense of that much-decried and much-abused word. He speaks as a Christian and as a churchman ought to speak, of that free justification of the soul, which the papists anathematize and hiss out of the schools. He contrasts the principles and effects of the two opposite doctrines. He derides the confirmation of the Trentine creed by reasonings drawn from Aristotle. He proves the union of holiness of life with the evangelical truths he is maintaining; and vindicates, throughout, the common faith once delivered to the saints, as it is generally upheld by the members of the church of England at present, in the most complete and satisfactory manner. A brief account of the work is given, with much eulogy, by Strype, <sup>f281</sup> and an abridgment of the treatise has been lately published by the Tract Society in London. <sup>F282</sup> It may be presumed, therefore, to be familiar to all; and it will reward the perusal of all who are interested in these inquiries, and are willing to seek for truth in every quarter where there may be a probability of finding that pearl of great price. The book concludes with another prayer to Christ, that all who profess his name, and wear his badge, may depart from iniquity, and be gathered together, in one uniform doctrine, into the kingdom of Him who suffered for the sins of man, and rose again for his justification. They are simple and common words; but what Christian will not desire both his own justification and the union of the holy catholic church? and what Christian will refuse to say Amen to that prayer? <sup>F283</sup>

Little now remains to be said of John Foxe. We have seen <sup>f284</sup> his language of kindness and love towards the members of the church of Rome, though

he was the most severe condemner of their errors, and especially of their intolerable persecutions. We cannot tell whether he had by this time followed the example of Dr. Humphrey, and many of his other friends, in conformity to the vestments; but, if Strype is right, in imputing to him, rather than to Dr. Humphrey, the beautiful expostulatory letter to the puritans, who were now beginning to be powerful, we may believe that he conformed, and we have still more abundant reason to admire in John Foxe the union of those two virtues which ought ever to characterise the episcopalian protestant — the love of union, and the love of truth.<sup>F285</sup> The internal evidence would induce us to conclude that it was written by Foxe. There is the same intermixture of Greek sentences which characterises his application to lord Burghley, “to obtain the queen’s confirmation of his prebend in the church of Sarum.”<sup>F286</sup> It abounds with scriptural allusions, and references to the Apocalypse, which Foxe had made his peculiar study. It breathes the same spirit of peace and desire of union, with the same aversion to the church of Rome, as the enemy of such union, which marks his other labors, excepting that comparatively little notice is taken of the papacy, in consequence of the letter being addressed to the puritans. The chief attack on the church of Rome, indeed, appears in the forty-first paragraph, where he contrasts the gorgeous and sumptuous vestments of the church of Rome, with the more simple robes and surplice adopted by the church of England, to which the Writer is persuading conformity.<sup>F287</sup> If, then, we may, on such evidence, together with that of Strype, attribute the letter to Foxe, we may regard it as his last address to the church, and to those friends who taught with him the great truth of justification by faith alone, as a principle of love, leading to obedience to God. A brief abstract of its contents, therefore, may not be uninteresting.

The English title of the letter is, “An Expostulatory Letter to the Puritans, upon occasion of their Contentions in the Church, and Exhortatory to Peace, and earnest Application of themselves to preach the Gospel.” Its Latin title does not mention the puritans. It is addressed only to all the faithful ministers of Christ, his fellow-workers in the gospel, and who have the true zeal of reforming the house of God.<sup>F288</sup> It may appear that the attributing to the persons to whom the letter was addressed, zeal in reforming, is the same as denominating them puritans. We may, however, hope that the desire to remove whatever may be justly objectionable,

either in the church or in the state, does not necessarily subject the respectful proposer of a change to any odious, or contemptful, epithet. Two terms of mutual reproach divide the clergy of the church of England at this moment. Some are called high churchmen, some, low churchmen. Both are supposed to be inflamed with an honorable zeal so to reform the church, that if there should be found anything in the liturgy, articles, homilies, or canons, which may be objectionable, we ought, at a fit opportunity, to remove it. It is believed that the reforms which the high churchman would propose, would make the church approximate more to Rome than it now does. It is believed that the reforms which the low churchman would propose, would remove the church further from Rome. Peace be to both. Neither are papists; neither are puritans. Let but their controversy proceed till they both esteem each other more than they may have hitherto done, and all useful changes may be eventually made, and peace be upon our Israel.

The letter consists of forty-six paragraphs; and, as their contents are of a very general nature, they may be said to be as useful at present as they were when they were originally published. "I speak the truth, my brethren," it begins (Par. 1), "do not, I entreat you, oppose the truth. I know that there is nothing so true, but it may be corrupted by prejudice; nothing so false, which may not be so treated that it shall appear both probable and certain." "Let us contend for the truth." (Par. 2 and 3.) "Imitate the bees; as they extract honey from every flower, so let us obtain truth from all sources. This is our business; this is our duty. The spiritual church, Jerusalem, our mother (Par. 4), is not yet at its home in heaven; it is still in its wanderings upon earth. And this spouse of Christ is not naked as in Paradise before the Fall, but possesses its own robe; not the Babylonian garments of meretricious pride and splendor, but the dress, and ornaments, and ceremonies which are, as it were, the coats of skin to clothe it, granted by its Lord himself, simple, plain, and decorous. This our mother is not now, as she will in future be, 'without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.' This our field of the church cannot be without its tares; yet let us not despise the manners and the customs of the church of God. The ancient churches, even though planted by the apostles (Par. 5), had their faults. Let us (Par. 6) learn to bear with each other, to avoid all schisms, and not to rend asunder the seamless coat of Christ. <sup>F289</sup> This is

not the time (Par. 7) for disputes, but for peace. Let us in that bond keep the unity of the Spirit; and may your (Par. 8) indefatigable and useful preaching extend and obtain a blessing. We may observe that in the Apocalypse (Par. 9), three angels are represented as preaching, each having his own, certain, definite, separate, yet agreeing commission. They were the precursors of the Judgment day. The first said, 'Fear God, and give glory to him.' This is the preaching of the gospel. The second (Par. 10) said, 'Babylon is fallen, is fallen.' This is the preaching against Antichrist and his kingdom. The third (Par. 11) said, 'If any shall adore the beast and his image, he shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God.' As they agree (Par. 12), so let us do also. As they (Par. 13) do not condemn each other for taking their different offices, so let us not rashly condemn the preaching of each other. Let us not call a man a pharisee because he preaches the necessity of good works. Let us not call a man a papist, who prefers celibacy to marriage. So let us (Par. 14) rightly divide the word of truth, giving to each the food of life, according to opportunity and place. In council, at court, let us speak as our circumstances or station permit, on the laws and on the reformatations which may be required in the church or state. In the parish, in the manor, in the country; let us converse on obedience, and morals, and the necessity of a holy conversation. Though we act as skillful physicians in these matters, yet, as John the Baptist (Par. 15) reprov'd Herod, and the prophets reprov'd wicked kings, so (Par. 16) should we, in palaces, instruct princes; in villages, the common people; and in the assemblies of the clergy, heal the wounds of your brethren. Yours it is (Par. 17) to pour in the oil and the wine, with the good Samaritan; yours is the word of reconciliation, the gospel of peace: and if the rod of severe reproof or the sword of excommunication be necessary, so use it that the drowning man shall emerge from the mire, and not be plunged deeper. The nature of man loves persuasion, and abhors compulsion.

“You desire to extirpate papistry. Make allowances (Par. 18) for the attachment to their ancient practices, among those whom you endeavor to convert. Do not imitate (Par. 19) their intolerance. Let not your words be swords. Avoid (Par. 20) spiritual pride and contempt of the weak; avarice (Par. 21), superstition, and indolence. Without obedience to the law which we understand,

knowledge does but increase our punishment. Take care lest, when you wish to be as Argus, ye become not more blind than the blind papists themselves. Why preach ye my law (Par. 22), and hate your own required reformation?"

The next fourteen paragraphs consist of arguments against pluralities and non-residence, and exhortations to consider Christ alone as the object of all their teaching. On him alone, the hand, the eye, the soul, must be intently fixed; or the preacher commits sin, and errs from the mark. After some severe and just remarks on non-residents, he proceeds — "The kingdom of God (Par. 37) is not meat and drink, but peace and joy; yet all in the churches must be done decently and in order. The things consecrated to God (Par. 38) must be appropriated exclusively to God."

From this the author passes on to the defense of the vestments, of suitable ornaments for the Lord's table, and especially of the surplice. He expostulates (Par. 40) with them for resisting the authority of the church on such a point as the wearing the surplice. <sup>F290</sup> It is a popish garment, is the objection. "Even if it is so," he answers, "does the error of the faith necessarily follow the use of the garment? Do we become Turks, pagans, heathens, because our clothes resemble theirs? Are not the holy persons who are represented as engaged in heavenly things, described to us as clothed in white?" He contrasts (Par. 41) the sumptuous magnificence of the popish vestments with the simplicity of the English surplice, and urges (Par. 42) its adoption as the robe of order, decency, and union; not, as many imagine, of devotion, holiness, and religion.

From the defense of the surplice, he proceeds to discuss the subscription (Par. 43) to the prayers. The Amen, which expresses the assent to the petitions, he argues to be equivalent to the required subscription. "They agree (Par. 44) to the truth of the doctrines which cannot be, and ought not to be, changed. Why should they not subscribe to things which are in their own nature indifferent, such as rites and ceremonies, which may be changed, if it so please the church and the ruler? As the kiss of peace and the mode of unction in the apostolical churches have been changed or removed, so also may the observances of any other church be altered, if it be necessary: but while they are ordained by law, they are bonds of union, and may be wisely retained. I beseech you, therefore, brethren," he

concludes (Par. 45), “that ye follow peace; so do the work of an evangelist; and contend no more for trifles. Let us join hands in union, promoting the establishment of the gospel, the inculcation of good works, and the overthrow of the Jesuits, the enemies of the church. This is labor sufficient for us; this is our bounden duty. So let us bear each other’s burthens; so fulfill the law of Christ.” He then concludes with a prayer for the blessing of the Holy Spirit, and ascriptions of praise to Christ, the Lord and Savior, as the great Head of the church.

Such is the address to the puritans, which Strype would attribute to John Foxe, in the last year of his life. If it may be justly ascribed to him, we may be certain that he had at length followed the example of the great majority of his fellow-exiles in the reign of Mary, and conformed to the external vestments and ceremonies, as he had uniformly adopted the doctrines and truths, of the church. It breathes throughout the same spirit of truth and love, which had characterised his sermon at St. Paul’s Cross. It is written in the style and language which has been always deemed most becoming the church of England, as the medium between popery and puritanism. It condemns the errors of both, but the former more severely than the latter, because more of christian truth is perverted by popery than by puritanism; but it speaks of the holders of error as objects of compassion rather than of reproach. It aims at union, but would sacrifice no truth to obtain it. It regards the changeableness of things indifferent as one source of the desired union, and obedience to the authority of the church in all matters where no scriptural truth is denied, as the solemn obligation of a Christian. Happy would it have been for the church and for the state of England, if the principles it inculcates had been made the guide of the two contending parties who changed the island into a field of blood within the eventful century which followed the death of the martyrologist; when mutual exasperations led to mutual crimes; and the severest wounds which the holy religion of Jesus Christ ever yet suffered, proceeded neither from the violence of the heathen; nor the persecution of the papist; nor from hypocrisy, as was so often alleged, on the part of the puritan; but from the personal piety of the holy, and of the zealous, refusing conformity to a ceremony, or the putting on of a surplice. Whenever the time arrives that nations, rulers, and people, shall learn the great lessons which are given to us by the crimes and follies, by the virtues and vices,

recorded in the history of the past; they must act in the temper and spirit of this address to the puritans, by one who studied and enforced the truth, which the papist and the puritan have alike perverted.

And now the time arrived when the martyrologist must die. The man of the world, who has his portion in this life, and who passes through life anxious only for its honors, wealth, and pleasures, staves off all thoughts of dying; and when the law of his God commands the body to faint, and the soul to live in its new condition, he yields to the sentence merely as to an unavoidable event, of which it would be unphilosophical to complain. He dies as the fool dieth — as a sentimental and affected heathen might die — professing, perhaps, in terms which seem selected to conceal his terrors under the mask of serenity, to believe that the soul is immortal; and sinking, and making no christian sign, as if there was no revelation to guide him, no church to aid him, no priesthood to console him, no God to fear, nor Savior to love, nor Holy Spirit to strengthen, nor heaven to hope, nor hell to dread, nor soul to save. Some Christians die in humble hope — some in the calmness of holy peace, and rejoicing in God their Savior. They know in whom they have believed. They gather their friends and their kindred around them; and their last expressions are divided between the language which describes their own quiet confidence in the revealed mercy of God, their affection to their friends, and their gratitude to the providence which has led them through the wilderness of life, and which upholds their faltering steps in the dark valley through which they are walking. Some Christians — and archbishop Leighton and John Foxe were of the number — when the last hour of their earthly existence approaches, rejoice that the communion between the spirit parting from the body, and the invisible Father of the spirits of all flesh, should be undisturbed by the tears and lamentations of their weeping kindred. They endeavor to dismiss from their presence all who may interrupt the solemn and sacred composure, with which the Christian awaits the moment when the consciousness of existence in this state ends, and the consciousness of existence in the next state begins — when, resigned and expectant of that great and mysterious change, the dying man prays within, “Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace!”

“Being now full of years,” says his son, “he died, not through any known disease, but through much age.” He foresaw the time of his departure, and

would not suffer his sons to be present at his death. He would not permit one to be sent for; and the other, who was in attendance upon him, he dismissed on a journey three days before he died. He commanded their return at such time as he knew they would but come back to weep over his lifeless body. No particulars are related by his son of his dying expressions. We may, however, believe that they were worthy of him who had replied to the expostulations of his friends, when they solicited him to diminish his charities, and to have more regard to the management of his resources — that he depended upon the continued providence of God, who had, by covenant, the charge of his affairs; who knew all his wants, and how to supply them, and whom he could not distrust without manifest ingratitude; for his providence had never failed him. His heart and affections, indeed, had been so devoted to the service of his God, that he could not now distrust him. “He had lived in the deliberate and resolved contempt of all things,” says his son, “which are in the greatest esteem among men.” He had, more especially, despised the allurements and pleasures of the world. Yet he did not conquer in this battle by flying to retirement; neither did he disdain them from any affectation of indifference or apathy. The true cause was, that he appreciated those highest pleasures, which, as the world could not give them, so neither could it take them away — the pleasures which proceeded from the love of God. So was his mind filled with these — so much was he delighted with the contemplations now so little known among the controversies, and the din of the disputes, of Christians, that he had neither room in his heart, nor affection in his mind, for other and inferior delight. He willingly, therefore, separated himself from the fashions and attractions of the world, all of which he was able rightly and fully to appreciate. He devoted himself to these higher meditations, as one who had found in them an invaluable treasure. He bent his eyes and his mind on these alone, so stedfastly, that he both spoke and did many things beyond those of ordinary good men; so that many honored him as one who seemed to speak to them as by a superhuman power, and were willing to pay him honor which ought not to be given to the best of mortals. Some anecdotes are related by his son, which illustrate the power he was supposed to possess of predicting the future restoration to perfect health of some who were diseased, and believed themselves to be dying, and the consequent veneration in which he was held. The agreement of the event, however, with the sanguine

prediction of the best of men, would be considered only as a coincidence in the present day; when the attempt is being daily, though vainly, made to resolve even the well-authenticated miracles of the Scripture into natural and common events. I purposely, therefore, omit all the circumstances to which I allude, knowing they will be deemed to be incredible, whether they be true or false.

Though he was thus eminent for his contempt of the world, he was not an ascetic, banishing himself from the society either of his equals or superiors. His intimacy with the duke of Norfolk had continued unbroken from the earliest years of the duke until he was attended by Foxe to the scaffold. The pension assigned him by the duke was continued by his son. <sup>F291</sup> The lord treasurer Burghley, ‘the earls of Bedford and Warwick, sir Francis Walsingham, the amiable and accomplished brothers, sir Thomas and Michael Heneage, sir Drue Drury, and sir Francis Drake, are enumerated among his friends. The earl of Leicester made him valuable presents; a circumstance not, indeed, surprising, as that nobleman was supposed to be anxious to conciliate those who peculiarly regarded John Foxe as the champion of the anti-papal cause. The principal ecclesiastics of the day, Grindall, Aylmer, Pilkington, Nowell, were devotedly attached to him, not only as their fellow-exile, but as that good and holy person, of whom no fault has ever been alleged, and against whom none could find occasion to speak, unless, as against Daniel in the olden time, “it was found in him concerning the law of his God.” These he loved in return, but he more peculiarly delighted in the learning and conversation of Fulk and Whittaker, whose labors still enrich the church, and in those of Humphrey, president of Magdalene, of sir Thomas Gresham, and sir Thomas Roe, the wealthy and accomplished merchants of London. From these, and from many others enumerated by his son, he derived the large sums of money which he was known to distribute so bountifully, and to which he added so much of his own more scanty resources, that he is said by many, though his son doubts the certainty of the report, to have given away the very furniture of his house to supply the temporary, but pressing wants of his poorer neighbors. <sup>F292</sup>

Great cheerfulness is the usual concomitant of piety united with knowledge. Many anecdotes are recorded by his son to illustrate the

cheerfulness with which he adorned the tables of his noble and learned friends.

We have seen the manner in which his horror of inflicting the punishment of death for real or supposed errors in opinion was exemplified in the case of the burning of some anabaptists. His son assures us that he had the utmost moderation towards the persons of the most zealous papists themselves, however vehemently he was opposed to their opinions. “I could produce letters,” says his son, “wherein he persuadeth lords, and others, who then held the places of chiefest authority, not to suffer Edmund Campian and his fellow-conspirators to be put to death; nor to let that custom continue longer in the kingdom, that death, rather than some other punishment, should be inflicted on the papist offenders. And, lest he might seem only out of the goodness of his nature, and not out of the judgment of his mind, to have so spoken, he there endeavoureth to prove, by many reasons, how much it was to the weakening of the cause, rather to follow the example of their adversaries, in appointing punishments, than their own mildness; and that they much rather ought to strive, as well in mercy and clemency to overcome them, as they had already excelled them in the justice of their cause. This he repeated often, adventuring, even till he was in danger of giving offense by his importunity, to entreat for them. Whereas, on the other side, the lords gave him to understand that this was a matter of state, not of controversie; that the sovereign’s life, the publick liberty, and the assurance of the kingdom, rested on this point; that subjects ought, by their own peril, to be warned how they grow too prodigal of their countrie’s blessings; that such was the estate of the kingdom, as that nothing could be more glorious, or more secure, if the subjects only would consent to devote their abilities to the service of their own church and country. Yet, for all this, did master Foxe continue in his opinion; and, though he could by entreaty gain nothing, yet would he, with many sighs, testify his sorrow, as often as he heard that any of them had been put to death.”

Every religious error among Christians may be said to be either the adding to, or taking from, or perverting, or deducing wrong inferences from, some undoubted truth. It has ever been, as it still is, the glory of the church of England so to uphold the abstract truth, as to avoid the perversion of the two opposite truths — that authority must be maintained for the sake of

order, and freedom of inquiry be not only permitted, but commanded, for the sake of progressive improvement. Popery is the perversion of church authority into mental tyranny. Puritanism is the perversion of freedom into caprice. Both have maintained opposing errors, from which the episcopal churches, which reject alike the usurpations of the papacy and the encroachments of the laity, are free. John Foxe was an episcopalian. In the course of the controversy between Cartwright and Whitgift, the Acts and Monuments of Foxe was praised by Cartwright. This circumstance elicited from Whitgift his opinion of the character of the martyrologist. "I conclude," says Whitgift, speaking to the puritan, "with the very words of that worthy man, who hath so well deserved of this church of England, master Foxe: — 'In the ecclesiastical state we take not away the distinction of ordinary degrees, such as by the scripture be appointed, or by the primitive church allowed, as archbishops, bishops, ministers, and deacons; for of these four we especially read, as chief. In which four degrees, as we grant diversity of office, so we admit in the same also diversity of dignity; neither denying that which is due to each degree, neither yet maintaining the ambition of any singular person; for, as we give to the minister place above the deacon, to the bishop above the minister, to the archbishop above the bishop, so we see no cause of inequality why one minister should be above another minister, one bishop in his degree above another bishop to deal in his diocese, or an archbishop above another archbishop.'"

Such are the words of Foxe, quoted by Whitgift; and the archbishop adds his own general testimony to the merits of Foxe as an episcopalian. "And I cannot but observe," says Strype, "the esteem and character that Whitgift expressed of this reverend man." "The archbishop," says his great biographer, "was not a man to speak otherwise than as he thought, and he spake of Foxe as of one that he loved and venerated." <sup>F293</sup>

But though Foxe was thus an episcopalian, we cannot be certain that his nonconformity to the vestments entirely ceased. If so, there is an inconsistency in this, which has already been considered, and which we may with difficulty excuse. Every church, and every society of Christians, like every political association of men into communities and states, must be founded on the agreement in some general principles, and on the submission of the reason, founded upon that agreement, to some regulations, which would be neither originally proposed by the individual,

and which are assented to, also, by him with some difficulty, for the sake of the public peace. If the most rigid papist, from the pope in the Vatican to the last acceptor of the tonsure, were to be asked whether there was not some one law, opinion, or conclusion, which is sanctioned by, or included in, the twelfth article of the Tridentine creed, "I do receive and profess all things delivered, declared, and defined by all the sacred canons," which might possibly be worthy of reconsideration, it is difficult to imagine that the reply would be in the negative. If the most severe Calvinist, or presbyterian, were to be asked, whether no point of the Genevan discipline were capable of improvement, the reply would be the same. If the episcopalian of the church of England were to be asked, whether he would not prefer the exclusion from the canons, of the decree that no Greek Grammar should be used in our public schools but that which was sanctioned by Henry VIII., is it not probable that he would say that this, and perhaps some other minor matters, might be usefully reconsidered? Yet the papist, the presbyterian, and the episcopalian, are contented to be united in their several communities on general principles; while they desist, for the sake of the public peace of their society, from insisting on the adoption of the several alterations they might be willing to suggest. The individual members of all political, or all religious societies, after the centuries of controversy which have agitated the civilized world, must be contented thus to unite with his brethren; or he must become the very Ishmael of his particular tribe. His hand must be against every man, and every man's hand against him. Such a man must become to himself his own church, his own pope, and his own Bible. He must forsake the communion of his fellows, and retire from all churches, and all societies, to worship God in the wilderness. Such were, probably, the reasonings which induced the exiles who returned from the continent at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth, to conform to the vestments, to which they had previously objected; and it is much to be regretted that such reasoning was not certainly influential on the mind of the martyrologist.

But, though he might have been, to this extent, a nonconformist, he highly disapproved of the intemperance of the rigid puritans. He expressed himself to the following effect in the Latin letter written on the expulsion of his son from Magdalen College, on the groundless imputation of his having turned papist: —

“I confess it has always been my great care, if I could not be serviceable to many persons, yet not knowingly to injure any one, and least of all those of Magdalene College. I cannot, therefore, but the more wonder at the turbulent genius which inspires those factious puritans, so that violating the laws of gratitude, despising my letters and prayers, disregarding the intercession of the president himself (Dr. Humphrey), without any previous admonition, or assigning any cause, they have exercised so great tyranny against me and my son: were I one, who like them would be violently outrageous against bishops and archbishops, or join myself with them, that is, would become mad, as they are, I had not met with this severe treatment. Now, because, quite different from them, I have chosen the side of modesty and public tranquillity, hence the hatred they have a long time conceived against me is at last grown to this degree of bitterness. As this is the case, I do not so much ask you what you will do on my account, as what is to be thought of for your sakes; you who are prelates of the church, again and again consider. As to myself, though the taking away the fellowship from my son is a great affliction to me, yet because this is only a private concern, I bear it with more moderation. I am much more concerned upon account of the church, which is public. I perceive a certain race of men rising up, who, if they should increase and gather strength in this kingdom, I am sorry to say what disturbance I foresee must follow it. Your prudence is not ignorant how much the christian religion formerly suffered by the dissimulation and hypocrisy of the monks. At present in these men I know not what sort of new monks seems to revive; so much more pernicious than the former, as with more subtle artifices of deceiving, under pre-renee of perfection, like stage-players who only act a part, they conceal a more dangerous poison; who, while they require everything to be formed according to their own ‘ strict discipline’ and conscience, will not desist until they have brought all things into Jewish bondage.” <sup>F294</sup>

Such were his sentiments on the puritan controversy; and the events of the two succeeding reigns proved that he had not judged rashly of the violent tempers and designs of some of the puritans.

No less moderation was constantly expressed by Foxe even towards the church of Rome itself. Bitterly and vehemently as he justly expressed his most righteous indignation and abhorrence of its persecuting spirit, its persecuting laws, and its persecuting conduct: he had too much learning, and too much wisdom, to deny that the church of Rome, in its purer state, was originally entitled to the admiration of the world; or that all nations were once rightly in communion with its bishops; or that the time may again arrive, when there may be communion with Rome, if Rome will so far change, that such communion shall imply neither subjection to its supremacy, nor adoption of its unscriptural errors. The principal heads of his opinions on this point are still worthy of the attention of all who desire the eventual reunion of Christ's holy catholic church. They are thus collected by his son.

“Among the christian churches the Roman church had always been the highest in dignity, and the most ancient in antiquity. It retained this dignity with much estimation for many centuries. Gradually increasing in authority, neither by the consent of the people, nor by any rightly founded claim, but by reason of the custom and tendency among all nations imperceptibly to submit to those who begin to be powerful, the church of Rome at length exercised command over the churches. Its greatest honor and authority was over the western churches; where Christianity was generally professed, and where the influence, discipline, and piety of the church of Rome was so worthy of admiration, that in these respects it might be called the mother of the churches. Rome was the place where the Christians who were persecuted by the emperors could assemble with the least trouble, be more perfectly protected, and die both with more constancy and with more effect. The church of Rome thus flourished, rather in good discipline, and in the approved holiness of its professors, than in the abundance of its riches and power. Neither pride, nor indolence, nor worldliness, nor error, were discoverable in the manners and opinions of its clergy; while money, servants, lands, and goods, were in great

measure unknown to them. Their contentedness in possessing, or their moderation in using, the few advantages they enjoyed, seemed to render Rome the principal seat of the christian religion. Such was the condition of Rome in the earlier ages of the church. In process of time, however, it began by slow degrees to be corrupted. Having brought the western nations generally to the christian faith, when they had once begun to esteem it to be for the honor of the empire that the priests should no longer, as they had formerly done, endure poverty, but live more plentifully; and when the emperors, to effect the same object, granted many possessions to the churches as ornaments, and to churchmen as rewards; then, also, the priests began to be avaricious, negligent, and ambitious. One age added to the vices of another. They aspired to, and they obtained dominion. They ruled the churches, without permitting the interference of the civil power. They continued their demands of supremacy, till the civil power became subjected to their scepter, the crosier. They subdued the emperors. They invaded the privileges of the empire. The spiritual and temporal governments were identified; till one secular authority alone was recognized in the churches and states of the west. In the meantime the laws of religion were neglected. The Scriptures were neither studied by the priests nor permitted to the people. The worship of God was made to consist in outward devotion and pomp of ceremonies, rather than in the inward obedience of the heart to God. The homage and affections of the people were consequently slowly but effectually weaned from such a priesthood. As the most healthy bodies may fall by sickness into the greatest danger, so it was with the church of Rome. Its strength became the cause of its weakness, and the reaction of the former veneration into hatred and contempt was so great, that Rome was commonly regarded as the chief antichrist, accomplishing in itself the predictions which describe, in the New Testament, the principal enemy of the spiritual church of Christ, and the chief destroyer of the souls of men. Yet, with all this, deeply rooted was the honor and approbation of Rome in the minds of men; so that, though it had fallen in estimation solely by its own covetousness, pride, and error, yet no church, nor person, nor controversialist, imagined that it had sunk so low in sin and

apostasy, that it could not return and repent. None believed that it was so far gone in sinning that it could not be recovered by repenting. We, therefore, may justly hope, that the day shall come, when some Italian shall arise in its own society, under whose authority and influence the church of Rome, and the members of the church, shall not be ashamed to confess their error, to amend their faults, to reconsider their discipline, and be willing to part with their usurped supremacy, to procure the peace of the whole world, and the repose of the churches of the holy catholic church of Christ. If this could be justly hoped, the conditions of such agreement might be, first, that the pope should forsake all those tenets, by which he gained so great sums of money; there being nothing whereto the people might with more difficulty be persuaded, than that Christ, the Savior of the world, had instructed his church in the ways of money, and setting the Scriptures to sale. Next, that he should renounce all secular jurisdiction, and not; suppose himself to have anything to do with the right of princes. That, on the other side, his opposers should not refuse that some one man may have the principal place of counsel and government in the church affairs, as being a thing which would have many conveniences in it, when it might be done with security; neither that the Roman church had once fallen, ought to make against it, nor that it had first flourished, to prevail for it, herein to be preferred before any other; but that all this was to be left to the discretion of a general council of the Christians, which might be so equitable, as that neither the power nor favor of any one should be able, either from the place of meeting, or the difference in number of voices, to promise itself any advantage to the injury of the rest. That in the meanwhile it would be of great moment to the hope and speediness of settling all controversies, if hereafter on both sides they would give such instructions as might cause in each party a better hope and opinion of the other; especially that they ought to leave off that stubborn conceit, whereby each of them, presuming itself to be the only true church, supposeth all other churches to be excluded from the covenant of God.”

Such were the opinions of Foxe respecting the origin, progress, and eventual destiny of the church of Rome. In the latter part of this brief survey, I have preserved as far as possible the antiquated language of his son's memorial. Strange, indeed, it will appear to the majority of the readers of the Life of Foxe, that peace with Rome, when Rome changes, should be recommended by the martyrologist himself to the churches, which compose the one catholic church of Christ. So it is, however. Neither are the protestant, nor the ultra-protestant Christians, nor all the high-minded, zealous, and honorable lovers of truth for the truth's sake, justified in rejecting the aphorism of John Foxe — that every person and every church, under the christian dispensation, if they will remove their sin, may both hope for pardon of God, and for reunion with their fellow-churches, and their brethren of mankind. Even now the great experiment is in progress, whether the assumption of infallibility, united with the claim to supremacy, and the retention of un-primitive, un-apostolical, yet long-defended errors, can coexist with deliberative senates, free institutions, an unfettered press, the general diffusion of the Scriptures, unlimited permission of inquiry, and well-disciplined episcopal churches, with the Scriptures interwoven into their services, and with liturgies which, combining all that is venerable from antiquity, are both devotional in language, and useful, as the best assistants to holy prayer and holy conduct. Many and great evils still remain to be overcome. Error, before it can receive its greatest downfall, must once more become both influential and powerful. The Trentine church, with the Trentine creed, must, will, and does again endanger the religion, the liberty, and the peace of the civilized world. It will obtain for a time yet more strength, until it dares yet further to insult, and injure; and then the time shall come, when the indignation of spiritual men, and of the more disciplined nations and churches, shall so resist its usurpations, and so condemn its errors, that they shall throw off the yoke of its domination, and after that, consent to accept its repentance. So may the church of Rome, when it is converted, become the strengthener of its brethren. So may the prophecies be fulfilled, and the stakes of the one fold be extended, and the voice of the one Shepherd be heard. The object of all revelation, and the design of all controversies, shall thus be completed together. As the family of man before the murder of Abel — and in the ark of Noah — and as the church of Christ at Pentecost — were all of one heart, and of one mind — so shall

all the family of man become eventually, even upon this earth, the family of God. The errors of the papacy shall vanish before the moral and spiritual persuasion of the churches of Christ; and the anticipations of John Foxe, the now despised and insulted, but once venerated and honored martyrologist, shall come to pass. Rome, repenting, may be pardoned both by God and man; and the christian church, though it be still the field where many tares shall grow together with the wheat, shall be once more united in one holy communion; as it was, in those days when the faith of the church of Rome was spoken of with honor, admiration, and praise, throughout the whole world.

Foxe died on the 18th of April, 1587, at his residence in the city of London. No particulars are recorded of the lamentation made for him by the citizens. His son only tells us, that upon the report of his death the whole city lamented, honoring the small funeral which was made for him with the concourse of a great multitude of people; and in no other fashion of mourning, than, as if among so many, each man had buried his father, or his own brother. This is briefly but forcibly said. There can be little doubt, that the general popularity of his great work, the blamelessness of his life, the gentleness of his character, and the zeal with which he had devoted himself to the service of the protestant church of England, had commended him to the love and esteem of all his fellow-citizens. He was buried in the chancel of Cripplegate church. This church was not destroyed in the fire of London, and the inscription to his memory placed by his son still remains, with another inscription on the same stone, announcing that two brothers of the name of Bullen are interred in the same spot with Foxe. <sup>F295</sup> On one side of him is buried the grand-daughter of sir Thomas Lucy, in whose family he had been domiciled as a private tutor. <sup>F296</sup> On the other side is buried a man, if possible, still more illustrious by his talents; equally hostile to popery, which he has denounced as the worst of superstitions, and the heaviest of all God's judgments; but less deserving of our approbation, as the teacher and guide of the people, in other respects — John Milton. Their bodies are buried in peace. Their souls are in the hand of God. It is not permitted to mortal man to penetrate, before the hour of his own great change shall come, beyond the dark valley of the shadow of death; and to know the condition of the departed. Yet so strangely are we divided, and so rashly do we intrude where angels fear to tread; that while

some among us canonize — others excommunicate, these illustrious partners of a common grave. I know not the destiny of the dead. As I presume not to “deal damnation round the land, on all I judge ms foe” — so neither shall I presume to deal salvation to those, whom I might judge ms friends. This only I may hope, that the souls of these men may be pardoned in all they have done amiss, through the mercy of the great High Priest, the Mediator, and the Sacrifice for the sins of the whole world. If that hope be not vain, then shall they be saved with the rest of that great number which shall be delivered out of all nations, and kindred, and people, with the glorious company of the apostles, the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of the martyrs, with the Fathers of the christian church at the beginning, and with the reformers and restorers of its pure faith and ancient discipline in these the latter days. With such fellowship may my soul be united! With such high society may my spirit rest hereafter — the kindred spirit, in all that our God and Savior would approve, of such men as John Foxe and John Milton!

# LIFE OF JOHN FOXE,

*etc., etc.*

## PART 2.

*The Objectors And Objections To The General Authority And Veracity Of Foxe's " Acts And Monuments Of The Church," Considered.*

### INTRODUCTION.

The fact is alike disgraceful to the church and people, to the universities and to the government of England, that there is neither a commentary on the Bible, nor an ecclesiastical history, in their own language, worthy of the character, the opulence, the learning, or the religion Of the nation. Even to this day, the most complete ecclesiastical history, unsuperseeded by any which has followed it, is the work of John Foxe. When will the time come that some better historian shall arise among us, who shall incorporate into one noble, useful, acceptable work, the original documents, which still remain unedited, with the labors of John Foxe, the Magdeburg Centuriators, Baronius, <sup>f297</sup> Alford, Tillemont, Fleury, Du Pin, Mosheim, Gieseler, Waddington, and others? <sup>F298</sup> When shall some honorable and wealthy patron or patrons be found, who shall enable the students and scholars, who would rejoice to execute the task, to combine in one work the results of the labors of the learned protestant, papistical, Lutheran, and Calvinistic writers; and by relating only, if it were possible, the facts on which all are agreed, to give to England and to Europe the pure truth of the past; offending or pleasing with equal indifference, and instructing and improving all? Oh! for the patron or patrons to execute that other desirable work, which our country does not yet possess — a complete commentary on the whole Scriptures of truth! The time will come! “THY people shall be willing in the day of THY power,” to do these, and such like things as these: but we must wait His pleasure; and rest in patience till the possessors of the wealth of the world again delight to build up and to adorn the tabernacle of God, in the wilderness, with the gold and gems of

Egypt. In the mean time, the individuals who are interested in the honor and safety of the ark, must continue their humble efforts in its great and holy cause.

Though the work of John Foxe, as we have already seen, was especially honored by the convocation of the Church of England; and though no ecclesiastical history has been hitherto submitted to the public, which gives a fuller account of all the facts related by the martyrologist; the fashion of the times has so far changed, that it has become a supposed proof of good sense, refined taste, sound judgment, and, above all, of most unsullied liberality, to despise and neglect his labors. Seldom has the reaction from unbounded national, and almost universal approbation, not merely to scanty, partial, and niggardly praise, but to severe and undeserved censure, been so complete as in this instance; and Foxe's book would have been long ago consigned to oblivion, and the decision of our ancestors on its merits have been deemed a proof of their exceeding inferiority in literary power to their sons; if there had not been in the pages of Foxe the union of those higher qualities, which are as much more valuable than mere literary excellence, as virtue is superior to accomplishment, or piety to mere refinement; — the honest scorn of oppression, and the fearless love of truth. The spirit of his pages appeals to that peculiar highmindedness of his christian countrymen, which I trust, by God's blessing upon them, will ever be with them, to love truth for the truth's sake, and to detest persecution, whether from an infatuated church, a misguided sovereign, or an excited people.

I shall now endeavor, without undertaking the defense of every page, sentence, proposition, or opinion of the martyrologist, to prove that he deserved the approbation of the bishops and convocation of the Church of England. It has become necessary to do so. The approbation or the disapprobation of the great principles of the "Acts and Monuments" of John Foxe, is now too often made the criterion of attachment, or non-attachment, to the Church of England itself. Some of the best among us may be said to have been blinded by the influence which began in the days of archbishop Laud, under whose government of the church the volumes of Foxe were removed from the churches. Since that time, to despise Foxe, and to believe the rulers and senate of their own church to have erred in approving him, has been made the proof and pledge of high

churchmanship. We will proceed to consider the principal writers who have opposed this once universal national approbation with which John Foxe was honored. It will be impossible to notice all who have contributed to the reaction. I shall select the chief, ending the list with the antagonist to whom Foxe himself replied — the persecuting Harpsfield. We will consider the several objectors, their objections, and the replies to those objections. On one point all are united in favor of Foxe. They take for granted the received truth — that the martyrologist, so far from being deemed unworthy of a place in the catalogue of ecclesiastical historians, or of being despised as a plagiarist from his contemporaries, is worthy to be regarded as an authority to whom deference must be paid on many points. Let it be remembered that Foxe wrote at a time, when, with the marvellous and superhuman exception of the language of the English Prayer-book, the style of the best writers was unrefined. References were not given with particularity. Notes — that great explanatory improvement on the text, were almost unknown. The art of criticism was in its infancy. The authorities to which he alludes as the basis of his narra-fives, have been thoroughly sifted since his age, and many of them have become for some time obsolete. His credulity was that of his age; but it was not so childish as that of many of the most eminent ecclesiastics of his own church in the second and third generations after him, who objected to the favorable estimation of his labours.<sup>F299</sup> The modern believer doubts more, and believes less, than his ancestors. But the work of Foxe has retained the favor of very many in a refined, critical, inquiring age. He pleases the devout by his piety, the candid by his honesty, the incredulous by the evidences of his facts. The publication of his book began in his own language the study of ecclesiastical history in England; and his volumes have not yet lost their value. The time has come when they ought to be set aside by other works, which our theologians and historians may be justly expected to produce, embodying all that is desirable to be retained, rejecting much that is objectionable, and interweaving more that is useful. But until another history is written which shall include all, and much more than all, of the facts which he has col-leered; and which shall be written in the same honest and fearless spirit of the love of truth, and hatred both of persecution and error — until the labors of John Foxe are superseded, instead of being calumniated — we are justified in affirming that the publishers of this edition have been well advised to reproduce the work —

that the subscribers have not acted absurdly — and that the pages of John Foxe, so far from deserving to become obsolete, still continue to be worthy of the approbation and study of the truth-seeking, religious, and protestant people of England.

## I. MODERN ASSAILANTS.

Various writers of our own day have alluded to Foxe on some points on which they came into contact with him, and we often observe the existence of that dislike to the martyrologist which, from the days of Laud down to the present moment, has ever been a prominent feature of those who, *of the two*, prefer the decrees of Trent to the confession of Augsburg. I will name, in passing, two or three of these writers.

**1.** The *Reverend Edward Churton*, Rector of Crayke. — This gentleman, in a recent volume of Church History, thus characterizes a book, which the whole Church of England, by her Convocation of 1571, deliberately commended and adopted: — “There are many notices of early church history in Foxe’s Acts and Monuments; but it must be considered as a misfortune that so much credit has been given to this writer, and that he has found so many imitators; for his style is that of a coarse satire, rather than of history.” This is the mock refinement of one class of objectors. Nothing is more easy than this sort of fault-finding. But Mr. Churton should, in fairness, apprise his readers that the style in which Foxe wrote was not so much that of the man, as of the *age*. A period in which venerable and learned prelates could be burned to death in the open street, was not likely to be one of great fastidiousness and delicacy of speech. Nor is it reasonable that a great and laborious work, like that of the Martyrology, should be judged of by modern proprieties of diction. The same remark applies to —

**2.** The *Reverend J. E. Tyler*, Rector of St. Giles’s, who observes, in his “Life of Henry of Monmouth,” that “It is *painful* to read the marginal notes of Foxe, such as — ‘Lord Cobham would not obey the beast.’ ‘Caiaphas sitteth in consistory.’ ‘The wolf was hungry; he must needs be fed with blood.’ ‘Bloody murderers;’ with others, still more ungentle.”

It is difficult to understand the tone and temper of mind, which can turn from the heart-rending spectacle of a gallant christian knight, remorselessly

persecuted by the Romish prelates, his sovereign alienated from him, himself represented as a traitor, and hunted up and down the country like a wild beast, and at last caught, and suspended by an iron chain over a slow fire, and so miserably murdered, — his whole crime being, his adherence to the faith of the New Testament; — it is difficult, I repeat, to enter into the feelings of writers who can turn from this thrilling sight, to find fault with the chronicler who uses such “ungentle” terms as “bloody murderers.” We have learnt, indeed, in modern days, that in writing history it is at all times desirable to be sparing of epithets. But it is idle to find fault with men of other times, — of times when hard words, and hard blows also, were of more frequent occurrence than now, — it is idle, I repeat, to impugn their narratives on such grounds as these.

Another objection or two of Mr. Tyler’s will fall under the same head with that which we shall next remark upon, in the work of —

**3. Patrick F. Tytler, Esq.** — This gentleman, as well as Mr. Tyler, has indulged in a species of criticism which is founded on a mistaken view. We will adduce an instance: — Foxe gives a narrative of Mary’s conduct towards Elizabeth, at the time of Wyat’s rebellion; when three knights and a troop of horse were despatched to Ashridge, “to bring the Lady Elizabeth to court, *quick or dead.*” Foxe’s narrative describes great violence and rudeness.

Mr. Tytler, however, in the course of his researches, discovers, in the State Paper Office, a letter or despatch from these three knights to Queen Mary, giving an account of their mission. This document very naturally omits all notice of violent or peremptory conduct; stating only necessary facts, and those in courtierlike style. Mr. Tytler, rejoicing in his own discovery, asserts that this despatch “carries truth upon every word of it, and *totally demolishes the inflated narrative of Foxe.*”

Let us try the soundness of Mr. Tytler’s method of reasoning by a case which will be familiar to every one.

Sir Walter Scott, towards the dose of his “Life of Napoleon Buonaparte,” had occasion to describe the Battle of Waterloo. His narrative is probably the best account we have of that great contest. In compiling it he used great

pains and research, drawing his information from the highest sources, both by letter and personal converse.

Supposing, then, the present state of the world to last some centuries, and Scott to be preserved then, as Foxe is now. And let us imagine, that in A.D. 2300, some new historian should, by searching, recover what might have been long lost sight of — the original despatch of the Duke of Wellington from the field of Waterloo. Immediately, if he acted like Mr. Tytler, we should find him exclaiming, “Here is a document, the authenticity of which is unquestionable, and which completely demolishes the *inflated* narrative of Scott!”

Every one can see how absurd this would be: — every one can see that the narrative of one who quietly collected, after the event, all the details, would be both more full, and also more correct, than the despatch written from the scene of action: Yet Mr. Tytler prefers the latter; and alleges, that the dry and courtly report of Mary’s messengers, must be more credible than the narrative of Foxe, which doubtless was derived from the personal relations of some of Elizabeth’s own attendants!

It is by this sort of criticism that both Mr. Tyler and Mr. Tytler endeavor to diminish the credit of Foxe; but a little reflection on the validity of such objections, will soon replace the old martyrologist on his pedestal.

**4.** The *Reverend S.R. Maitland*, is the only other living assailant of Foxe to whom I shall allude; and it can be only an allusion. He has himself, by the almost endless succession of his attacks, rendered the very attempt to reply to them an impossibility. *Seven* separate publications, containing nearly *six hundred* octavo pages, of real, substantial criticism, on Foxe, has Mr. Maitland poured forth, within the last five or six years. I cannot inflict on the subscribers six hundred pages of reply. All that I can attempt to do, is merely to account for, and to allude to, this vast hostile array; and to give the reader some idea of the drift of the whole. To do this, I must distribute my remarks under three heads, or observations: —

**1.** *That Mr. Maitland is not an impartial critic of Foxe.* It is necessary that this should be borne in mind; for on more than one occasion Mr. Maitland writes as if he were sincerely concerned for the honor and

credit of Foxe, and were finding fault only with the errors of *this* edition.

It so happened, however, that before a single sheet of the 1837 edition of Foxe was printed, Mr. Maitland had already resolved, as he himself tells us, on the challenge of the *Christian Observer*, “to show that the attempt to set up Foxe as *as an authority of any kind*, is perfectly absurd.”<sup>F300</sup> And even when commencing his attack upon the new edition, he says, “It is due, I hope and believe, to many most sincere and zealous protestants among the subscribers, to ask them whether they have fully considered what they are doing in supporting the republication of a work which is, to say the least, characterized by (I would not wish to believe that by any it is prized for) the strain of bitter invective which runs through it.”<sup>F301</sup> And in closing that pamphlet, Mr. Maitland says, “I cannot but think that the style and spirit of Foxe’s work, and its aspect towards the church of which I am a minister, are quite sufficient to justify what they call my ‘personal dislike’ of it.”<sup>F302</sup>

It is confessed, then, with sufficient distinctness, that, in criticising either Foxe in all editions, or Foxe in the particular edition which was printed in 1887, and is, in a revised form, reprinted now, Mr. Maitland is not dealing with a writer like Bede, or Fleury, or Mosheim, on whose merits or demerits he could dispassionately enlarge; but with one, the circulation of whose work he deems an evil, and the discrediting of which he would regard with peculiar gratification.

2. Accordingly, he does not hesitate *to treat the author with great injustice*. This is chiefly visible in the want of all allowance for the circumstances under which the Martyrology was written.

There is scarcely a more remarkable instance extant, of great industry, shown in the production of a voluminous work in a short time, than is furnished by the *Acts and Monuments*.

Hume was occupied between eight and ten years in the production of his *History of England*; Gibbon was employed about fourteen years upon his *Decline and Fall* Foxe published his Latin work in 1559: the same, greatly enlarged, and written in English, filling more than *seventeen hundred* closely printed folio pages, in 1563; and a further enlargement, bringing it

nearly into its present form, in 1570. And the *Acts and Monuments* contain more than twice as much matter as Gibbon's, and three times the contents of Hume's work.

A still greater difference is evident in the means and appliances of these authors. Modern historians write with all the aid of large libraries; generally, too, in easy circumstances, at home, and surrounded by friends and admirers. Foxe compiled the bulk of his work in exile, and the whole of it under the pressure of extreme want; unaided by libraries, borrowing a book or an old MS. wherever he could get one.

If it be asked, why the martyrologist did not prefer to wait for more auspicious circumstances; and *why* he rushed into print without more care and caution? -the answer is, that the necessities of the Church, and the urgent call of Protestants everywhere, forced him to hasten its publication. "Great was the expectation," says Strype, "of the book here in England, before it came abroad." <sup>F303</sup> Further, it must always be remembered, that while the merit of vast industry rightfully belongs to him, still, the production of so prodigious a mass in some five or six years, was only rendered possible by the aid of large contributions from various friends. These, in most instances, he could only gladly accept with all faults. Hence, when critics now fasten upon error after error, it is very probable that they are criticizing, not Foxe, but some of his less careful and less learned assistants. <sup>F304</sup>

Most of these circumstances, and, above all, the fact, that as the world advances in civilization, libraries accumulate, scholar advances and improves upon scholar, and each new critic adds something to the accuracy and requirements of his age, — all this Mr. Maitland unreasonably overlooks, and finds fault with Foxe, as though he were a writer of our own times. But with what historian of former days could not Mr. Maitland find fault? Would he have any difficulty in pointing out scores of errors in Hume and Gibbon, hundreds of faults in Collier and Fuller, or myriads of blunders in Illyricus and the Magdeburg Centuriators? Has he not recently shown, that it was just as easy for him to detect blunders in Strype, as in Foxe? <sup>F305</sup> May we not, then, complain, that he applies all the stores of his learning, and all the acuteness of his criticism, to the destruction of Foxe's character for truth and accuracy, without making the

admission, which truth and justice so plainly demand, — that for an historian of the sixteenth century to write with the certainty and correctness of one of the nineteenth, would have been as *impossible*, as that he should have traveled, as we do, thirty or forty miles per hour.

3. The like unjust and unreasonable strictness of demand has been visible in Mr. Maitland's criticisms on the 1837 edition.

The circumstances of its production have been entirely and purposely overlooked. A loud call had been made, for several years before 1836, for a new edition of the *Acts and Monuments*. Efforts had been made to induce the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge to undertake the work. On the failure of these, schemes were formed in other quarters, which proved abortive. At last, the present publishers took courage, and threw themselves into the work. But what had been called for, and what they undertook, was, simply, a good and handsome *reprint of the work*. A revision, and the eradication of all the errors into which Foxe or his various assistants might have fallen, was not asked of them. But, as soon as they had issued their proposals, and some subscribers had entered their names, a natural impatience began to manifest itself, and they were eagerly *asked*, when the first volume would appear?

Now of all this Mr. Maitland takes little notice. He falls upon the work as if it were a history of the present day, and wonders that Foxe should not always understand the strange phraseology of the old Latin chronicles, *then existing only in MSS*; and is still more surprised, that where his mistakes have introduced obscurity into a statement, the editors of the edition of 1837 did not clear that obscurity away. Clearly, it must have been both their wish and their duty to do this, so far as time and opportunity permitted; and, as far as time and opportunity permitted, it was done; but, in many cases, a conjectural emendation of this kind might only introduce one mistake in lieu of another. No doubt this was the case in some instances; and upon such Mr. Maitland eagerly fastens, with his peculiar skill, and immediately draws the harsh and unjust conclusion, that besides retaining the old errors, the editors have added new ones. Unquestionably, in this, as in his charges against Foxe himself, some instances may be adduced to justify the accusation; and yet the accusation itself, in the main, be essentially unjust and untrue.

With these general remarks, I shall dismiss Mr. Maitland. To reply, in detail, to his 567 pages of criticism, is clearly impossible. The truth of much that he has written is cheerfully admitted. The present edition (1843) will show how sedulously the editors have striven to turn his censures to a practical use. The main question, however, relates to the value of *the work itself*, independent of any question concerning this or that edition. On this point Mr. Maitland will best be answered, by exhibiting the agreement of a long series of great men, in various ages of the Church, as to the high and unquestionable rank of Foxe as an historian. A chain of testimony of this kind, will be given at the close of the present review.

## 2. FORMER OPPONENTS.

I must now proceed to earlier antagonists.

On the mere railings of Cobbett or Eusebius Andrews, I shall not waste the reader's time. The latter, who is the most voluminous and the most effective writer of the two, is well described in the *Quarterly Review*: — “His arguments bear the same relation to sound logical reason, as the scrawlings of a lunatic to the diagrams of the mathematician.”<sup>F306</sup>

We arrive then, at last, at the declared and natural impugners and contemners of the book, the Romanists, Milner, Parsons, and Harpsfield, and the nonjuror, Jeremy Collier. We will attend to each of these writers in his turn.

### 1. Dr. John Milner, Or Miller, Bishop Of Castabala.

He was ordained priest of the Church of Rome in 1777, and in 1803 was appointed bishop of Castabala. He resided at Wolverhampton, where he died in April, 1826.

I shall briefly review the objections which Milner has collected against the work of Foxe. They are to be found in his “Letters to a Prebendary,” his “End of Controversy,” and his “History of Winchester.”

He introduces his attack on Foxe, by alleging the various excuses or apologies which are urged by the friends of Mary for the burnings of the antipapalists. It is much to be regretted that this very influential writer did

not submit to his friends and party, the great truth — that the laws of the church of Rome are all, every one, founded, established, and enforced, upon the theory which ever will, ever did, ever must, end in punishing the body for the good of the soul — the theory, that the church of Rome and the bishop of Rome, have an innate divine authority, confirmed by the general councils, and especially by the council of Trent, to enforce the canons which prescribe compulsory obedience to the church and bishop of Rome. The whole mass of the bulls of the popes, the whole ecclesiastical code of Rome, is as much founded upon the one principle, that obedience to the church is to be enforced by the church; as the law of England is founded upon the principle that the obedience of the subject is to be enforced by the state, and by the king. The apologies of Milner prove the truth of this affirmation to the utmost. I insert them, therefore, with a brief notice of the fallacy of each, as the best introduction to his remarks on the martyrologist.

“As the sanguinary persecutions,” says Milner, “for which this reign (that of Mary) was, unfortunately, too famous, reached Winchester, it is necessary to say something concerning them; and since the matter has been misrepresented by the generality of writers, for the purpose of keeping up a spirit of unchristian resentment and counter-persecution in the nation, we shall enlarge upon the subject further than would be proper, were a less benevolent object in view than the appeasing of that spirit.”

**Objection 1.** “First, then, it is to be observed, that if Mary was a persecutor, it was not in virtue of any tenet of her religion that she became so.”

**Answer 1.** The tenets of her religion taught *obedience to the bishop of Rome, at all hazards*, whatever were the conscientious or rational conclusions of the individual inquirers.

**Objection 2.** “At her coming to the crown, and for almost two years afterwards, while she declared herself openly in favor of the ancient religion, she as openly disclaimed every degree of force or violence against those who professed and practiced any of the late systems.”

**Answer 2.** *She disclaimed force, but she demanded obedience in religion.* The question is, What was to be the result to the subject, if that obedience was not eventually yielded? She would not punish heretics, unless they were obstinate heretics!

**Objection 3.** “We have the ordinances and instructions of the pope for bringing back this kingdom to his communion; in these occur many documents and rules of forbearance and conciliation, but not a word that insinuates corporal punishment or persecution of any kind. <sup>f308</sup> It is universally admitted that the papal legate, cardinal Pole, uniformly expressed ‘ a strong aversion to extremity and rigor,’ <sup>f309</sup> and opposed the practice of them, as far as was in his power. In like manner it is admitted, that the Spanish chaplains of king Philip, and other catholic preachers, publicly condemned, from the pulpit, the persecution which was then carried on; as being opposite to the christian spirit, and detrimental to the interests of religion.” <sup>f310</sup>

**Answer 3.** Would not the pope, the cardinal, and the Spanish chaplains, all have agreed that obstinate heretics, continuing to refuse to obey, should be eventually coerced? *Would persevering disobedience to Rome, have been permitted?* This plea of Milner is mere hypocrisy.

**Objection 4.** “If, after an interval of nearly two years’ toleration, the queen engaged the parliament to revive the ancient acts against Lollards, <sup>f311</sup> it cannot; be denied that she had many provocations, <sup>f312</sup> from which she too hastily inferred that the existence of the protestant religion was incompatible with the security of her government. These were — Wyatt’s rebellion; the open and avowed attempts made by reformers upon her own life, and the lives of the established clergy; <sup>f313</sup> the prayers that were publicly made in conventicles for her death; <sup>f314</sup> the intolerable insults publicly offered to the religion of the state; <sup>f315</sup> the political impostures practiced against her government and faith; <sup>f316</sup> and the seditious and treasonable books which were published by some of the leaders of the reformation, and, amongst the rest, by our late prelate of Winchester, Poynt. <sup>f317</sup> All this, however, is offered, not in excuse, but barely in extenuation of the charge brought against Mary.”

**Answer 4.** All these pleas will neither excuse, justify, nor even extenuate the cruel burnings of peasants, artificers, and women, against whom no such crimes were alleged, and whose only offense was anti-popery. Each traitorous offender — every treasonable offense ought to have been punished, but never, never ought there to have been either with Henry, Mary, or Elizabeth, burnings for religious opinions. We have changed; and *if the propriety and reasonableness of further changes in our laws respecting religion can be pointed out, we will make. further changes.* Rome must imitate our example; and not be content with apologies.

**Objection 5.** “If Gardiner, Bonner, and certain other catholics taught and practiced religious persecution in their days, they were not singular in this particular; the most eminent protestant divines openly inculcated the same intolerant lessons.”<sup>F318</sup> In like manner, the protestant states were no sooner established, than they every where began to turn the sword against the catholics; <sup>f319</sup> and not content with that, the different sects amongst them made use of it against each other.<sup>F320</sup> At the very time when Mary was burning protestants in England, the English refugees in Germany were persecuting each other on account of their respective opinions.”<sup>F321</sup>

**Answer 5.** I have noticed these sickening recriminations. I again say, Equal crime proves only equal guilt when that equal crime is continued. *Our guilt has ceased, for our laws are changed.* The guilt of Rome is not that it formerly persecuted, but that its canon laws are unchanged.

Let us now consider the charges of Milner against John Foxe. They will be found to be as vague and as unmeaning as those of Andrews.

**Objection 6.** “The huge history of these persecutions,” says Milner, “written by John Foxe, which has been the storehouse for all succeeding writers on the same subject, has been demonstrated to be one tissue of falsehood, misrepresentation, and absurdity.”<sup>F322</sup>

**Answer 6.** The answer to this remark is, that instead of the word *demonstrated*, we must read the word, *accused*, or *said to be*. No assailant of Foxe has *demonstrated* his work to be one tissue of falsehood.

**Objection 7.** “Some of his pretended martyrs were alive at the time when he was describing the circumstances of their death; <sup>f323</sup> many of them were executed for rebellion, assassination, theft, or other crimes: <sup>f324</sup> not at few of them died in the open profession of the catholic doctrine, or only differed in certain points of no great consequence to the main subjects of controversy; <sup>f325</sup> whilst the greater part either differed from the received doctrines of the established church, or differed from each other in some of the points, at least, on which they were arraigned and condemned.” <sup>F326</sup>

**Answer 7.** For “some” read “one;” that is, Marbeck, to whose case I shall presently refer.

None were burnt for such crimes in the reign of Mary who are mentioned by Foxe as martyrs. I have already said, if a thief be burnt, not for robbery, but for quakerism, he may be called a martyr for that quakerism. Their holding different opinions among each other, or their greater or less variation from popery, has nothing to do with the one only fact of any moment, which is, that they were burnt for anti-popery.

With respect to the remarks of Milner, in the notes, I add that —

**1.** Foxe could not have committed errors by trusting to the accounts of poor, simple people, without those errors being instantly discovered. He did trust to those who reported the martyrdoms, but his narratives were instantly and closely scrutinized. The most decisive proofs of his veracity are to be found in his great anxiety to correct his accounts of Grimwood and Marbeck, one of which, as we shall see, he retained, and one of which he rejected, after inquiring into the truth of the accusation that he had been in both instances deceived.

Milner then goes on to discuss the martyrdoms of Bainbridge and Philpot, who were natives or residents of Winchester. In doing so he appears to condemn the cruelties in question, by speaking of “the odious persecution;” but he so speaks of “church authority” and “obstinate heretics,” that the reader of his book very unwillingly but very rightly infers, that the bodily punishment of a heretic by his church would not be deemed to be persecution. I pass by all such observations, however, as he has not assailed in his narrative the character of Foxe.

One mistake he seems to have discovered in the narrative of the death of Gardiner by Foxe. “Gardiner,” says Milner, “having opened the new parliament, in quality of lord chancellor, October 21, 1555, was two days afterwards seized with the gout, and died, in sentiments of great humility and contrition, November 12th following, at York-place, now Whitehall.” In the notes to this passage Milner adds — “Foxe, and after him Burnet, and other historians, relate, that on the day of Ridley and Latimer’s execution at Oxford, Gardiner postponed his dinner until he had received an account of that tragical event, having messengers at proper distances on the road to convey him the earliest intelligence; that the old duke of Norfolk, who was then one of his guests, expressed great uneasiness at the delay of his meal; and that, on the arrival of the news, Gardiner, transported with joy, sat down to table, where he was seized with the dysury, and being carried to bed, died in great torments a fortnight after. The falsehood of this stow, founded in excessive prejudice, is proved by Collier, from the following circumstances: Latimer and Ridley suffered October 16. October 21 Gardiner opened the parliament, which he afterwards attended a second time. The old duke of Norfolk had been dead a year before this event; and Gardiner himself died November 12, not of dysury, but of the gout.” <sup>F327</sup>

With respect to the duke of Norfolk, who dined with Gardiner, it was probably the grandson of the duke, who died in 1554. He might be called the old duke after he had possessed his dukedom some years, and ceased to be a young man; and with respect to the other alleged inaccuracy, the death of Gardiner, I answer in the language of the Quarterly Review: —

“As to the death of Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, Dr. Milner, as his high-church friend, Jeremy Collier, had done before him, endeavors triumphantly to confute Foxe’s story, that he died of dysury, immediately after the burning of Ridley and Latimer, by the fact of his having opened the parliament five days after that melancholy event. But let it be remembered, that Foxe, though at that time in concealment, had the best opportunities of information; and it has been suggested, that Gardiner, though laboring under that malady, might really open the parliament the fifth day from its access, and return to his own house, where he certainly expired a few days after.

“A late speaker of the House of Commons is said to have attended to his parliamentary duties under circumstances equally distressing.” <sup>F328</sup>

The conclusion is, that Milner has produced nothing against “the veracity and fidelity” of the martyrologist. This attempt, also, like every other, to impeach him of dishonest representations of facts, has totally failed. <sup>F329</sup>

I shall now, before I proceed to the consideration of the other assailants of John Foxe, make some remarks upon those cases, which have been always placed by his opponents in the van of their forces — *the cases so often alluded to, of Grimwood and Marbeck*. The manner in which Foxe was betrayed into error respecting either of these persons must be regarded as a demonstration of the severe criticism to which his book was subjected, and the extreme fewness of the mistakes, inadvertencies, and inaccuracies, so freely, but so falsely alleged against him. When we consider the extent of his work, the disadvantages under which he labored, and the vigilant inspection which it has undergone, we may be justly astonished that so few charges can be adduced against him. Neither can we be surprised that the deficiency of matter for any just impeachment of his veracity and fidelity, should be compensated, by the general, though unproved accusation, of universal falsehood, and by unsparing, and rancorous abuse.

The cases of Grimwood and Marbeck are those alone, in relating which Foxe is charged with wilful falsehood, in his statements of facts.

The accusation respecting his account of Grimwood is — that in the last volume of his *Acts and Monuments*, in that section, <sup>f330</sup> where he relates the strange deaths of certain persecutors, and calls them, I must say, with very questionable propriety, examples of God’s judgment; he has included among those persecutors a person named Grimwood; and affirmed respecting him — that in the harvest following his having given false witness against a religious antipapist of the name of Cooper, as he was stacking corn, in full health, fearing no peril, he suddenly fell down, and immediately most miserably died. In consequence of the publication of this story, a clergyman believed it; and quoted the death of Grimwood, in a sermon, as an illustration of his argument, and as an instance of the judgment of God against all persecutors. So far, however, was the story from being true, that Grimwood was at that very moment one of the

congregation; and being indignant at the charge, he brought an action of defamation against the clergyman, which is alluded to in Croke's reports, <sup>f331</sup> The verdict was given for the defendant; because no malice could be proved on the part of the clergyman. Anthony Wood charges Foxe with committing, in this instance, *a most egregious falsity*; and nearly every writer who hates the martyrologist, has rung the changes on this story; as if it was an undeniable, and wilful untruth.

The reply to this accusation shall be taken from Strype's Annals of the Reformation. <sup>F332</sup> The martyrologist was informed of his supposed mistake. He inquired personally into the matter; and retained the narrative in the last edition of his work, published under his own superintendence. He must therefore be as his enemies represent him, a wilful deceiver, or the story he relates is true.

Let us first examine his own account. It is contained in seven short paragraphs. <sup>F333</sup> I will proceed through each.

The *first* gives an account of Cooper. The *second*, that a man named Fenning wished to purchase from him two oxen: but Cooper refused to sell them. Upon this refusal, Fenning (in the *third paragraph*) charges Cooper before sir Henry Doyle with high treason. Cooper was carried before the magistrate by two persons, one named Timperley — the other *Grimwood of Lawshall*, a constable.

We read in the *fourth paragraph* that Cooper was indicted at Bury for the alleged treason: and found guilty, and executed. The accusation against him was supported by Fenning himself, and by two other witnesses, both of whom were suborned and perjured, whose names were Richard Whyte, and another *Grimwood* — *Grimwood of Hitchaw*, in the county of Suffolk.

In the fifth *paragraph* is the assertion that this last-named Grimwood died suddenly, and miserably.

The *sixth paragraph* appeals to Fenning as being still alive, when the account of Grimwood's death was published: an appeal, which is certainly no proof of falsehood; more especially as both in the *sixth* and *seventh paragraphs* this very Fenning is described as a wicked man, for whose repentance, Foxe offers up a prayer.

It must be observed, that all these circumstances are omitted by the uncandid authors, who are anxious to condemn the martyrologist, and who only mention the contradiction to his narrative.

Let us now consider the observations of the impartial and accurate Strype. In narrating all those circumstances, of which John Foxe could not be an eye-witness, he was unavoidably compelled, as we all are, to rely on the authority of the reports of others. John Foxe was not an eye-witness to the death of Grimwood. The only question, therefore, is, Did he invent the story? or had he authority for this narrative? and was that authority worthy of belief?

The relation respecting Grimwood, says Strype, as Foxe inserts it in his history, is this — “ Be it true or false, he had it from William Punt, who, under queen Mary, had been a diligent inquirer into the sufferings of the professors; and taking the same in writing, had procured the printing of them beyond sea, and then vended the books here in England. The same Punt was informed against, by Tye, bishop Bonner’s commissary in the parts about Colchester, as a leading heretic. This is the character of the man. But to pursue this matter further, and to search whence this Punt had his information; he had it from credible witnesses, who gave in this account before him and Sutton, a minister of Ipswich, and one Foxe, brother to our martyrologist. After the martyrology was printed, William Rushbrook, minister of Byldeston, a neighboring parish to Ipswich, reading the aforesaid relation of Cooper, in the said book, and knowing something of the business, perceived several errors therein. Therefore, out of care of consulting for the credit of the author and book, he wrote hereupon to Mr. Walker, an eminent minister in Ipswich, showing wherein Punt’s information failed, and wishing it had not been put into Mr. Foxe’s book, and desiring him to inform the said author thereof. Cooper’s punishment, as he asserted, having been justly inflicted, not so much for religion, as treasonous words against the queen. The sum of his letter was, ‘That he had talked with those which he judged could best certify the truth of the matter which was reported of Cooper. That if every man indeed might be a martyr which was then punished for rebellious words, we should have many martyrs indeed. That Will. Punt was much to blame, because that he, Rushbrook, told him, more than two years past, that his paper that contained that report was untrue, which, as he had then writ it, was now

put into print. That in this report he committed these faults, viz. — that Cooper was no such man that ought in commendation to be named in that book: that whereas Whyte was named to be a false witness, he witnessed truly: that Grimwood was unjustly reported to be a witness, much more a false witness: that what was said to come upon the said Grimwood, was as true as the rest: that Cooper was valued more than he was worth, as to his goods, which were seized by the sheriff; a true account whereof in kine, horses, and other cattle, and household stuff, came but to 61*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.*'

*“When all this was understood by Mr. Foxe, he came himself to Ipswich to inform himself truly about it. Punt also went to Mr. Sutton before said, who remembered it very well, every part thereof as it was then imprinted.*

*Notwithstanding, these two, with another honest man, went to the party that had related it, and read the story unto them, who boldly affirmed the same to be true, and would so confess before any man, as they said. There were two that attested this, being one and twenty years of age apiece. He also procured Mr. Candish, a justice of peace, as it seems, and the wife of Cooper, to meet at Ipswich; whom, with the children, they minded to bring before Candish and others, and so to make a true certificate thereof with their hands, as witnesses of their words, and then would send it up with speed; as Punt wrote up to London, to Foxe's brother, living at the duke of Norfolk's house, by Aldgate. He wrote, also, that Mr. Sutton had and would take great pains therein. And so I leave the matter undecided to the reader's judgment and discretion. I have set down all this at this length, to show what diligence and care was used that no falsehood might be obtruded upon the readers, and Foxe and his friends' readiness to correct any mistakes that might happen.”*<sup>F334</sup> Such are the precise words of

Strype. I give them at length, that the reader may be assured I have no wish to allege anything of my own, in favor of the accused martyrologist. He will see that Foxe used every precaution in his power to obtain a true narrative; and after he had done so, he retained the account in his book. There were two persons of the name of Grimwood. One died, as Foxe related; the other was present at the sermon. The clergyman was not accurate in his specification, and was wrongly supposed by this hearer to be guilty of a libel. This solution of the difficulty is confirmed by another declaration of Strype, who positively affirms<sup>F335</sup> that he had received an assurance that the relation by Foxe of the judgment upon Grimwood was

true, from a very careful inquirer, whose name he mentions. “This inquirer into the truth of the matter told me,” says Strype, “that he had read it in a very authentic paper, carrying so much evidence with it, that he did not in the least misdoubt it; the judgment, indeed, not falling upon that Grimwood who sued the minister, but upon another of the same name, both christian and surname, as was well known afterwards.”<sup>F336</sup> Such is the remaining evidence that Foxe did not invent the story; but that he had such authority for his narrative as he was justified in crediting. If this authority is not deemed to be sufficient, I refer the reader to the original letters from which Strype borrowed his account. They are preserved in the British Museum.<sup>F337</sup> The accuracy, the fidelity, and the veracity of John Foxe, remain, therefore, unimpeachable in that very narrative for which, more than for any others, he has been stigmatized as a false, unsafe, and unworthy historian.

We are now brought to the case of Marbeck, the second instance in which the calumniated martyrologist is accused of wilful falsehood.

When Foxe was accused of inaccuracy in relating the incident which he deemed to be the judgment of God against Grimwood, he went down to Ipswich to make inquiries whether he had been deceived or not. He retained, after such inquiry, the narrative in his book. In the present instance he was informed that he had been deceived, he made inquiry; and having done so, he expunged his account. How was it possible that he could have given to his readers a more perfect proof of his desire to speak the simple truth? Yet he is still denominated, in the coarse language of his unsparing opponent, “the lying Foxe,” both for retaining the story of Grimwood, and for having once received into his martyrology the story of the martyrdom of Marbeck.

The case is briefly this. Four persons of the name of Testwood, Person, Filmer or Finmore, and Marbeck, were condemned to be burnt at Windsor, under the act of the Six Articles. One of the four was pardoned: it was Marbeck. Foxe was not present at the cruelty. The information upon which Foxe relied told him that Finmore was pardoned, and that Marbeck was burnt; his authorities had deceived him; Marbeck was pardoned, and Finmore was burnt. This is the whole error he committed, and this error was corrected in a list of “Faults and oversights,” at page 1742 of that

same edition. When his book was published, *the scrutinizing eyes of his papal critics immediately detected the error, as they would have done any other*, if he had committed any: and they loudly triumphed. The correction of the error, in the same volume, they either did not see, or affected not to have seen. Harpsfield, the contemporary of Foxe, is quite sportive on the subject. Leaving his more lugubrious, though not inelegant language, he becomes humorous over this mistake of Foxe. He had been deriding the manner in which the pseudo-martyrs, as he calls the victims of the intolerant ecclesiastics of the day, endured the violence of the fire and declared their freedom from pain. “Do not think,” says this beginner of the attacks upon the martyrologist, “that I am unjust towards the pseudo-martyrs, and that I wish to lessen or extenuate these their miraculous endurings; for I certainly cannot doubt their truth, if that indeed be true which Foxe relates, that we have lately had another Polycarp among us in England; upon whom either the fire had no power, or who, his whole body having been reduced to ashes, sprung to life again, more wonderfully than Lazarus. For behold you have John Marbeck, the organist at Windsor, in the year 1543, and 28th July, ‘undergoing martyrdom at the fire with cheerful constancy,’ (I quote the words of Foxe.) But he is yet living, and chaunts as beautifully, and plays the organ as skilfully, at Windsor, as he was wont to do.’ Crito-bulus answers, ‘I am altogether astonished at this account. And now you have, according to your own confession, at least one miracle of our martyrs, which may vie with the: most celebrated of those either of Christ or of his disciples.’ Irenaeus <sup>f338</sup> answers, — ‘This I would most readily concede to you, if he had ever been burnt; but he was neither burnt nor brought to the fire.’” <sup>f339</sup>

Before the error in his narrative had been thus uncourteously pointed out, Foxe had already adopted the only remedy in his power: he had acknowledged and corrected the error. The correction did not satisfy his assailants. He expostulates with them on this treatment; — “Be it known to all the depravers of my book,” he says, <sup>f340</sup> “that I repeat that Marbeck was condemned, but not burned; yet, even if I had not corrected the mistake, what gentle or courteous reader could have therein any just matter to triumph over and insult me; seeing the judicial acts, records, and registers, the bishops’ certificates, and the very writ of execution remaining, did lead me to give the account in my book. He who writes

histories and who cannot be in all places to see all things, must follow the records and registers he consults. *But now, even now, that I correct the error of which complaint is made, I am still condemned;* I correct myself, but I am still corrected by others; I warn the reader of the truth; still I am called a liar. Though I use my utmost diligence to prevent occasion of cavilling, I may not be indulged with the privilege which is granted to every author, to plead my own errata. If such men could be satisfied, I have said enough; if they cannot, nothing I can add will satisfy them. May God himself amend them!”

Yes, venerable martyrologist! so it has been, and so it will be, as long as any men are to be found who hate the pourtrayer of the effects of this one false principle — that the punishment of the body is required, to prevent the free formation of religious opinion. So it has been, from Alan Cope <sup>f341</sup> to Eusebius Andrews, and his living imitators. Wood, <sup>f342</sup> Milner, <sup>f343</sup> Parsons, <sup>f344</sup> Andrews, <sup>f345</sup> and every assailant of Foxe, prove and demonstrate the general truth, accuracy, and fidelity of his martyrology, by exhausting their energies in declamations of triumph over the mistakes of the historian, in the cases of Grimwood and Marbeck. They are not able, or are not willing, to see, that *precisely the same vigilance, enmity, scrutiny, and intense anxiety to discover faults, were exercised towards the other portions of his work by his contemporary foes*, who lived among the relations and friends of the martyrs, and they were all exercised in vain. No book of such magnitude ever underwent such an ordeal as Foxe’s Book of Martyrs. Many, very many, are the defects which the accumulated knowledge and the severer criticism of our own age can now discover; but there are preserved in Foxe’s martyrology alone the authenticated materials which must ever be invaluable to the student of history. If the book had never been published, the solid foundation for a better ecclesiastical history of the catholic church, and of its best portion, the English church, had not perhaps even yet been laid. <sup>F346</sup> I cannot defend the coarsenesses which justly shock our modern refinement. I read many sentences which I utterly condemn; but if this book had never been published, I verily believe that the heart of England had never been so permanently animated with that utter abhorrence of persecution which has been the foundation both of our political liberty and national influence among mankind; and which has

certainly given to the people, a church which the christian community may love.

## 2. Jeremy Collier.

The celebrated jacobite and nonjuror, <sup>f347</sup> — the absolver at the place of execution of sir John Friend and Sir William Perkins, who had been convicted, certainly upon questionable evidence, of a plot to assassinate king William, — the successful opponent of the immoralities of the English drama, <sup>f348</sup> — the author of the Ecclesiastical History of Great Britain, <sup>f349</sup> throughout the whole of which he seems to have had Foxe's Acts and Monuments before him, — is the next assailant of the labors of the martyrologist. With Mr. Maitland and Eusebius Andrews, he appears to have had a "*personal dislike*" to the book; and it was with him, as with them, that criticism founded upon this unworthy motive has sometimes led him to injustice and unfairness. As Jeremy Collier is an author whose integrity and candor, notwithstanding his severe attacks on the motives and actions of those to whom he was politically opposed, has been hitherto considered unimpeachable, I can only conclude that he hated Foxe for the same reasons which make those who are still called High-churchmen, dislike the martyrologist and his pages. Foxe wrote his book at the time when the authority of the church had been abused to the atrocious persecutions which he has related. All the eloquence and energies of the historian are devoted, therefore, to the cause of the oppressed rather than of the oppressors — to the cause of the victim rather than of the judge. The abuse of which he complains was principally that of the papal authority; but because the episcopal power was not free from the modes of thinking which had been originally introduced into states and churches by the Roman canonical law, therefore it is that the opposition by Foxe to the abuses of church authority sometimes appears to be anti-episcopal. The Ecclesiastical History of Collier is written on the old and absurd fallacy, that the church, in a christian nation, is independent of the state. He did not perceive that, in a wisely-ordered community, the church of a country is only the christian people of that country, considered ecclesiastically, of whom the clergy are but the servants, as Christ was humbled to take upon him the form of a servant; and that the state is but the same christian people, considered politically, of whom the civil magistrates are but the servants. <sup>F350</sup> He did not perceive, that, in England

at least, the government is but the committee of the state ruling the people according to the united ecclesiastical and political law; and, therefore, that the church being the people, and the people being the state, the church can no more be independent of the state or of the people, than it can be independent of itself. The ecclesiastical servants of the people may refuse to receive the conclusions of the political servants of the people in matters of religion; as the political servants of the people may refuse to receive the conclusions of the ecclesiastical servants of the people in matters of civil polity; and many painful controversies and many fierce persecutions may be the result of their mutual disagreements; but when Christ gave his apostles the commission to preach the gospel, and when the same providence of God gave the scepter to Nero or Vespasian, both the apostles and the emperors were the servants of the people, proposing or rejecting the truths of the gospel. But the one people was not the one church, till the civil magistrate and the ecclesiastical magistrate adopted the same conclusions, and the one people thus became one church. The church, before the time of Constantine, was formed of that portion of the people who received the apostolical teaching: the church, after the time of Constantine, consisted of the whole people, who were now governed by the one united law of the apostles and of the emperors. The christian church became the christian people; and the christian people became the christian church. The people were the church, in religion: the same people were the state, in politics. They were governed by one law, of God, and not of man alone, and were no longer, therefore, independent of each other. As it was in the Roman empire in the time of Constantine, so it had been under God's own ordinance in the days of Moses, and of the Jewish sovereigns. They were one people with one law to govern them, as the people of God, and a two-fold class of magistrates, to administer that portion of the law which related to God, and that portion of the law which related to man. So it also ought to be, and so it is prophesied it shall be, that every people shall be one united church and state, in which the ecclesiastical servants who teach the law of God, shall be agreed with the political servants who teach the law of man, and they shall no more oppose each other. <sup>F351</sup> Neither did Collier nor his followers perceive that the people may preserve their conviction that the authority of their ecclesiastical servants and of their political servants may be said to proceed from God, as certainly as the authority of a father and mother

proceeds from God; and yet, as I have already observed, as a most affectionate family may be compelled, with grief and tears, to take out a statute of lunacy against the most affectionate parent, to refuse obedience to his divinely-given authority, to depose their father from his place, and to decree the possession of the power over the family to their elder brother; so also a people may take out the statute of lunacy against their chief ecclesiastical servants, or their chief political servants, if the family is oppressed and injured by those very persons whose authority may still be said to be of divine origin, but of injurious exercise. Collier and the nonjurors did not perceive or acknowledge this. Foxe, by his severe denunciations of oppression, whether by the ecclesiastical or political servants of the people, compelled many of his readers to infer this conclusion; though he himself has never so far proceeded as to affirm it. Neither he nor they perceived that a christian church, state, or people are, or ought to be, all names for one and the same community, in which the several officers and servants sometimes clashed and differed. The nonjurors and the papists, therefore, hated the martyrologist, because the people inferred from his labors that even a divinely-appointed authority could not demand implicit and unremonstrating obedience when it was injurious to the nation whom it was intended to benefit; while the subjects who were compelled to be obedient to authority, admired and loved the pages, which taught them that the exercise of a divinely-originated authority might be fallible and injurious; and therefore, that, though they were still required as a church, or people, governed by the law of God, to obey their double rulers, yet their very obedience might be accompanied with remonstrance, and be limited, or qualified, according as that divine law regulated the people or the church, both in their capacity of rulers and of subjects. If this had been rightly understood, the nonjurors, and their followers, would not have hated the labors of John Foxe. This, and this alone, is the secret which secures to all classes of a people, the advantages of good ecclesiastical and civil government — that they thus consider their ecclesiastical and civil rulers as possessing a divinely-granted power, as the parents of one christian family; but that they demand that such divinely-originated power be exercised according to the law of God, and compatibly with the best interests of man. Simple as this truism may now appear to be, it is not even yet universally adopted. The papist people treat their ecclesiastical magistrates, or servants, as their irresponsible lords. The

antipapal people, who are not episcopal, treat their ecclesiastical servants as slaves. The episcopal people treat their ecclesiastical servants as fathers, and deem themselves neither their lords nor their slaves; but as their adult, free, religious and thoughtful children; acknowledging a divinely-given authority in the parent, but claiming to be governed by the divine law, which is granted for the service both of the parent and children — that power, freedom, toleration, religion, and union, may be blended together for the common peace and benefit of the one christian people, church, or family. Time, experience, and all the painful controversies and inconveniences of the past, have alone impressed these now common-place remarks upon nations and governments. *They are all founded upon the one truth, which is taught by the labors of John Foxe, that divinely-originated authority may be so exercised, that submission to its decrees is a crime, both against God and man* The papists thought otherwise respecting their ecclesiastical magistrates. The nonjurors thought otherwise respecting both their ecclesiastical and temporal magistrates. Both hated the martyrologist; and depreciated and undervalued his labors. Never, therefore, was any book so severely scrutinized as the Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. Collier was most conscientiously the eulogizer of authority for its own sake. He seems to watch for an opportunity of condemning Foxe, as the assertor of the privileges of the christian individual to think and judge freely. He writes as if he imagined that the *exercise of such freedom must uniformly, instead of casually, lead the individual into error*. He could not understand that this very privilege is the best safeguard to the divine authority of the church itself, because of the evidences upon which the religion of the church rests; while it is the best security, and the most vigilant protector, of the right exercise of that authority: and he so speaks of Foxe and of his efforts, that if it had been possible to have discovered any material error, or any notorious falsification of history, Collier, as the writer of the same ecclesiastical narrative through which Foxe had previously proceeded, would have exposed the fault, and triumphed in the exposure. The Acts and Monuments of Foxe were unavoidably well known, and were most familiar to Collier; we may believe, therefore, that he has enumerated every inaccuracy which his research enabled him to mention, he has only, however, from the whole mass of the immense materials collected by Foxe, gathered eighteen objections, five in the first

volume, and thirteen in the second volume, of his Ecclesiastical History, each of which I shall now proceed to consider.

That Collier had Foxe's Acts and Monuments constantly before him, appears from the frequent allusions to the book, even where no fault is found with it. Thus we read, on the question whether Sawtre was the first who suffered death by burning for heresy, that "Foxe is positive on this point, and affirms that king Henry IV. was the first of all the English kings that began the unmerciful burning of Christ's saints." <sup>F352</sup> Collier discusses in another place, whether a certain testimonial in favor of Wycliffe by the university of Oxford, was a forgery. He gives the arguments of Wood against the document; but adds that Foxe did not doubt its authenticity; without any censure on him for his credulity; though Collier believes also that the testimonial in favor of Wycliffe was a counterfeit. I mention these references to Foxe, to prove the probability that his work was generally kept in view by Collier throughout his history. I notice only the objections he produces.

**Objection 1.** Collier's first objection is, that "*the opinions of William Thorp, a lollard, who takes no notice, in his definition of a church, of the necessity of a regular mission, or apostolical succession, were approved by the martyrologist.*" Though he objects to Foxe's opinion, he considers him, at the same time, an undeniable authority, fully to be depended upon for his statements of facts. "I shall only observe," he says <sup>f353</sup> "that we have no reason to question the truth of the narrative of Thorp's trial, since that whole narrative was penned, as Foxe reports, by Thorp himself." Collier then goes on to say — *that a paper called Thorp's testament is approved by the martyrologist*, though it contains some very objectionable doctrines. "He exhorts the people to desert the communion of the church in consequence of the misbehaviour of the clergy: a doctrine which is opposed by the 26th article of the church of England. Yet Foxe calls him 'a good man, and a blessed martyr.'" "

**Answer 1.** A man may be "a good man and a blessed martyr," and hold many opinions which would be deemed objectionable. *Who will venture to say, that any one of the primitive or later martyrs, or archbishop Laud, or Cranmer, or Polycarp, or any other witness for*

the general mass of christian truth, *would deserve our approbation in every opinion* they had possibly formed on the points controverted among Christians? A man of holy and blameless life, worshipping Christ as divine, and holding the common faith, must be deemed “a good man, and a blessed martyr,” if he dies for religion, or no martyr ever existed. On referring, however, to Foxe, <sup>f354</sup> we find only that, as he had related the whole trim of Thorp, he adds, to use his own words, “We thought it not meet to leave out a treatise which came into our hands, under the name and title of His Testament; which treatise, by the matter and handling of it, might seem to be counted a complaint of vicious priests.” The paper is then given, and it proves, on inspection, to be what Collier describes it. It condemns the priesthood, but it relates to a period which, we may trust, has for ever gone by. If Collier had applied its remarks to the clergy of whom Foxe spoke, and considered only the period to which they applied, Collier would have agreed with Foxe. The censure against the popish clergy of the time in which Thorp lived, when Arundel was archbishop, and when Thorp was tried, we may justly thank God, is not applicable to the present day. Collier applies generally, the remarks which Thorp applied to the clergy of his own day more particularly. Foxe does not approve, either in this instance, or in the instance of Wycliffe, Huss, or any other of his martyrs, of all the sentiments they uttered. He relates their opposition to Rome, their opinions, and their martyrdom, in the same manner that Collier himself might have done: for, in the present instance, Collier himself says of Thorp, that, notwithstanding “Thorp was mistaken in some points, and his spirit too much embittered, he seems free from the impressions of interest, and boldly prepared for the worst that could happen.” Collier could not say less; Foxe did not say more.

**Objection 2.** Collier objects to Foxe’s mode of treating the history of Sir John Oldcastle. <sup>F355</sup>

**Answer 2.** “Oppression maketh a wise man mad.” (Ecclesiastes 7:7.) If a man wished to worship his God and Savior only, and not a saint or the Virgin, he was a heretic and a traitor, and deserved death. There was a meeting of the oppressed. The oppressors called the meeting a rebellion. The public records prove the fact of the meeting of a few

men, but they do not prove the crimes of intended treason or regicide. The matter has been already discussed even to tediousness. “Fuxe,” says Collier, “by questioning,” (and, he might have added, justly questioning, and therefore throwing great doubt upon the proofs,) “does but discover the strength of his wishes, and the bias of his inclination. I have no desire to charge this historian with insincerity, yet it is plain that his prejudices and passions governed his pen in some cases.”

**Objection 3.** Collier censures *Fuxe for the mannner in which he has discussed the narrative of Augustine’s conversation with the British bishops*. “Fuxe,” says Collier, “acknowledges that Augustine wrought miracles; and then he speaks of him with very coarse language for not rising to the Welsh bishops, in calling Augustine ‘his lordship so high, so heavy, and so proud.’” <sup>F356</sup>

**Answer 3.** Fuxe’s credulity in believing Augustine’s miracles justified him in anticipating from Augustine greater humility. There is a want of philosophy in this conduct of Fuxe which Collier has not noticed, and which I shall not stop to discuss. But, without losing any of our respect for Augustine, as the ecclesiastic who, with all the faults of his age, had all the goodness of his age, we are compelled to confess that his demeanour towards the christian prelates who, as bishops, were equal, by the ordinance of Christ, either to the bishop of Rome, or to Augustine himself, was not very conciliatory. There were seven bishops present; no bishop accompanied *him*. <sup>F357</sup> It was at least ungracious in him not to rise on their approach, and they might well argue, that a man who would thus act towards them would soon assume the authority of a master. His answer to them, upon their refusal to receive his mission, is most intemperate. Gregory himself appears to have found it necessary to keep in subjection this spirit of Augustine, by reminding him that he had no authority over the Gallican bishops, and “that he ought not to put his sickle into another man’s corn.” <sup>F358</sup> He was also cautioned against being too much elated with his success. <sup>F359</sup> These historical facts, we may believe, had not escaped Fuxe, and they might draw from him the sentence with which Collier is so scandalized. Yet Collier himself admits that Augustine

“had some of the infirmity of human nature about him; that he gave too broad signs of his superiority, and pushed his claims too far.” <sup>F360</sup>

Foxe expresses this very same sentiment, but he uses more plain language than Collier.

**Objection 4.** “Foxe states that king John among divers conditions belonging to him, had one which is not in him to be reprehended, but commended rather, for when the king saw a fat stag broken up, he said, ‘How easily and happily he has lived, and yet, for all that, *he never heard any mass*’” <sup>f361</sup>

**Answer 4.** On referring to the passage in Foxe which Collier condemns, I find that while Foxe was unjustifiable, Collier is uncandid. The expression of the martyrologist is — “*the popish mass.*” This Collier omits. That which Foxe would not reprehend in king John is, to use his own words, <sup>f362</sup> “that being far from the superstition which kings at that time were commonly subject to, he regarded not the popish mass.” Then follows the profane allusion to the stag. Yet nothing can justify language of this kind. Collier was right in condemning it; Foxe was wrong in approving it. But Collier informs us, in the next paragraph, of the reason for which he thus criticizes the language of the martyrologist, and it is only another specimen of the unfairness with which Foxe was treated. “I had passed over,” says Collier, “these exceptions against Foxe, if he had not taken the freedom to blemish the public records.” This accusation made me search very carefully to see whether Collier alleged any one single proof whatever of its truth. He mentions none — not one! I, therefore, deem the assertion itself, after the opposite testimony which I find, to be an insufficient demonstration of its truth. Collier, like the great majority of his school, had a “*personal dislike*” to Foxe’s book. He goes on, in the same paragraph, to insinuate, for he does not affirm, that Foxe did not carefully distinguish between “martyrdom and treason.” He meant to say, between heresy and treason, which he well knew could not be done, for the laws of Henry IV., <sup>f363</sup> the ecclesiastical authorities, the people, and the influence of the priesthood upon the people, had identified the two crimes; and the act of parliament at Leicester identified them by the public law.

**Objection 5.** “Foxe says that a council may depose a pope, and illustrates it thus: ‘For like *as oftentimes kings which do wickedly govern the commonwealth and exercise cruelty are deprived of their kingdoms*, even so ‘tis not to be doubted but that bishops of Rome may be deposed by the church.’” f364

**Answer 5.** Collier was a Jacobite, and believed, with certain of our modern Oxford theologians, *that the people of England had committed a sin*, when they made their deliverer from the assumption of irresponsible authority in church and state, and therefore from tyranny and despotism, their ruler instead of James the Second. *Foxe does not tell us that kings ought to be deposed*; he certainly infers that such deposition is not criminal, when they violate their own laws. This question is one of those on which silence is better than discussion. Our theory, that the king can do no wrong, will ever, I trust, prevent the future necessity of such discussion. We may hope that no popishly-affected sovereign will ever again call forth the national indignation and jealousy; more especially as we are not governed by an individual or person only, but by three estates of the realm, of which an individual is but one; and the ordinances of men to which we are required to submit, as Christians, for the Lord’s sake, make the individual sovereign supreme, according to known laws and well-defined institutions. But Foxe was not wrong in the principle which his Jacobite critic condemns, — “that in every well-ordered kingdom, it ought especially to be desired that the whole realm should be of more authority than the king, which if it happened contrary, it were not to be called a kingdom, but a tyranny.” Collier calls this a republican topic. It is the truth, which has been abused to republicanism, and to all kinds of folly and wickedness; but it is the truth which is implied in every text of Scripture, which gives duties to the sovereigns as well as to the people; and it is the foundation of, ‘ill the greatness, freedom, and prosperity of the English monarchy itself; which is so protected and so limited by the laws, that while it can do no wrong, it can do much right, and secure the love, without incurring the hatred of the people.

**Objection 6.** “Foxe,” says Collier, “*misrepresents Wolsey, by charging him with using the expression, ‘Ego, et rex meus;’* whereas he was charged only with the presumption of uniting the king’s name

with his own, and even then placing the king's name first; — 'The king and *I would you should* do this.'"

**Answer 6.** *Foxe charges the cardinal with using the expression in his letters to Rome.* Collier refers to the articles of impeachment; Foxe to the popular accusation. Foxe gives only the summary of the allegations against Wolsey in eight short sentences.<sup>F365</sup> Collier gives the whole impeachment in more than four folio, double-columned, pages.<sup>F366</sup> The only error of Foxe is, that he mentions the popular accusation, as if it had been one of the actual articles of the impeachment.

**Objection 7.** Foxe is censured for *representing cardinal Wolsey as the pattern by which we are to judge and censure the hierarchy in general.*<sup>F367</sup>

**Answer 7.** If Collier had observed the marginal note in Foxe, he would have seen Foxe's meaning more plainly. Bilney, of whom Foxe is speaking, was indignant at the "pomp and pride of the pope mid cardinals;" and from them he turned to censure "the bishops and clergy." Both Bilney and *Foxe, if they did censure the hierarchy, could only refer to the contemporaries of Wolsey;* and I am sure that Collier himself, if he had reflected, would have joined in that condemnation.

**Objection 8.** *Foxe says, that those who murdered cardinal Beaton were stirred up to do so by the Lord;*<sup>f368</sup> and Collier justly asks, whether the Lord stirs up men to wrest the sword out of the magistrate's hand, and whether stabbing a nobleman is a proof of divine impulse?

**Answer 8.** *Foxe calls the crime a murder, and therefore he condemned it.* But Foxe, in common with some men in all ages, was too much accustomed to attribute *any* unexpected retribution to the immediate interposition of God. He uses the common language of all parties in the day in which he lived, in thus assigning to the providence and agency of God, the actions of men which seemed to inflict a punishment, corresponding to the greatness of a crime. I condemn all such language, as most unjustifiable.

**Objection 9.** “Foxe calls Gardiner ‘an insensible ass,’ and says that he had no feeling of God’s Spirit in the matter of justification.” Collier mentions this because there is a vein of satire and coarse language running through the Acts and Monuments. <sup>F369</sup>

**Answer 9.** Foxe wrote with the impetuosity of a man who felt the importance of his subject, remembered the past, and trembled for the future. It is certainly considered coarse language *now* to call a bishop “an insensible ass.” When he said that Gardiner had no feeling of God’s Spirit in the matter of justification, *Foxe perhaps means that the bishop’s conduct proved that he was not accepted in the sight of God.* I can only observe that the language of all controversialists, with few exceptions, at that time, would not be endurable at present. *I am defending Foxe’s veracity, not his taste.*

**Objection 10.** Foxe is censured for *comparing the alarm which took place among the guards, at the execution of the duke of Somerset, to that which seized the officers of the high priest when they seized our Lord.* Collier calls this an odd, not to say profane, parallel. <sup>F370</sup>

**Answer 10.** This was the style of writing of the time. The simile is *between the alarm which arose, in both cases, and not between the person of our Savior and the duke.* <sup>F371</sup>

**Objection 11.** Foxe is charged *with being inconsistent, in sometimes praising the duke of Somerset, sometimes pointing out defects in his character and conduct.* <sup>F372</sup>

**Answer 11.** *This is a proof of his sincerity;* he praised what was laudable, and censured what was blameworthy. <sup>F373</sup>

**Objection 12.** Foxe is censured for *having been so calm* when describing Wyatt’s rebellion. <sup>F374</sup>

**Answer 12.** He calls it a *rebellion;* that marks his opinion of its character. The exact mode of dealing with a subject, especially negatively, is no ground of criticism. <sup>F375</sup>

**Objection 13.** *Foxe is censured for attacking the duke of Suffolk’s servant, and calling him “traitor.”* <sup>F376</sup>

**Answer 13.** Is not that man a traitor who betrays a trust imposed in him? The man might be no traitor to the crown, since it was his duty to reveal treason; but *he was a traitor to his master*, and that doubly, since he had promised to keep his secret. <sup>F377</sup>

**Objection 14.** Foxe is censured for affirming that the insanity of judge Morgan was a punishment for having condemned lady Jane Grey. <sup>F378</sup>

**Answer 14.** This is another instance of the feeling mentioned before, respecting Heaton; and the same answer applies <sup>f379</sup>

**Objection 15.** Foxe is censured for *ridiculing the prayers* made when it was supposed that queen Mary was likely to present the nation with a prince. <sup>F380</sup>

**Answer 15.** He *ridiculed the mistake*, not the prayers; others did so; there were satirical verses composed on the occasion. <sup>F381</sup>

**Objection 16.** Foxe is *censured for the marginal note* placed opposite the passage last mentioned. It was, “Cry up louder, you priests; peradventure your God is asleep.” <sup>F382</sup>

**Answer 16.** *This custom* of clothing our political opinions, or controversial conclusions, in the language of Scripture, *is common* to the bulls of the popes, the sermons of puritans, papists, high churchmen; low churchmen, and to every sectarian who ever formed an opinion either in religion or politics, and who took that part in public discussions, which entitled him to address his brethren. The bulls of the popes more especially abound with this mode of affirming the conclusions or opinions of the writer. <sup>F383</sup> Foxe’s allusion is made to Elijah’s reply to the priests of Baal. I pass no opinion on the expediency of this custom, because the right, or wrong, of so quoting the holy Scriptures, must depend on each particular instance, when the quotation is made; but Foxe only observed the universal custom of all, and every party; and he ought not to be too severely condemned. Even lord Clarendon quotes the sacred writings in that manner which illustrates his own views of historical events; as the puritans, against whom he wrote, quoted other texts to illustrate more ignoble views.

**Objection 17.** Foxe is censured for *misrepresenting Ridley's letter respecting auricular confession*. Ridley approved of the practice. Foxe, in the margin, says that confession is to be made by way of asking counsel, and thus gives a different colouring to Ridley's meaning. <sup>F384</sup>

**Answer 17.** Foxe *has not meddled with the text*, but left it to speak for itself. Ridley and Foxe agree in the main points, viz. that confession is expedient, not absolutely necessary; and that the priest is the adviser, not the judge, of the penitent. In these points, both differed from Rome. Foxe's "asking counsel," too, is implied in Ridley's terms, "*instructed, reprov'd, and comforted;*" how could the latter be given without the former having taken place? I see no contradiction. I see only a marvellous anxiety to prove Foxe in the wrong.

**Objection 18.** Foxe is censured *for praising -Elizabeth for her forbearance*, though she had permitted Sampson and Humphreys to be deprived. <sup>F385</sup>

**Answer 18.** *I see nothing to censure here;* if it be meant by Collier as a censure, it is a very pointless one.

This terminates the objections of Collier; and I rejoice to find that though this nonjuring divine disliked the labors of John Foxe, he was too honest to lavish upon him the abuse which that "*personal dislike*" originated, with Andrews, Parsons, and others. In the single instance in which he accuses him of destroying documents, he gives no proof of the truth of the charge; and my respect for Collier compels me to believe that he too hastily credited the slander of Parsons. He justly condemns the deficient taste, and the unmeasured language, which sometimes characterise the pages of Foxe; *but he has said nothing to disprove "his veracity and fidelity;"* the points in which alone the reader is interested, and with which alone I am concerned to deal. I accept the silence of Collier on these points, as a proof that nothing of any great importance could be alleged by him against either; and the martyrologist, therefore, escapes from this ordeal also, unharmed and scatheless. His authority is not shaken. His book is not proved to be valueless. Our fathers and their sons who esteem it are not yet proved to be fools.

### 3. Robert Parsons, Or Persons,

The contemporary, and the most unsparing and inveterate of the enemies of the church of England, and of the antagonists, therefore, of John Foxe, is the next on my list of the assailants of “the *veracity and fidelity*” of the martyrologist. I beg the more especial attention of the reader to the labors of this remarkable jesuit. Distinguished when tutor of Baliol, for six years, <sup>f386</sup> as the most learned and zealous of the opponents of popery, and as the most indefatigable introducer of protestant books into the college library, he changed his religious principles; and became the consistent and conscientious papist. He transferred to the church of Rome the same zeal and devoted attachment, which he had hitherto dedicated to the church of England. He believed, and he acted upon the belief, that the bishop of Rome was the divinely-appointed head of the church of Christ, and that he possessed, as such, the power to excommunicate, not only subjects, but kings and princes, if they refused submission to his supremacy. It was beautifully said of Fletcher of Saltoun, that he would have given his life to serve his country, but he would not have done a base thing even to save it. With Parsons, and the other jesuits, half the saying is true — they would have given their lives to serve Rome, but they believed they might do many base things both to serve, and to save it. *The mistakes of the conscientious are the tares in the field of the church.* Such was Parsons. He believed that if the bishop of Rome excommunicated a prince, such prince is from that moment deposed, and his subjects are freed from all their oaths of allegiance; and not only so, but that they might and ought to remove him from his authority, as an apostate, a heretic, a forsaker of Christ, and an enemy to the common-wealth. <sup>f387</sup> This doctrine, as I have elsewhere formerly shown, <sup>f388</sup> was taught in the canon law — preached by the jesuits — approved by their superiors — and acted upon by their agents and partizans. The queen of England had been excommunicated by the bishop of Rome. The curse of Pius V. had been denounced against every member of the church of Rome who obeyed her as queen after the 25th of February, 1569. The northern rebellion took place in England in the same year. Dr. Story was executed in 1570, for the plot to organize a foreign invasion of England. The Spanish ambassador fled the country in the following year, on having been detected in a plot against the life of the sovereign, to whom he had been sent as the messenger of peace: conduct

which violated the law of nations. Rebellions were planned and broke out in Ireland, on the same account, in the year 1574, two years after the massacre of St. Bartholomew in Paris, and in the very year when Parsons changed his principles, resigned his tutorship, and proceeded to Louvaine, Padua, and Rome. The history of the reign of Elizabeth derives its principal interest from the fact that England was the protector of the Christianity of antiquity and of the reformation, against the novelties, and the unchanging errors of Rome, — and that one universal war, both of secret conspiracy and open violence, was maintained against her, to restore the ascendancy of Rome and the supremacy of its bishop over the church and state of England. And England never fulfils its high destiny more certainly, as the benefactor and example to mankind, than when it thus acts as the defender of the true faith against the “world in arms.” Three times already it has thus been honored. It defended Christianity against popery, though all the power of the continent was arrayed against it, in the reign of Elizabeth. It protected the same faith against the same enemy, and against the armed continent, in the reign of William. It rescued the common Christianity against another enemy — the French infidelity, when the continent was again armed for the destruction of England. It is greatest in the hour of the greatest danger, when it thus remembers its lofty rank. Many, however, even of its own subjects, in the reign of Elizabeth, did not comprehend this high destiny of their country; and the *danger of the sovereign was greater* at one period from *the domestic traitor, than from the foreign enemy*. One bond of religious agreement united both. Both were sincere. Both were the enemies of England. The papist of the continent was joined together with the papist of England. Both believed that the end justified the means. Both imagined that he who killed a royal heretic, did God service. Both changed their “religion into treason, and their faith into faction.” Both were convinced that they would save their own souls, and the souls of others also, if they could overthrow the heretical state, and the heretical episcopacy of England. Both were persuaded that the destruction of protestantism in the church, state, and people of England, was essential to the happiness of mankind, and the honor and glory of God; and that such destruction, therefore, was to be accomplished by all means, and at all hazards.

No one individual, with the exception perhaps of Edmund Campian, was more deeply impressed with these convictions, than the jesuit Robert Parsons, after he forsook the church of England, and his tutor-ship at Oxford. Having been admitted into the society of the Jesuits, in the year following his leaving Oxford, <sup>f389</sup> he devoted his great talents, his profound learning, his fierce zeal, his restless turbulence, and his ardent piety, <sup>f390</sup> to the cause of the canon law, and the bishop of Rome, as the rule of the discipline, and as the supreme head, of the church of Christ. He is the most illustrious instance on record, that the Romanists are most zealous in their hatred of the church of England, when they are most pious and most religious: and, therefore, that, in the same proportion as they are to be respected for their sincerity, they are to be dreaded, *till they change*, for their mistaken enmity to the true Christianity of the gospel and church of Christ. Parsons, immediately on his change of principle, surrendered his soul and body to the work of destroying the purer religion so successfully established in England. He procured the changing of the hospital at Rome, founded in the reign of Mary, into a college, or seminary, for English students: where an oath was taken by the pupils to assume holy orders, and to return into England to convert the English to Romanism. He then ventured, at the risk of his life, to come to England with Campian, to communicate to the adherents of the church of Rome, a dispensation for their outward obedience to the queen, till the time arrived when they might throw off the mask; but he entirely put an end to the custom of attending the parish churches, which had hitherto prevailed among them in spite of the bull of Pius V. absolving the subject from his allegiance to the queen. The Romanist laity would have remained the quiet obeyers of the laws, if the influence of the jesuits and of the priests had not been exerted to render them disobedient and rebellious. Having succeeded in these great objects, and being in danger of apprehension through the vigilance of Burleigh, he returned to the continent, and to the college at Rome, of which he was now made the superior; and in the year 1587, while the armada was being fitted out for the destruction of the church and state of England, he went to Spain to encourage the invasion of England, to assert the title of the Spanish Infanta to the crown of Elizabeth, and to require the English students and priests in Spain to support the Spanish claim. He procured the expulsion of those English youths from the jesuit colleges, who refused to be employed against their country; and when the Armada, with its

thumbscrews and other instruments of torture, had, by God's mercy upon us, totally failed, he endeavored to form a continental league against England, in favor of the queen of Scots. He attempted to induce the king of Spain to make another effort: and when that failed, he was no less indefatigable in endeavoring to excite rebellions in England, and to organize confederacies against his own country, under the duke of Parma, the king of France, and the king of Spain. When the chief Romanist ecclesiastic in England, the archpresbyter of England, as the bishop of Rome styled him, Blackwell, had taken the oath of allegiance and supremacy to James the First; father Parsons, as the prefect of the English mission, deprived him of his office. He obtained a brief from Paul V. to deprive all priests who took the same oath. He increased the jealousy of the government against the papists. He prevented the possibility of union among the English, by rendering the more moderate of his own party hateful to the more zealous; while the common people, who abhorred the thought of popery, identified the moderate with the zealous. He obtained more influence over the members of his church than any ecclesiastic of his age; and the effects of that influence still remain in the institutions for the education of the partizans of Rome, at Douay, St. Omers, Lisbon, Rome, and Spain; yielding a constant supply of agents for that schismatical and papistical intrusion, into the dioceses of the protestant episcopal church, which is impertinently called "the English mission."

Against the efforts of such men as father Parsons and his successors, the English people not only opposed, with success, the laws of the state, the discipline of their church, the freedom of their institutions, and the intense love of truth which has ever characterized the Saxon race; but they opposed also the *one deep conviction which was principally enforced upon the public mind by the labors of John Foxe*, that the dominion and supremacy of Rome, were alike fatal to liberty, religion, and the common happiness; that it always had persecuted, whenever it was able; and that it always would persecute, by punishing with bodily torments blameless opinions, or undoubted truths, if it again had the power to do so. While the labors of John Foxe, therefore, remained unassailed, the zealous jesuit perceived that he must despair of succeeding in his endeavors to recommend the supremacy of Rome to the common people. The continent was arming; the armada was sailing; <sup>f391</sup> but Foxe was read in the churches

and in the houses of the people; and the voice of lamentation, mourning, and woe, which sounded from the scroll of that prophet, awakened alike the patriotism, the fears, the gratitude, the piety, and the sterner courage of the people. Foxe fanned the flame at home, which darted forth its fires of indignant bravery, and armed the nation both against the Spanish invader, and the papal traitor. When Parsons, therefore, perceived that every intrigue had failed — that the Armada was defeated — that plans of foreign invasion and of domestic treachery had proved alike abortive — he attempted, but too late, to destroy the reputation of the book which had so long excited the people to the love of antipapal freedom, and antipapal truth. Parsons was already well known as an author, and was justly reckoned among the best writers of the age. He had published his Discourse on the Reasons why Catholics should refuse to go to their Parish Churches; his Defence of the Mission into England; and the Christian Directory. He had published also that book, which, from that time to the present, has rendered his name most familiar to the students of the political history of England, the “Conference of the Next Succession to the Crown of England.”<sup>F392</sup> He now resolved to attack the ponderous volumes of John Foxe, to proceed through the whole work, and to undeceive the people, if he could prove the martyrologist to be in error. If it had been possible to have shaken the confidence of the English in the details given by Foxe, it would have been done by father Parsons. He had abundant opportunity to collect materials from among the surviving relations, friends, or enemies of the victims of the Marian persecutions. Talent, zeal, the command of the public attention, bitter hatred against the church and cause he had deemed it right to forsake, — all combined to render him the fittest person to test the “*veracity and fidelity*” of the martyrologist; and he has compiled a work from which nearly all succeeding writers against John Foxe have borrowed their chief materials.

It is comprised in five volumes, written with great care; and it is essential to the completeness of this survey of the assailants of John Foxe to review the whole work of father Parsons. The subject indeed is exhausted, but I will proceed with the details of this principal attack on the martyrologist as briefly as possible.

The five volumes were published, with the license of his superiors, in 1603. The slavery in which the papistical authors rejoiced, did not allow

them to obtain the privilege of publishing controversial works without permission. He did not, however, prefix his own name to the volumes. He had written or compiled, in 1694, the *Conference on the Succession of the Throne*, under the reigned name of Doleman. In 1599 he published a reply to a treatise of sir Francis Hastings, under the title of “A Temperate Wardword.” He combined the reigned name and the allusion to this last-named treatise, in his title-pages to the five volumes, and published them as the work of N. D., author of the Wardword. It is difficult to assign reasons for his doing so, as the name Parsons was as well known as Doleman. As to his attack on the “Acts and Monuments,” it resembles that of other Romish assailants. *He does not discover*, as we might have expected, *errors in the facts or narratives of John Foxe*, — the point in which we are principally interested. He deals less with *facts* than with *opinions*. He takes for granted the certainty, infallibility, orthodoxy, antiquity, and undoubted truth of every opinion he has formed, and every conclusion at which he has arrived; and he freely expresses his no less undoubted conviction that all who differ with him in these conclusions are in damnable error. His work is compiled, therefore, against the opinions rather than against any discovered errors of the martyrologist; and Foxe is dealt with throughout, not according to his conclusions, not according to his researches, not according to his facts and narratives, — but according to his agreement with father Parsons.

The title to the first volume of Parsons is — “A Treatise of Three Conversions of England from Paganism to Christian Religion; the First under the Apostles in the first age after Christ; the Second under Eleutherius and Lucius; the Third under Gregory the Great and King Ethelbert; divided into three parts, and dedicated to the Catholics of England, with a Blew Addition to the said Catholics on the News of the late Queen’s Death, and Succession of his Majesty (King James the First) to the Crown of England. By BY. D., author of the Watchword.” Deuteronomy 4:23, is quoted as the motto — “Inquire of antient tymes before you,” etc. etc., or, as it is rendered in our translation, “Ask now of the days that are past, which were before you,” etc.. etc.. It is the text which is usually quoted by those who would clothe in the language of the Scriptures, their opinion that the fathers were wiser than the sons, in

retaining opinions, which the softs may be supposed anxious to reject. Foxe's name is not mentioned in the title-page.

The book opens with an account of the general contents of the treatise, which he divides into three parts, all of which he declares to be written against Foxe. The first part, concerning the three conversions, he informs us "was begun against sir Francis Hastings, but it is enlarged against John Foxe, his false Acts and Monuments."

The second part "searcheth out the beginning, state, and progress of the protestant religion from age to age, and is against the whole course of John Foxe his said Acts and Monuments, from Christ's tyme to this, especially against the former part thereof, from the primitive church downward to the tyme of king Henry the Eighth."

The third part "examineth more particularly the second volume of Foxe his Acts and Monuments, wherein he treateth of new martyrs and confessors of the church, placed by him in an ecclesiastical calendar."

The whole of Parsons's five volumes, therefore, are expressly written against the work of John Foxe: with what success we shall now proceed to examine.

Vol. I. — He dedicates the first volume to the catholics of England, meaning by the word "catholic" the *papal, not the antipapal Christians of the country*; the true episcopal, anti-arian catholics. In this dedication he lauds their "loyal behavior of duty towards their temporal prince in all worldly affairs." Yet he calls Elizabeth their "old persecutor," and expresses his hope in an additional paper, that James would become a convert to papalism. After a preface on the general subject of Christianity, he begins by stating, that the scope of the work is to show that, upon three several occasions, England has received the christian faith from Rome; first, under the apostles; secondly, under Eleutherius; and thirdly, under Gregory; and that the faith: received at each period was identically the same as that of modern Rome. The *argument* is this. St. Peter came to Rome in the third year of the reign of Claudius; Claudius went into: Britain; there *probably* were many Christians at Rome at this time; it is *probable* that some of them would go with him into Britain. Christianity would necessarily extend in England in proportion with its extension in

Rome. At page 14, he conjectures that St. Peter himself may have preached here.

This is the amount of his proof, upon which we need not waste many words; for, admitting that all his conjectures, as to the fact, that many Christians came from Rome to; Britain, were undoubtedly true, as I believe they were, we have not the shadow of a proof that they taught any other doctrines than those which the antipapal church of England teaches. This is not the place to discuss the question, yet I shall observe here, that even Baronius, A.D. 35. Section 5, quotes a MS. in the Vatican, which says that Joseph of Arimathea founded our church. Gildas says that the light of Christianity reached us “tempore sumtoo Tiberii Caesaris.” Now, Tiberius died 17 cal. April, A.D. 39. (Sueton. in Tiber. cap. 73;) and Baronius fixes the origin of the church of Rome, 15 cal. Feb. A.D. 45. (Baron. A.D. 45. Section 1.) The church of Christ therefore in England, is the elder sister of the church of Christ in Rome, according to the very best papal, not protestant, authority.

Parsons then enters upon a long discussion, the object of which is to prove that the Britons did not at the beginning differ from the Romans in the celebration of Easter, but that this error arose at a comparatively late period of their history. It is unnecessary to follow him through all this.

The second part begins with an account of the conversion under Lucius by pope Eleutherius. The whole story is mysterious. Its truth depends upon the authority of Gildas. From him it is adopted by Beda. Usher has already shown the chronological difficulties with which it is beset, and his work should be consulted. It seems strange that, if Lucius had Roman teachers, and conformed to the church of Rome, there should have been such a prejudice in the minds of the British bishops against Augustine, and that there should have been such striking differences in doctrine and discipline. The speech of Colman <sup>f393</sup> gives us a key to the whole, by referring the origin of the British mode of celebrating Easter to St. John. From Ephesus it came to Gaul, and from Gaul to Britain.

All the subsequent discussion upon this question may be safely omitted, for we cannot argue upon the doctrines of Lucius when we have no documents whereon to rest a single opinion; though Foxe is called the “jangling Foxe” for rejecting the supposed tradition.

The conversion under St. Augustine follows, and it is the most important discussion of all, as far as Foxe is concerned. At the outset it must be admitted that Augustine and Gregory have scarcely had justice done them by Foxe. He seems to have been afraid of them. It is very important for us to admit the authority of Gregory, since he is a highly valuable witness against Rome as she is now. Yet Parsons admits that Foxe sometimes did Augustine justice. On the next page he is displeased with Foxe's impartiality in first praising what he considered a miracle, and then finding fault with his hauteur towards the British bishops. Yet this is the true way to estimate character; Foxe neither blindly praised, nor blindly censured.

I may add here, in reference to the miracle mentioned by Beda, (and admitted by Foxe,) that the person on whom Augustine performed it, was an Angle; that the proposed proof of the superior claims of Augustine was suggested by Augustine himself, <sup>f394</sup> and that the Britons were unwilling to have their orthodoxy tested by such a criterion. If all Augustine's miracles were of a similarly doubtful character, they do not make out a strong case for him.

At page 206, Parsons enters upon his proof that we owe all our religion to Rome, through Augustine. Even if this were true, it proves nothing; but it is not true; for he carefully conceals the fact., that, excepting Kent, Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk, the whole of England was converted by the Scottish monks, who were essentially the same in doctrine and discipline as the British. There is also another error which runs through the whole argument; it is this — he argues for the truth of modern Romanism, from the truth of primitive Christianity. (See pages 216, 217, etc.) Foxe is abused in every page for affirming an opposite opinion; but his Pacts are not disputed.

Parsons now passes rapidly over the history of England from Augustine to William the Conqueror, pausing only to notice the liberality of Canute in the building of monasteries, etc. He forgot to mention that Canute's bad title made him glad to have the aid of the clergy. At the beginning of his reign he had seen bishops and abbots in the field of battle against him, and he knew their influence too well to despise it. Nor do we hear anything of the liberties which Canute took with the clergy in legislating for them in spiritual matters, such as celibacy, fasts, and festivals, etc.

The remainder of the volume is a general outline of what is afterwards to be discussed in detail. The only thing which appears to be worthy of notice is the quotation made from Riche's Speech, which is said to prove that "the heart of the people was wholly against these innovations in religion, at the commencement of the reformation." If the quotation and inference are correct, we may set against them the better testimony of Tunstall, in his letter to cardinal Pole, where he says that the body of the English nation was weary of the papal yoke. Yet even in this very page where the opinion of Foxe is condemned, he is quoted as an authority, whose "*veracity and fidelity*" may be depended upon, when he relates the facts of history.

Vol. II. — We come to volume the second. The arrangement of Parsons's materials is here somewhat confused. He professes to inquire where the protestant church was, up to the time of Henry VIII. The volume exhibits the usual assumptions, false premises, false conclusions, etc. which the Romanists always employ when treating this question.

In page 277, he discusses the importance and value of the apostolical succession, against the notions of Foxe and others, on the invisibility and visibility of the church. As we by God's mercy have retained the succession, without its errors, it is unnecessary to enter upon the question, which, as far as Foxe and Parsons are concerned, is rather one of metaphysics than theology.

Parsons reasons absurdly about the relative bulk of the different parts of Foxe's history. His history is of course fullest upon those passages respecting which he had the fullest information.

The next hundred pages are taken up in an attempt to show that the faith generally professed in Europe (not in England particularly, for Parsons owns that there are no documents for this) was the same as the modern Romish doctrine. This belongs to the general question between the two churches, and is not connected with Foxe.

At page 352, Parsons begins with Gregory and Augustine; and at page 362, he proceeds to test Foxe's historical accuracy, by examining his account of the proceedings of one council, and detects two errors at the outset; one in the date, A.D. 680, instead of 673, and another in the place — Thetford

instead of Hertford. In the first, Foxe is certainly wrong; he probably confounded the council of Hertford with that of Hatfield, which last was held A.D. 680: in the second it is doubtful, for the place is not exactly known, and “Herutford,” as written in the MS., might have been as like “Thetford” as “Hertford”; and Henry of Huntingdon says “Thetford.”

Here I meet with the first charge of any real importance against Foxe. *It is the accusation of a wilful falsehood.* The case is this: -

The council of Whitby had decreed that Easter should be observed in England in the manner adopted in the church of Rome. The council of Thetford, or Hertford, or Herutford, confirms that decision. Easter-day was commanded to be the first Sunday after the fourteenth day of the new moon, in the first month of the year. The words of Beda <sup>f395</sup> are — “Ut sanctum diem Paschae in commune, omnes servemus dominica post quartam decimam lunam mensis primi.” Foxe relates all the decisions of the council in an abridged form. Parsons accuses him of so translating the above words of Bede, as to lead his readers to believe that the council decided against the Roman custom of keeping Easter; thereby to justify the oriental error. “Foxe,” says Parsons, “*without shame or conscience, putteth in, or putteth out, what he thought best, to make these fathers speak in favor of a condemned heresie.*” <sup>f396</sup> This is a serious charge. Let us first extract the very words of Foxe. The decree of the council was, says Foxe, <sup>f397</sup> — “That Easter-day should be uniformly kept and observed, through the whole realm, upon one certain day, videlicet, prima 14 luna mensis primi.”

The accusation of Parsons is, that “Foxe leaves out the word. dominica; and then for ‘post 14 lunam,’ written at large in Bede, he putteth in ‘prima 14 luna,’ short, in numbers only, to make it more obscure, adding ‘prima’ of his own; and putting out ‘post’ from the words of the council, thereby to make the sense more clear in favor of the heresy. For that *prima 14 luna mensis primi*, the words do signifie the fourteenth day of the first moone of March expressly. And moreouer, he addeth of his owne these words, *upon one certayne day*, which the decree hath not.

Meaninge thereby that this 14 day must be obserued with such *certainty* as it may not be altered or differred to any Sunday; but must be obserued as an immouable feast.” <sup>f398</sup>

I accept these remarks of Parsons as a proof of his anxious desire to find some undoubted inaccuracy in Foxe; and of the difficulty of his doing so. Foxe has not in any respect altered or falsified Bede. His translation does not vary from that of Bede. By omitting “dominica,” and giving “prima,” he gives the same sense with Bede, who omits “prima,” and mentions “dominica;” whereas both words ought to have been mentioned by the two writers. The oriental opinion respecting Easter-day was, that it might fall on any day of the week, provided only that it was observed on the third day after the fourteenth day of the moon, in the appointed month. There is not one allusion whatever in Foxe to prove that he adopted the oriental opinion; or that he desired to insinuate, in this instance, that the Roman custom was incorrect. The adopting the word “prima,” even though the word “dominica” is omitted, makes the decision of the council more clear, rather than more obscure. If he had written “tertia,” instead of “prima,” there might have been some apparent foundation for Parsons’s objection. The omission of the word “post,” and writing “14,” instead of “quartam decimam,” has nothing to do with the question. *Parsons’s allegation is therefore an indefensible mistake.*

In page 367, we are presented with what Parsons calls one of Foxe’s garbled quotations. Foxe is quoting the proceedings of the same council, on the subject of the celibacy of the clergy. The council decided that no man should put away his wife, but for the gospel reasons; and if he did even this, if he wished to be considered a more perfect Christian, he would not take another. Foxe omits the latter part of the decision of the council. He might otherwise have been led into the discussion of the doctrines of celibate perfection so curiously maintained by Rome; for the words of the council were, “si Christianus esse recte voluerit nulli alteri jungetur,” etc. Here is no garbled quotation. He quoted sufficiently for his purpose, and proceeded to other matters.

In page 370, Parsons is angry with Foxe for omitting the proceedings of another synod. It might have been inserted for aught of Romanism that it favors.

Now page follows after page, of most indefinite and vague matter respecting the faith of the church of England. A few quotations from contemporary authors would have been worth all this declamation. He

goes on without alluding to anything which tells against the popedom; nothing of William's answer to the pope, nothing of Henry II., nothing of Grostete, nothing of Edward I. nor Edward III. All are avoided; and nothing is said to invalidate Foxe.

In page 487, we have Wyclif's erroneous doctrines carefully pointed out, but nothing is said on those errors in faith and practice, in the church of Rome, which Wyclif censured.

In page 547, Parsons commences his survey of the reign of Henry VIII. Parsons here attempts to prove the inconsistency of Foxe in first calling Henry a reformer, and then showing that he persecuted the reformers. Both facts are true. He was a reformer, because *he threw off the papal yoke*; and yet he was not a reformer, for he *retained all the doctrines of Rome*, excepting some very important ones, respecting the use of the Scriptures.

In page 576 there is the same matter as we shall find in Harpsfield about Colyns, Cowbridge, Erasmus, Mirandula, etc.; and the remainder of the volume is a general history of the times. He does not attempt to deny one single martyrdom mentioned by Foxe, nor to show that in any one fact connected with these cruelties he has departed from the truth; and this is the sole and only question, which is in the least degree interesting to the modern reader.

Vol. III. — We are brought to the Third Volume. The general object of the whole of this volume is to prove that those individuals whom Foxe has inserted in his calendar as martyrs (witnesses of the truth) were, in reality, executed either for opinions which *we* would reject as heretical, or for treason, or for some crime against the government of the land. I have already commented on the use of the word "martyr." Foxe calls Wyclif a martyr. In the usual acceptation of the word, the reformer was not so; he was a confessor. Yet he may be justly called a martyr.

The temper with which this volume is written will appear from a few extracts. In the account of John Tudson, whose martyrdom is placed by Foxe in his calendar on the 14th of January, Parsons observes,—"John Tudson, falling to be a ghospeller, was so obstinate and arrogant as the *bishop of London was forced at length to condemne and burne him*, under

queen Mary.” And of another poor victim he says,—”being obstinate in divers hereticall opinions, but especially about the sacrament of the altar, he was burnt also for the same, in Smithfield, after many means first used to reclayme him.” And again, — “ a poor labouringe man, borne at Histon,.. married at London, and there becoming a ghospeller, fell to be so forward in sowing and defending Calvinian opinions, as lastly he was burnt for the same, in Smithfield.” And again, we read of “a poor woman burned at Canterbury, under queen Mary; “ the next were “two willfull poore women, also burned at Canterbury.” Of other victims, “the first was an artificer, the second a poore ignorant woman, and burned for like opinions with the former.” And so we might go on, page after page, noticing the poor ignorant men and women put to death. No fact recorded by Foxe is denied. The victims are ridiculed and despised, because they were poor, vulgar, mean, and low. The wretched bigot could not see, that whom the world most scorns, God most honors; whom the world most hates, Christ most loves. (1 Corinthians 1:26-28.) See especially, at the end of the “Foxian Calendar” in this volume, a notice of the lowly condition of these witnesses, so put as to excite contempt or ridicule.

Parsons now sets about justifying these enormities, and this he does by laying down two propositions, viz. —

1. It was necessary justice, and no cruelty, to punish such wilful and malignant people.
2. Constancy in a “sectary” is not constancy, but pertinacity.

He then proceeds to justify the second of these positions, by proving that it was the theory of the fathers; and to do this he quotes several passages from their writings. All is penned on the radical error of assuming that the Romanists are the church, and the protestants are without (extra) the church. Too much time would be consumed, if I were to refer to all his quotations; but I am by no means persuaded, that he has done justice to these venerable writers; the passages are, probably, either not to the purpose, or require explanation by the context. I judge thus from the first of his quotations — that from Cyprian de Unitate Ecclesiae. I there find some disingenuous dealing with the original.

The translation by Parsons is, <sup>f399</sup> — “Whosoever is separated from the church, and joyneth himself to an adultresse conventicle, is separated also from the promises of the church, nor euer shall he come to enjoy the rewards thereof if he leaue her; he is an alien, a prophane person, an enemy; he cannot haue God for his Father, that hath not the church for his mother; yea, though he should be slayne for the confession of Christ’s name, yet can he not be saued; *macula ista nec sanguine abluitur*. This crime of separating himselfe from the church cannot be washed away with bloud; *inexpiabilis culpa nec passione purgatur*, it is a fault unex-piable, nor can it be purged by death itselfe.” Such is Parsons’s translation. Now, Cyprian is speaking of the catholic church: — “Quisquis,” he says, “ab ecclesia segregatus adulterae jungitur, a promissis ecclesiae separatur, nec perveniet ad Christi praemia qui relinquit ecclesiam Christi. Alienus est, profanus est, hostis est. Habere jam non potest Deum Patrem, qui ecclesiam non habet matrem.” So far Parsons goes with Cyprian, inserting, however, the word “conventicle,” — translating “perveniet” by “ever shall he come,” — and making the “praemia” mean the rewards of the *church*, not the rewards of *Christ*, as the text requires. To have pursued the quotation would not have suited his purpose, for the following words would have shown that those who are here condemned are such persons as knowingly and artfully separate themselves from the unity of the catholic church. But Parsons proceeds as if the remainder of his quotation were in immediate connection with what I have now cited. It is not so. What I have already quoted is in page 121 of my edition; <sup>f400</sup> the remainder is in page 126. It is as follows: — “Tales etiamsi occisi in confessione nominis fuerint, macula ista nec sanguine abluitur, inexpiabilis et gravis culpa discordiae nec passione purgatur.” Here Parsons’s words, “yet can he not be saved,” are an interpolation, perhaps a natural inference from what follows; but what would have been said if Foxe had been found so tampering with a translation? To come to the text itself. Parsons omits the word “*tales*.” One would have been tempted to ask who, these “tales” were; and on turning to the context we see that a definition of them is given. They are such as have not charity. (1 Corinthians 13:2, 5, 7, 8,) “Ad praemia Christi, qui dixit, (John 15:12,) pertinere non poterit qui dilectionem Christi perfida dissensione violaverit.” Such, then, are those excluded from the rewards; and the whole is a paraphrase of the sentiment

of St. Paul in 1 Corinthians 13; but by this dishonest mode of tacking together two disjointed sentences, a different sense is attached to it.

The second extract is equally misquoted and misinterpreted. It is this — “He cannot become a martyr who is not a member of the church, neither can they euer come to Christ’s kingdom who do forsake his spouse which is there to raigne. Though tyed to stakes they burne in flames, and be consumed with fiar, though throwen to wild beasts they be by them deuoured — non erit fidei corona, Bed poena perfidia sit.” In this quotation a large portion is omitted between the words “raigne” and “though,” which would have given it a different colouring.

That Foxe was faultless we are not concerned to maintain. Thus, he did not (in my opinion) do justice to More, to say that he well deserved his bloody end. It was not judicious to compare Tyndale and Frith to St. Paul and Timothy. Yet I do not see that Parsons brings any proof of inaccuracy, still less of fraud, against Foxe; the differences are the differences of the church of Rome and England, and here Foxe may be permitted to have his opinion as well as Parsons. At page 524 he accuses Foxe of “sundry kinds of falsehood and untrue dealing, and diuers kinds also of lies, some historical, some doctrinal, and other like.” We have a specimen of the nature of these at p. 527, such as “the following 4 lies about justification, 2 about hope and charity, 10 about good works by the pope’s law, 3 about freewill and good works, etc.” In all these, the only “lie” consists in a differing from the doctrines of Rome. The “*veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe are still unimpeached; and there are no other observations on the martyrologist worthy of notice, till we may close the volume.

Vol. IV. — The Fourth Volume proceeds with the continuation of the examination of Foxe’s Calendar, with that of the church of Rome in juxtaposition, from July to December inclusive. Prefixed is “The Epistle Dedicatory to the glorious Company of English Saints in Heaven” who are supposed to be dreadfully scandalized by the bad company into which Foxe has brought them. They are supposed also to have attained heaven by “fasting, watching, large prayer, lying on the ground, and other such chastisements; “ but not one word on the merits of our Savior. On the next page there is a sneer *at faith*. <sup>F401</sup>

The Calendar itself goes on as before; there are no charges of any inaccuracy brought against Foxe, excepting such as having written *Brenbridge* instead of *Brenbricke*, (31 July.) Robert Purcas instead of William Purcas, (20 August.)<sup>f402</sup> This is satisfactory as showing how little could be corrected, and that nothing could be denied. Parsons is not accurate; e.g. he says that Ridley was a native of Northamptonshire.

Parsons takes care to repeat the caution to the reader, guarding him against sympathizing with these poor men and women thus put to death: he says that it was necessary justice and no cruelty, and further, that they were influenced by *pertinacity*, not *constancy*.

I find very little which requires notice after this, excepting the mode in which Parsons deals with the history of Marbeck. Parsons has the candour to admit that historians “may have many false informations.” He goes on to say that he does not often bring accusations against Foxe upon matters *of fact*, (would he have hesitated had he been able?) but is most indignant about his lies, “which lyes cannot any wayes be excused, whereof you shall see above 120 in one chapter afterwards, (see page 412,) taken out of less than three leaves of his Acts and Monuments, and thereby perceive the credit that may be given to John Foxe his narrations.” These “lies” are those on points of doctrine mentioned in the last volume, and have been already noticed.

In page 362 he commences a long disquisition upon the power, the right, and the obligation of punishing heresy with the sword; and affirms, that this sword is in the church. Parsons professes, indeed, to have been moved with compassion for the sufferers: but he suppressed the feeling as improper. If the question be raised at all, it is only in reference to the *expediency* of the case; and this expediency is questioned *only* from the want of success of the persecutions under Mary. His interpretation of the parable of the tares, is the necessity of caution in rooting up the heresies, which are the tares. This is the most important passage in the whole treatise. His interpretation is defended from Augustine.

In page 397, Parsons attributes the supposed errors of Foxe to want of judgment, or to mental weakness, rather than to malice; and mentions some infirmities of mind to which the martyrologist was subject, such as, that he imagined himself to be glass, or earthenware, or a bird, — circumstances

which proved his brain to be diseased. These things are not mentioned by Foxe's other biographers, and we have now no means of ascertaining their truth. In page 400, speaking of Foxe's errors, he says that many of them have already been specified, (we have seen how many!) and that further proof is given of his errors in the 19th chapter. This chapter contains the above-mentioned charge, that Foxe has told one hundred and twenty lies in three pages. These lies, we have seen, are not perversions of facts, but alleged misstatements of doctrines. All the charges of Parsons are equally vague and unfounded.

In pages 400 and 403, are some passages worthy of remark, as showing the result of Foxe's work, which would appear to have been great. At page 401, the fact of it being placed in the churches is mentioned. Parsons attributes the success of the book to the variety of the history itself, — the plates of the martyrdoms, rather the hypocrisy of the writer, which is clothed in seeming frankness, — the speeches attributed to the martyrs, — the greatness of the book, — and the placing it in the churches. He assures us, that this miserable man, John Foxe, and his abettors, will have to yield a strait and heavy account to their Redeemer, at the most dreadful "accounting day," for the infinite spiritual hurt which they have rendered to the souls of their countrymen. He assures us, (page 404,) that one effect of Foxe's book is to make men have no religion at all; while in page 405, he informs us that this Fox-den book is only fit to make madmen of fools, and heretics of ignorant people; and he exhorts his countrymen to lose no more time in reading his vain pages. This advice his poor foolish countrymen have not hitherto followed. One reason may have been, that it was then submitted to them by the papists. *The same advice has been lately enforced upon them by their brother protestants, who hate the name by which the public law describes them,* and prefer the opinions of Robert Parsons to those of John Foxe. I make no remarks on the coarse language which the jesuit has sometimes adopted; only commending it to the notice of the Churtons and Tylers, who find Foxe's language so "*painful.*" And thus we close the fourth volume.

Vol. V. — The Fifth Volume of Parsons is occupied solely with an account of the disputations mentioned by Foxe as having taken place between the Romanists and the Reformers. According to Parsons, the former are always right and the latter always wrong. On these I shall only observe,

that, in page 17, Parsons could get no other copies of these disputations besides those preserved by Foxe: and this very fact proves to us the great value of Foxe's work as a storehouse of materials. The whole volume is entirely dogmatical and polemical, having nothing to do with Foxe. It requires no special notice. And so the whole subject ends. No great facts are overthrown. The "*veracity and fidelity*" of Foxe are still unimpeached; and we may justly believe, that if the attack of Parsons, his inveterate and learned contemporary, has failed to depreciate his work, that they will still remain, not unimpeached, but certainly unimpeachable.

With respect to the character of Robert Parsons, I have assigned to him the credit of high motive and good intentions. I am not ignorant that pope Clement himself is said to have called him — a knave; the jesuit Fitzherbert — a hypocrite; the secular priests — the worst of villains; <sup>f403</sup> and that the Quarterly Reviewer, <sup>f404</sup> Southey, <sup>f405</sup> the protestant writers generally, and even the greater number of the papal authors, <sup>f406</sup> have deemed him to be unworthy of approbation. I cannot, however, after reading his Christian Directory, come to these conclusions. I believe rather, that *he was sincerely convinced that he was doing God service by every act of treason which he committed against his native country and against the church of England.* I am convinced that he believed the truth of the passage I have already quoted from his work on Foxe; that he believed in the damnation of Foxe and of his abettors; and that he thought that he should be the cause of saving many souls from everlasting perdition, if he could have surrendered England to Spain, rendered the Armada successful, and made his native country a province to the king of Spain, and its church a tributary to the bishop of Rome. The same principles have uniformly led to the same results. The more zealous adherents to the church of Rome, who always obtain the ascendancy over their more quiescent brethren when controversial excitement is greatest, have ever regarded their obedience to the laws of God, as identified with their own submission to the foreign bishop; and they have as uniformly believed that it is no less their bounden duty to convert their countrymen to the same opinion, and to reduce them to the same yoke. They have been convinced, with Parsons, of the truth of the papal maxim, <sup>f407</sup> that it is necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the bishop of Rome. They believe, with father Parsons, that the council of Trent, in its

catechism, as it is still taught at Msynooth, in Spain, and by Dens, speaks but the truth, when it declares that heretics and schismatics are still under the jurisdiction of the church. The belief in these and similar principles sent the Armada against England, and excited numerous rebellions and insurrections in England and Ireland from the reign of Elizabeth to the reign of George III. Such belief on the part of the papists demands, even to this hour, on the part of the protestants, the most vigilant and persevering jealousy against the holiest, the best, most pious, and worthiest Romanist. If the church of Rome still produce a pious, holy, virtuous, papal priesthood, then let England beware of the popery which would betray the protestant church and state to the church and creed of Rome, to please the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Even now, in our own day, language has been used respecting the propriety of appealing to the foreigner, — of withholding assistance, in the event of a war, from our own sovereign, — and of bringing England once more under the yoke of Rome, — language which I will not repeat, as I wish to say nothing which may appear to relate to the peculiar divisions of the day in which we live; but if Rome does not, will not change, — if the same principles, which our fathers believed to be the “worst of superstitions and the heaviest of all God’s judgments,”<sup>f408</sup> are continued, — if the worst maxims of the ancient canon laws are still taught, — if the general conviction be true, that a class of zealous, enterprising partisans are ever actively employed, secretly, yet perseveringly, to imbue the minds of all whom they can influence with the doctrines in question, — if these things are so: then let England beware, lest other domestic enemies are found who shall imitate the example of the jesuit Parsons, and betray their country to the foreigner, to please God and to extend the church of Christ. *If Rome does not, and will not, change* the principles on which this man acted, — and if similar religious principles, always, in the same circumstances, produce the same effects, then the experience of the past requires us to continue our ancient jealousy, — to beware of popery, — and to value, next to the holy Scriptures and the sacred liturgy of our protestant episcopal church itself, those writers who paint in their proper colors the consequences of the adoption of the principles of papistry. *If Rome does not, and will not, change*, every day and every hour deepens the conviction, that jealousy of Rome is still a duty; and the study, therefore, of the volumes of John Foxe, and of all,

who, like him, enforce the evil consequences of the dominion of Rome among us, is still both a duty, and a privilege.

#### 4. Nicholas Harpsfield,

The learned Greek professor at Oxford, in the reign of Mary; archdeacon of Canterbury; brother of Bonner's chaplain; one of the defenders of the papal cause in the conference held at the commencement of the reign of Elizabeth; but more especially distinguished for his knowledge of the canon and civil law; is the last whom I shall mention among the assailants of the "*veracity and fidelity*" of the martyrologist. His zeal and bitterness against Foxe were equal to his learning.<sup>F409</sup> He refused, at the accession of Elizabeth, to comply with the queen's injunctions, and was deprived of all his preferments: he was committed to the Tower, where he remained twenty years, and died in 1583. Dodd assigns no reason for this imprisonment.<sup>F410</sup> He would have us to infer that it was the result of the cruelty or caprice of the queen. Chalmers tells us that his zeal for popery occasioned the loss of his appointments; and that he appears to have been afterwards imprisoned. Chalmers,<sup>f411</sup> like Dodd, assigns no cause for his punishment. Fuller says he was imprisoned for denying the queen's supremacy.<sup>F412</sup> This does not, however, seem to be a sufficient cause; as many denied the supremacy who were not molested for their opinions. The mystery appears to be solved by a passage from the Lansdowne MSS. We there find, among the notes and additions to Anthony Wood's memoranda on Harpsfield, a letter from the council to sir Thomas Fynch, and George Maye, one of the aldermen of Canterbury, that Harpsfield was guilty of disorderly and seditious conduct. We may therefore justly infer that it was on this account Harpsfield was apprehended and committed to the Tower; for the queen was certainly never guilty of any unnecessary harshness; and she desired, especially at the beginning of her reign, to conciliate and not to irritate the papists,<sup>f413</sup> While he was in prison he wrote the celebrated Six Dialogues against the reformation and the reformers generally. The first five were written principally against the Magdeburg Centuriators. The sixth was chiefly directed against Foxe. Harpsfield was imprisoned soon after the queen's accession, in the beginning of 1559. Elizabeth came to the throne on the 17th of November, 1558. The Magdeburg Centuriators was published very early in the reign of Elizabeth; and one of the first copies, therefore, must have been

conveyed to Harpsfield in the Tower, together with the first edition of Foxe. We have no means of ascertaining what number of books were collected by the prisoners for religion in the Tower at this time; and what portion of the references, therefore, were made from memory, or from inspection: but the work is a wonderful production, under such circumstances. It is, indeed, possible that some part of it was compiled by the editor, Alan Cope, under whose name it was published,<sup>f414</sup> at Antwerp, in 1566, and whose name, as editor, is in the title-page. At the end of the book are printed ten large Roman capitals; they are —

*A. H. L. N. H. E. V. E. A. C.*

They are thus interpreted: — Auctor Hujus Libri Nicholaus Harpsfeldus, Edidit Veto Eum Alanus Copus.<sup>F415</sup> It does not appear that the suppression of the name of the author prevented the general knowledge of the fact that Harpsfield was its writer. A letter is still extant among the Harleian manuscripts, from Laurence Humfrey to Foxe, informing him of the publication of the book; in which he mentions Alan Cope's name, but not that of Harpsfield.<sup>F416</sup>

Foxe knew that the work was written by Harpsfield, for he entitles a part of his reply to the Dialogues, "A Defence of the Lord Cobham against: Nicholas Harpsfield, set out under the name of Alanus Copus."<sup>F417</sup> As this work was printed very soon after the publication of the Martyrology, by the bitter enemies of its author, while the contemporary witnesses of the principal matters which are related by Foxe were still alive, it is, I think, evident, that the zeal, activity, rage, and hatred, of the papal party would have collected any facts which could have destroyed the reputation of the work. The language of Harpsfield against Foxe is everywhere most abusive. The Acts and Monuments are said to abound with blasphemies and lies. The blasphemies are the antipapal propositions. The lies are the reports of the courage, constancy, sufferings, and testimony of the papal victims against the faith and discipline of Rome.<sup>F418</sup> I shall go through the whole dialogue, by first giving the abstract of the forty-six sections of which it consists, and then by considering the principal charges which he alleges against the accuracy of the narratives of the martyrologist. Foxe deeply studied the pages of Harpsfield, and replied to his chief accusations. It will be seen that the result of our examination of the charges

of Harpsfield, the more immediate contemporary and severest enemy of Foxe, will afford us the last and most triumphant reply to all the attempts to depreciate the value of his pages. Whoever will take the trouble to read Harpsfield, will find that he is very diffuse and indefinite, as well as abusive, and that his indefiniteness renders it very difficult to meet his objections. Vague and general expressions, accusing an author of lying, blasphemy, misrepresentation, injustice, and other literary crimes, prove only the hatred or anger of the writer who uses them, unless they are supported by specific facts and instances. The survey, therefore, of the table of the contents of his sections, and the consideration of the particular circumstances to which he may allude to prove their truth, will enable us to decide whether Harpsfield has been more successful than any of the assailants of Foxe whom we have already considered.

The forty-six sections of the Sixth Dialogue occupy two hundred and sixty-two closely-printed Latin quarto pages. They are the chief foundation of all that Parsons or Andrews have written, and much of them has, therefore, been already considered. The briefest possible statement of the contents of the sections will be sufficient to show the indefiniteness of which I complain.

- Chap. 1.** The cause, not the fortitude, of the victim, makes the martyr. In what true fortitude consists.
- 2.** Foxe enrols criminals among his martyrs; as in the case of lord Cobham and his followers.
- 3.** The pseudo-martyrs commit themselves to death to obtain the praise and glory of martyrdom.
- 4.** They ought not, therefore, to be called martyrs.
- 5.** But to be detested.
- 6.** They are not conscious that they are heretics.
- 7.** Why one error makes a heretic.
- 8.** Though Cyprian might err without heresy.
- 9.** The folly of the declaration of the reformers, that the whole world began to see the true light.

10. On the causes of the multiplication of sects.
11. They will decline as the Manicheans and others in former times.
12. The martyrs and pseudo-martyrs contrasted.
13. Why the title of martyrs ought not to be given to the opponents of Rome; and whether the ancient prophets, the Maccabees, and the Innocents, are entitled to that name.
14. Sectarians, mutually opposed to each other, cannot call each other martyrs.
15. The absurdity of denying the greatness of the differences between the Zuinglians and Lutherans.
16. Yet Foxe blends all opponents of Rome in one mass, and eulogizes Lutherans, Zuinglians, other heretics and criminals, in one indiscriminate mass as martyrs.
17. Falsehood of Foxe in the case of Cowbridge.
18. The Lutherans cannot be martyrs, because Luther recalled from the bottomless pit many ancient heresies.
- 19-25. The follies, etc. of Luther and of Lutherans.
26. Foxe is ridiculed for his respect for Erasmus.
27. And for including Mirandula among his martyrs.
- 28-30. Foxe's account of Wycliffe condemned.
- 31-35. Attacks on Luther and the foreign reformers.
36. Credulity of Foxe condemned.
37. Eulogy of Foxe on Cobham condemned.
38. Some improbabilities in the accounts of the martyrs censured.
39. On the story of Baynam.
40. Comparison between the martyrs of Foxe and of antiquity.
41. On the Hussites.

- 42, 43.** On the controversies respecting the headship of the church.
- 44.** On the martyrs for the church of Rome.
- 45.** That true martyrs are found only in the church of Rome.
- 46.** On the true catholic church. Arguments from Augustine to strengthen the weak and confirm the wavering. The manner in which heretics are to be treated.

Such is the brief abstract of the chapters of which this sixth dialogue is composed. It will be seen from this, how little of the whole treatise is devoted to Foxe. Even of the small portion which is thus given to the martyrologist, much has been answered by Foxe himself.

I will consider throughout the replies of Foxe, and the arguments (if the objections of Harpsfield may be justly called by that name) which his antagonist has adduced against him.

At the end of the fifth dialogue, Harpsfield anticipates many of his subsequent remarks by deriding the account of the patience, joy, and self-possession related of many of the martyrs by Foxe. It is useless to record how one clasped his hands three times above his head in the flames; another remained unmoved, as a token to his friends of his adherence to the conviction of the truth of the opinions for which he was condemned; others gave other expressions of their attachment to their opinions in their most intense sufferings. Harpsfield, like Andrews and Parsons, derides such narratives. Foxe compares, and exults in the comparison, such sufferings with those of the martyrs of antiquity. Harpsfield is very indignant at this. It is, however, impossible to discover the difference either in the suffering, the endurance, or the cause, between the two. Harpsfield calls it an unjust comparison,<sup>f419</sup> and surnames the victims mentioned by Foxe, pseudo-martyrs; but he assigns no reason whatever for his doing so.

After some preliminary remarks on the nature of true martyrdom, and refusing the glory of martyrdom to the pseudo-martyrs, and calling them the slaves of the devil,<sup>f420</sup> rather than martyrs, we come in the sixth dialogue to the accusation against Foxe, *that he is guilty of falsehood, for placing among his pseudo-martyrs the names of men who had no claim*

*even to the honor of such martyrdom* as he would assign to them; for they suffered for crimes, and not for opinions. Harpsfield enumerates the following *names*, — *Cromwell, Hales, Randal, Tonley, Sanders, Cranmer, Cobham, Acton, Wyatt*. These are inserted by Foxe among those who bore witness to the truth of antipapalism, but who are called by Harpsfield traitors, thieves, and rebels. <sup>F421</sup>

With respect to *Cromwell*, Foxe tells us, that with his last breath he declares that he died in the catholic faith. The distinction between catholic and papist was very frequently maintained at that time as well as at present. Many, who were apprehended and burnt for antipapalism, called themselves catholic; and were still condemned for denying some of the anticatholic doctrines maintained by the church of Rome. *Cromwell* is called by Foxe the “noble and worthy lord.” Foxe disbelieved the charge of treason, which was never proved; and ranked him among the witnesses against Rome. Harpsfield does not venture to say that the “*veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe’s narrative of the actions and death of *Cromwell* are erroneous; and this is the chief point we have to consider.

*Judge Hales* drowned himself in madness, vexation, or despair, on account of *Mary’s* conduct. He was sent into the Marshalsea — removed to the Counter — then to the Fleet; where he was so agitated at the report of the cruelties reported by the warden to be contriving against the antipapists that his reason fled. He endeavored to destroy himself with a penknife. He was afterwards released; but he never recovered his reason, and drowned himself. <sup>F422</sup> *Hales* was the only judge who had refused to sign the instrument which gave the crown to lady *Jane Grey*. He was imprisoned for charging the justices of *Kent* to conform to the unrepealed laws of *Edward*; that is, he was imprisoned for being a protestant. Did not Foxe rightly eulogize him as a martyr — as a witness for the truth of the gospel, as it is now professed and taught in the Anglican, protestant, reformed episcopal church?

*Randal* hanged himself, and therefore Foxe is condemned by Harpsfield for placing his name also among the martyrs for the truth. Harpsfield, according to the custom which *Mr. Maitland* condemns so severely in Foxe, does not give his references with sufficient clearness. I cannot find any person of this name, to whom the observations of Harpsfield are

applicable. A person of the name of Randal was compelled by the bishop of Lincoln in the year 1521 to do penance for abetting the heresy of Thomas Man. Both he and his father were required to abjure their errors, but I do not read that he hanged himself.

*Foxe is condemned for inserting Tonley among his list of martyrs, whereas Tonley was hanged for theft.*

This appears to be a most serious charge; yet it is capable of explanation, and that explanation is a complete vindication of the martyrologist.<sup>F423</sup> John Tooley, as Harpsfield informs us<sup>f424</sup> was executed for a robbery attended by violence. Yet he is placed by Foxe among his martyrs. Harpsfield is quite right. *Tooley was hanged for theft; and Foxe has made him a martyr;* and if the two facts are thus put together without any further explanation, the martyrologist appears to have been guilty of the greatest possible absurdity. Let us, however, consider all the circumstances which Harpsfield has omitted. Tooley, while he was in prison, or before his execution, was brought to a better state of mind. Immediately before he was hanged he addressed the people, and declared that he died a true christian man, and that he trusted to be saved only by the merits of Christ's passion, and shedding of his most precious blood; and not by any masses or trentals, images or saints, which he said were mere idolatry and superstition. He added much more to the same effect; and appealed to the people who agreed with him, to say Amen, — which they did, three times.

If the matter had rested here, nothing would have been so absurd as for Foxe to have canonized a thief, because he declared himself an anti-papalist. But this was not the beginning of the matter. The queen's council heard of the dying words of the culprit; and they were actually guilty of the unpardonable folly (Foxe believes under the influence of Cardinal Pole) to do in the case of the dead body of Tooley the same as was done at Oxford respecting the dead bodies of Bucer, of Fagius, and of the wife of Peter Martyr. They issued a commission to Bonner the bishop of London, to inquire into the matter, and to proceed to the making out of the process provided by the ecclesiastical laws in that behalf.<sup>F425</sup> The bishop of London acted upon the mandate. He issued a writ or mandate to the clergy of London, — called Tooley the son of perdition and iniquity, — and charged them to summon the relations of Tooley to show cause why the

dead man should not be excommunicated; and after certain depositions and attestations of witnesses, the dead body was actually excommunicated, unburied, and burnt. *All this Harpsfield has omitted. Foxe does not say one word to eulogize the man.* He merely records the facts from the registers to which he refers; and places the name of Tooley among; his list of witnesses against Rome, to direct the attention of the reader to the follies and absurdities connected with the observance of the old canon law in the instance of the exhumation of the criminal. In a part of his reply to Harpsfield, Foxe expressly says that his table of names against Rome was never intended to denote that ALL whom he enumerated were holy persons; but that the reader, by seeing their names, might be reminded of the facts he has related. <sup>F426</sup> Does not this explain the whole matter? Does the martyr-ologist deserve censure, even when the name of a thief, under such circumstances, is found among his list of witnesses against the papal follies?

*Sanders, Cranmer, Cobham, Acton, and Wyatt*, whom Foxe has also added to his list, are called by Harpsfield rebels, and not therefore martyrs.

*Laurence Sanders* is called a rebel, I believe, because he rightly and justly refused obedience to the queen, when she commanded the clergy of the apostolic church to cease from preaching. He not only refused to obey, but *he persevered in preaching against the errors of the papistry, which was so rapidly returning to curse the protestancy of England.* He refused to leave England. He preached the one only true doctrine, which is in itself the sole refutation of all popery — the justification of the spirit of the sinner by the faith, which is founded upon evidence, and is the motive to obedience. <sup>F427</sup> The bishop of London sent an officer to charge him to attend him, on pain of disobedience and contumacy. When Sanders obeyed, the bishop accused him of treason for disobedience to the queen's proclamation, questioned him on the old test of papalism or antipapalism — the doctrine of transubstantiation; and concluded the conference by committing him to prison. The result is well known. His beautiful letters are still preserved. His distrust of his own firmness, — which, however, endured to the end, — when Pendleton, the boaster, who assured him of his own superior firmness, fainted and apostatised; his perfect freedom from every thing like enthusiasm; his sober zeal for the truth; his dying salutation to the stake, "Welcome the cross of Christ, welcome everlasting life;" — all combine to

prove to us that he possessed the only true spirit which can ever conquer the threatening domination of the now reviving papacy, and preserve the primitive Christianity which is still established among us. Harpsfield, in this instance also, does not deny the accuracy of the narrative of Foxe. With this we must be contented; though he calls Sanders a rebel.

*Cranmer*, too, was a rebel. I shall say no more of his melancholy and well-known story, than to observe, that *Cranmer* was murdered by the papists — *Laud* was murdered by the puritans. May the archbishops of *Canterbury* study their lives, avoid their faults, and be prepared for their deaths; in defense of the same church which still holds its place between the puritan and the papist, and deserves the homage of its children and servants, even to the death of the stake, or of the block! The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. The seed of the church of England is the blood of antipapal and antipuritan martyrs. May the flowers and the fragrance of learning and of truth ever spring from that seed! and may the fruit of the seed of the blood of the martyrs, and the flower and fragrance of its learning and its truth, be, holiness to the Lord — holiness on the mitres of its rulers — holiness on the robes of its priests — holiness on the bells of the houses and the bowls of the altars (*Zechariah 14:20.*) — holiness on the heads and hearts of the sovereign, clergy, and people!

*Cobham* and *Acton* were rebels; and, therefore, they also could not be martyrs.

I am sure that the reader of this protracted examination into the charges which have been made against *John Foxe* will rejoice to be referred to the defense which *Foxe* himself has made against the accusations of *Harpsfield* in the case of *lord Cobham*. I had promised to proceed through the whole detail; but I am sure my doing so must unavoidably prove uninteresting. The question is, was *Cobham* arraigned as a traitor or as a heretic? The answer of the papal party is, that he was executed as a traitor, because of the affair in *St. Giles's Fields*. The antipapal party deride the notion that the meeting in *St. Giles's Fields* was a political meeting of twenty thousand men suddenly gathered together, as *Walsingham* and others affirm; but declare it to have been a religious meeting of comparatively few numbers. They assure us, also, (and the evidence upon this latter point cannot be contradicted,) that heresy was identified with treason; so that he

who was guilty of opposing any one doctrine taught by the church was held to be guilty of an act of treason against the sovereign. The question has already been discussed. I must be contented to refer the reader for further details to Foxe's discussion of the case of lord Cobham against Harpsfield.<sup>F428</sup> He refers to the original indictment,<sup>f429</sup> and proceeds to inquire into and to demonstrate the improbability that lord Cobham intended or desired to destroy the king, or the estates of the realm. He shows how treason and heresy had long been identified by the priesthood. He examines the accounts of the several witnesses against Cobham — Fabian, Polydore Virgil, and points out their disagreement with each other. To the general accusation by Harpsfield, that his book was full of lies, he answers, "I would to God that in all the whole book of Acts and Monuments, all the narratives of this nature were false, all were lies, all were fables; I would to God the cruelty of you Catholics had suffered all them to live, of whose death ye do now say, that I do lie.

I deny not but that in my book many things may have escaped me, yet I have bestowed my diligence, to profit all men, but to hurt none."<sup>F430</sup>

The question of the calendar is then discussed. Foxe declares, that he arranged the names of his martyrs according to the days of the month, to serve as a table, by which to remind his readers of their testimony, not to displace from the other calendar the names of the truly wise, good, and holy men, who may have been justly placed there. Parsons and Andrews, as well as Harpsfield, exhaust every epithet of vituperation on Foxe, for his thus arranging the names of his victims in a calendar. Yet on this point also, his reply is unanswerable.<sup>F431</sup> Harpsfield accused him of thrusting God's saints out of heaven into hell. No! he answers, I thrust none down to hell. Yet I am not like the great godmaker of Rome; I exalt none to heaven. You are the men who, like the giants of old, would scale heaven; and then to place there the traitor, and the enemy of God;<sup>f432</sup> and make even Becket's popish blood, a ladder to enable men to climb there also: while you thrust down from heaven the true saints of God, even those who die to serve him, and lay down their lives against his enemies. I am sure that neither the names of the archbishop Thomas Becket, nor of the archbishop Thomas Cranmer, deserved to be placed in the same calendar with the holy evangelists and the apostles; but if we are compelled to have either, the days are at hand when we must decidedly prefer Becket, or

Cranmer. You encumber, says Foxe, your calendar with saints. ‘You place among them men of the most questionable character; and you derogate from and degrade the honor of Christ as the only Mediator, when you beg these canonized traitors — whose only claim to notice, as in many cases mentioned, was their slavery to Rome — to intercede at the throne of God for the dupes who worship and pray to them. As to the accusation, that in printing the names of his martyrs some were printed in red letters, he assures us that this was done at the discretion of the printer. After some further general defense of his book, and solemnly asserting (I have already quoted the passage) that if “a lie be a wilful intention to deceive, then I protest to you, master Cope, and to all the world, that there is not a lie in my book:” <sup>f433</sup> and after some observations on the manner in which the church of Rome has perverted the testimony of the fathers; he goes on to prove most unanswerably, against Harpsfield, that treason and heresy were identified by the statute law <sup>f434</sup> of the land before the execution of Cobham; as they had long been identified by the bishops, and under their influence, by the people, before his arraignment. He quotes the words of the letter of Walden, the provincial of the Carmelites, to pope Martin, that *all the followers of Wycliffe, as being equally traitors to God, and traitors to the king, should be punished with the double punishment of burning at the stake on account of God, and hanging at the gallows, on account of the king.* In his book on the catholic faith, the same writer exults in the same conduct of Henry the Fifth. The illustrious king, he says, decreed, that every man who was proved to be a Wycliffite, should be punished as guilty of treason. <sup>f435</sup> The same undoubted fact may be proved by other quotations. I subjoin only two more from the historian Roger Wall; the noble king, Henry V. he says, reputeing Christ’s enemies to be traitors to himself, to the intent that all men might without doubt know, that, so long as he lived, he would be a true follower of the christian faith, did enact and decree, that whosoever should be found followers and maintainers of this sect, which is called the Lollards, should be counted and reputed guilty of treason against the king’s majesty. The king in consequence of this very statute, and of his inveterate hostility to the Wycliffites, was called by the ecclesiastics of his age, the Prince of the Priesthood. “O true friend!” <sup>f436</sup> says his eulogist, “who taketh and reckoneth that injury done to himself, which is done to his friend; who reputeth that to be to his own prejudice which is done to the prejudice of his friend.” That is, *Henry treated the*

*actions, opinions, and worship, which he was taught by the priesthood of his day to believe to be against the cause of Christ, as treason against himself, as the friend of Christ and of his church: and thus heresy and treason were, as Foxe proves, identified.* <sup>F437</sup>

But it may be said, by some one who is ignorant of the details of the lamentable period of which we are speaking, perhaps the king was right. What were the Wyclifflites, and of what crime were they guilty? The answer is, they were guilty of reading the Scriptures <sup>f438</sup> in their own language, without the consent of their ecclesiastical superiors. Those who studied the Scriptures, perceived the contrast between the revelation of God and those ordinances of men which were called the decrees of the catholic church. They protested against the enactment of those ordinances of man. They were punished for doing so. They refused, because of such punishments, to cease from such protesting. The severity of the punishments was increased to conquer the supposed crime, till we actually read of the burning of men to death for having read four of the epistles of St. Paul; the persons who heard them read being put to open penance; and a bishop, yes, a christian bishop, first preaching to the victims at the stake, in the presence of their own children, who were commanded to set fire to the faggots, which were placed round their suffering parents. We read, I say, of a bishop of Christ's holy catholic church preaching to the victims, who were expecting the flames which their own children were to kindle, that whosoever they were that did but move their lips in reading those chapters, they were damned for ever. Oh, God of mercy! these were the members of thy holy church; and *now, even now, in this land, where these things were done, it is deemed to be illiberal to man, uncharitable to thy people, and unjust before thee, to remember and to mention these things.* We have forgotten at what hazard the people of the church of Christ wrested back the holy Scriptures, from the hands of an ambitious priesthood; and plucked forth the sacred volume from the fires of their persecuting tyranny. Many there are among us, who are again beginning to place the traditions of men on the throne of revelation; to give to the church the scepter of its ruler; to lessen the value of the Scriptures; to forget the records which relate the eventually certain consequences of such apostasy; and to call those men bigots and fools, who would learn from the past, to direct the present, and to secure the future. Treason and heresy

were one crime. The bodies of men were hanged and burnt at the same moment, that the double punishment might be inflicted at the same moment, for the double yet identified crime; and if such crimes of the ecclesiastical and civil rulers of the past are ever palliated or forgotten, the curse of the causes which occasioned them will return also. *That statesman was wise who uttered the undoubted aphorism, that if the English people should ever cease to hate popery, they will cease at the same time both to love truth, and to value liberty.*

Wyatt took up arms against Mary. He acted in the name of the protestant religion: he committed a great crime: he was justly punished for actual, undeniable treason. If he had confined his mode of objecting to the queen's marriage with the Spaniard to remonstrance and petition, he would have obeyed the law, maintained the liberty of the subject, and upheld his loyalty to the prince. Christianity requires neither the confused noise of the battle of the warriors, nor the garments rolled in blood. Wyatt was a rebel. Foxe pities, but does not defend him. <sup>F439</sup>

I read on, with much patience, many most unquotable sentences <sup>f440</sup> on the characters of many persons who were burnt for their antipapalism, and who certainly cannot be defended for the actions which immediately occasioned their punishment, whatever be our opinion of the principles which excited them to injudicious conduct. Gardiner, for instance, after many cruelties, was put to the horrid death of having an iron hoop round his waist, to which one end of a rope, which passed over a pulley, was tied, while the other end of the rope was held by a man opposite to the victim. The pulley was inserted by a staple in the cross-beam of a gallows. His hands were cut off. In that state the sufferer was drawn up by the rope to the top of the gallows. A fire was kindled below him; he was then slowly let down into the fire. After he had been burnt for some short time, he was again drawn up into the air. After he had thus hung some time, he was again let down. This fearful operation was repeated, while the sufferer continued to pray aloud, as they pulled him up and down with the rope, till the rope was burnt by the fire, and the body fell into the flames. All this was horrible, and because the reason of the infliction of this fearful torture proceeded from the conviction that the sacrifice of the mass was an abomination, Foxe inserts the name of Gardiner among his list of martyrs. Harpsfield objects to his doing so; and no protestant upon earth can

justify the conduct of Gardiner, by which he displayed his antipapal zeal; and brought upon himself the indignation of the priesthood. Gardiner, — it was in Portugal, — rushed through the people when mass was being celebrated by a cardinal, in the presence of the king and his nobles, snatched the wafer from the priest, stamped it under foot, and with the other hand overthrew the chalice. This proceeding was the act of a madman, and deserved to be punished with severity, or with the treatment of a lunatic. In that day <sup>f441</sup> the deed was considered laudable. Foxe speaks of the outrage, as a history no “less lamentable than notable,” and eulogizes the most constant suffering of the victim. The inhuman severity of the punishment would by many, on the other hand, be deemed only proportionate to the crime. Harpsfield so considered it. Harpsfield spoke of the crime, Foxe of the cruel punishment. Nothing is said by Harpsfield against “the *veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe. He takes for granted throughout, on the contrary, that Foxe has related these sad narratives truly. I again say, this is sufficient. I am not defending the taste, the judgment, or the opinions of the martyrologist; I am asserting only the credibility and the certainty of his histories. With respect, however, to the philosophy of these attacks of Harpsfield, I can but add, that he has quite mistaken the whole question. *The detestation of the cruelty of a punishment does not imply the approbation of the conduct of the sufferer.* We condemn the burning of Servetus; we pity his sufferings; we are compelled to abhor the error or duplicity of the great and good John Calvin. Yet, who in his senses can imagine, because we do so, that we approve the opinions of the denier of the blessed Trinity, and the oppugner of the divinity of Christ? The death of Servetus made him, in one sense, a martyr; for he died as a witness to his conviction of the truth of an error. We may quote the death of Servetus as an argument against the cruelty of committing the body to the flames, because of the mistakes of the judgment; but we do not therefore approve of the mistake, though we pity the victim.

The same mode of reasoning will apply to *Robert Debenham*, *Nicholas Marsh*, and *Robert King*, who were executed for the felony of taking down and burning the rood at Dover Court. They are called martyrs by Foxe, and criminals by Harpsfield. Their act was rash. Their consciences were burthened, says Foxe, to see the honor of the living God given to an idol; therefore they took it down and burnt it. They derived no benefit to

themselves from their conduct; they hazarded their lives to the death, and they lost their lives. The words they addressed to the people at the scaffold edified the people more than many sermons. Is not Foxe more justified in calling them martyrs, than Harpsfield in abusing them for nefarious impiety? <sup>F442</sup> They bore their testimony against Rome, and were added to the catalogue of witnesses who died in bearing witness against her. No narration of Foxe is contradicted. The truth of all his facts is taken for granted, even where Harpsfield places in the margin of his well-printed pages, <sup>f443</sup> that Foxe is convicted of the most evident lying. <sup>f444</sup> The expression is used in reference to the character of the persons whom Foxe eulogizes, not in reference to the facts he relates; and so it is throughout. Because the names of the victims are mentioned in the calendar, to the apparent exclusion of the saints of the Roman calendar, Foxe is charged, as I understand the argument, with raising the martyrs to the rank of saints, in the sense of such saints being intercessors for men, or mediators between God and man; as Thomas a Becket, Dunstan, St. Swithin, and other questionable characters, are entitled saints by the church of Rome. This is an entire misapprehension of the reasoning of Foxe. Some, and the great majority of the victims to the severity of the church, are rightly and justly called saints, and holy and godly martyrs; for they were persons of blameless lives, pious motives, and sincere believers in the truth of the gospel of God: others, however, though they suffered the same cruel death of the stake and faggot, were not men of this character, and Foxe, therefore, does not speak of them in the same manner. His eulogies are not indiscriminate. Harpsfield abuses Foxe for inserting the names of *Coilings*, or *Colyns*, and *Cowbridge*, among his martyrs. *Collins* was burnt for lifting up a dog above his head in imitation of the act of the priest, when elevating the wafer, <sup>f445</sup> to insult the holy ordinance. Foxe is condemned for inserting his name among his martyrs. *Cowbridge* was burnt by *Longland*, bishop of *Lincoln*, for holding many most absurd and strange notions, very contradictory to each other. They are omitted by Foxe, but are given by Harpsfield; and a proof is thus afforded us of Harpsfield's power to have discovered any falsehoods in the martyrology, if Foxe had written any. Among them are such propositions as these: — that Christ is not the Redeemer, but the future deceiver of the world; <sup>f446</sup> that all who believe in Christ shall be damned. <sup>F447</sup> These, and ten more, are omitted by Foxe; and Harpsfield imputes his silence to the desire to misrepresent the orthodox

Oxford theologians, who had so piously discharged their duty of causing such a wicked heretic to be burnt. <sup>F448</sup> It certainly does appear, at first sight, that Foxe has acted unwisely in elevating these two men to the rank of martyrs, and that, in this instance, Harpsfield has decided rightly. If we refer, however, to the account of Foxe himself, we shall find that in these, as in his other narratives, he has carefully distinguished between the testimony of the wise and of the unwise, of the pious or questionable, of the persons whom he certainly places in his calendar as witnesses against Rome, but not necessarily, therefore, approvable as the undoubted saints of God.

*Collins* is described by Foxe as a madman, who was driven to insanity by the desertion of him by a fair and beloved wife. <sup>F449</sup> He was a student of law in London. He came by chance into the church, where a priest was saying mass. His dog was with him. He held it up by the legs; was apprehended, condemned, and burnt. <sup>F450</sup> Foxe mentions the fact as an instance of the cruelty of his judges, in burning a madman. "I do not," says Foxe, "recite this man as one of God's professed martyrs yet neither do I deem him to be sequestered from the Lord's family; and, though the flock of the bishop of Rome account him to be a heretic, and condemned and burned him, I would on that very account esteem him as belonging to the holy company of saints." Foxe was wrong in speaking thus; for, though a man might be burned as a heretic unjustly, he might have still been an erroneous and wicked man. But Foxe does not canonize him, as Harpsfield represents. Foxe has expressed himself obscurely, and meant, I believe, that, as no other action was urged against him but this of holding up the dog, which he considered to be a proof of insanity, and as he was burned for that only, he therefore considered him as probably one of those who might be regarded, when sane, as among the pious opponents of the errors of Rome.

Foxe, has spoken in the same manner of *Cowbridge*. <sup>F451</sup> He tells us that Cowbridge was out of his senses. His father, the head-bailiff of Colchester, had left him great wealth, which Cowbridge resigned to his sisters, and wandered about the country, seeking out learned men, and instructing the ignorant. For thus acting as a priest, without a license to teach, he was apprehended, sent to Oxford, and imprisoned. Famine and loss of sleep, in the Bocardo, deprived him of his reason. "In his insane moods, he uttered,"

says Foxe, “many unseemly and indiscreet words.” Dr. Smith and Dr. Coates, the Oxford professors of divinity, and the other divines of the university, reported that there was a heretic at Oxford who could not bear the name of Christ to be uttered, and therefore that he ought to be burned; and so thereupon condemned him. He was sent up to London; and the articles upon which he was condemned were sent up also. Foxe assures us that he could not obtain a copy of them, which were, that in the creed, the words “in Jesum Christum” ought to be “in Jesum Jesum;” and that every poor priest in the church hath as much authority as the pope, or any other bishop. In reply to this, Harpsfield gives us twelve articles. Foxe replies to them all by saying, “that, as the man was mad, if the articles were so horrible as Cope, in his Dialogues, doth declare, he was more fit to be sent to Bedlam than to be had to the fire in Smithfield. But such is the manner and property of this holy mother-church of Rome, that whatsoever cometh to their hands and inquisition, to the fire it must go. There is no other way; neither pity that will move, nor excuse that will serve, nor age that they will spare, nor any respect that they will consider, as by these two miserable examples of Collins and Cowbridge doth appear, who should rather have been pitied than been burned.” <sup>F452</sup>

Who will not agree with Foxe? Who will not now (thanks be to God for the labors of the martyrologist, which have so greatly contributed to the improvement in the public mind!) approve the opinion of Foxe, rather than the arguments of Harpsfield; and pity, rather than burn, either the sane or the insane heretic? Foxe does not canonize the madman. He does, however, tell us, that “when he came to the stake, he called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ: and with great meekness and quietness, he yielded up his spirit into the hands of the Lord.” He had recovered his senses; and he is justly reckoned, therefore, by Foxe among those who, though they were not elevated to the rank of the saints-mediators of Rome, bore their testimony against the cruelty of the priesthood, and are rightly denominated martyrs.

The time would fail me to go through the long list of names whom Foxe mentions, with praise always for their testimony against Rome, though not always with approbation either for their opinions or conduct; and whom Harpsfield, Parsons, and Andrews, as uniformly speak of with hatred, contempt, or detestation. Joan of Kent, Peter the German, John of

Yesel, Ball of whom held notions which the church of England, as well as the church of Rome, condemn, — with Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Bradford, Barnes, Lutherans, Calvinists, Zuinglians, Wycliffe, Frith, and others, are all classed by Harpsfield with the Manichees, the Donatists, and the enemies of God. Foxe is supposed to be the indiscriminating eulogizer of all heresies and all heretics. The same vague, general, unmeaning abuse, *which spares his facts as unassailable, while it impugns his motives, opinions, and conclusions*, is given by Harpsfield which we have read in Parsons and Andrews, and the same general answer must be given to it; that while the “*veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe are proved to be unimpeachable, we are not required to defend his taste, his language, nor his errors. I shall only, therefore, go on to examine whether any specific falsehood is produced by Harpsfield, to justify the frequent appellation, both among the papal and protestant enemies of the martyrologist, of “the lying Foxe.”

It will be said that *Harpsfield, in his index, alleges seven specific falsehoods against Foxe*. He does so: and when I mention them, the absurdity as well as the nature of the accusation will be seen at once. *The first is that Foxe calk heretics martyrs;* <sup>f453</sup> — this has been sufficiently considered. *The second, that he makes Eleanor Cobham and Roger Onley, martyrs, and not sorcerers;* a charge which he discusses at some length, and which I shall certainly leave to the student, as Foxe himself has replied to the accusation at great length. <sup>F454</sup> It would indeed be most absurd to inquire, in this age, of the probability of the witchcraft and sorcery, by which Roger Onley, the knight or priest, <sup>f455</sup> labored to consume the king’s person by way of necromancy; <sup>f456</sup> or whether, the painted chair, upon the four corners of which hung four swords, and on every sword an image of copper, were the true instruments of magic; and whether Lady Eleanor Cobham, who desired in her treason to take the king’s life, employed Onley as her coadjutor; or whether these accusations were invented, and the real crime of both Onley and Lady Cobham was not, as Foxe from other authorities relates — an attachment to the principles of Wycliffe. I think it probable that every reader in the present day will believe the evidence which convinced Foxe that these people were guilty of holding certain opinions in religion which the priesthood of the day condemned;

rather than, that they practiced the king's death by melting an image of wax with arts magic and necromantic. <sup>F457</sup>

It was wittily said of some person, that he drew on his imagination for his facts; and on his memory for his fancy. Those who believe Harpsfield in preference to Foxe, may draw on Shakspeare for their facts, and on Harpsfield, Parsons, and Andrews, for the arguments with which they may defend them. I would as easily believe the "hallowed verge" and the "conjuro to," the "adsum" of the invoked spirit, and the answered "asmath" of Margery Jourdain, as they are so graphically related by our splendid poet; <sup>f458</sup> as believe in the legends of the dark age on which his dramatic scenes are written; or depend upon the authority of the papal antagonists of the martyrologist. In the very same page in which Harpsfield accuses Foxe of falsehood and of depraving history, <sup>f459</sup> by partially citing authorities in the case of the duchess of Gloucester, Eleanor Cobham, he dares to accuse him also of making Margaret Jourdain, the reputed witch of Eye, the supposed assistant, and the supposed sorcerer, in his supposed ceremonies. The indignant answer of Foxe is, <sup>f460</sup> "I never spake, nor thought, nor dreamed of the woman, till you yourself mentioned her in your book. So far is it off that I, either with my will, or against my will, made any martyr of her." But so it has always been. When Rome wishes to usurp domination over others, its claims to that domination always begin with doleful lamentations over the grievances it professes to suffer from heresy and heretics. When Rome accuses its adversaries of falsehood, it generally becomes itself the Cretan it describes its antagonist to be. The world has never witnessed a greater heresy than that of Rome, nor worse heretics than its adherents. Foxe is only called a liar by those who themselves excel in the peculiar accomplishment which they profess to discover in the martyrologist; and which Harpsfield, Parsons, Andrews, and their followers, have found to be so peculiarly useful in producing the conviction that their own falsehoods are truths.

*The third alleged falsehood* <sup>f461</sup> *is, that Cobham and Acton were not guilty of treason. The fourth, that men were put to death only for reading the Bible. The fifth is the repetition of the charge that Foxe acquitted lord Cobham of sedition. The sixth relates to an error in a date. The seventh,* <sup>f462</sup> *that Foxe denies, excepting in three instances, the heterodoxy of the martyrs. I quote these instances of alleged falsehoods, because they are*

more especially pointed out to us in the copious index of Harpsfield, as the peculiar falsehoods of the Book of Martyrs; but they do not appear to require further notice. I might make some remarks on the fourth charge. Harpsfield tells us, that because no man was permitted to read the translations of the Bible in the reign of Henry VI., which had been made by the Wycliffites, without permission of his diocesan, they could not be burnt merely for reading the Bible. They read it, either with or without permission. They would not be burnt for reading it with permission. If they were burnt for reading it without permission, they were not burnt for reading the Bible, but for disobedience to their diocesan; and *therefore* — *yes, gentle reader* — *therefore Foxe is a liar, for affirming that the perusal of the Scriptures was the crime of the martyrs.* The reader smiles at this folly; but it is the most impressive of all warnings to us. All the controversies respecting religion among protestants, are decided by the holy Scriptures. All the controversies between Rome and the protestants, are to be decided by the church. When the partisans of the two tribunals seem to clash, the two tribunals seem to clash. One tribunal must therefore destroy, or tolerate the other. The Scriptures destroy Rome. Rome tolerates the Scriptures. But in all matters of toleration, the assumption of the power to tolerate, implies the power to remove the toleration, if those who are tolerated, rebel, or appear to rebel against the tolerator. So it is with Rome and the Scriptures. The partisans of Rome are permitted to read the tolerated Scriptures; but if the tolerated Scriptures appear to teach that partisan of Rome to rebel against the church of Rome, then the toleration is withdrawn from the Scriptures. The sanction of the diocesan is withdrawn from the reader, and the rebel is punished, not for reading, but for disobeying the command which forbids him to read. By what name is such reasoning to be called? One of the greatest crimes, one of the most intolerable usurpations of the church of Rome, is the daring claim of intruding itself between the light from heaven and the darkness upon earth; and demanding the power of granting or withholding to the blind and fallen soul, the Scriptures of the eternal truth of God. If the bright beams of the Sun of Righteousness shine upon the people, it dares to tell that people, who are beginning to emerge from their darkness into that marvellous light, — “ You shall not “see at all. You shah not direct your steps to heaven, nor guide them “upon earth, by that light, unless you put on the blue, the green, or “yellow spectacles, which we will give you, to enable you to

understand “better the true nature of the light itself; and to see more clearly the “road, through the wilderness, to Canaan.”

We are next brought to the story of Hunne. No one of the narratives of John Foxe has been so much discussed as this. To repeat the arguments by which one party would prove to us that Hunne was murdered in prison, while another would prove to us that he hanged himself, would occupy too much time and room. No additional evidence can be found in the present day to that which is given by Foxe in his history, by Harpsfield in his reply, by Foxe in his rejoinder to Harpsfield, and by Parsons, who discusses the whole subject at great length,<sup>f463</sup> Dr. Lingard, in his History of England,<sup>f1464</sup> writing of the persecution of the Lollards, — and saying, with the utmost calmness and serenity, of the numbers brought before the primate, and the bishops of London and Lincoln, “almost all were induced to abjure; *and a few of the most obstinate forfeited their lives,*” — adds, in a note, — “I have not noticed ‘the legend of Hunne,’ who was found dead in prison. To the accounts given by Hall and Foxe may be opposed that of sir Thomas More.” The smooth manner in which this historian speaks the sad truth, and prevents the possibility of our declaring him to be in actual error, while he despoils history of its utility by his mode of writing, is peculiarly conspicuous in this account. It forms one of the best illustrations of his mode of so writing history, that the reader, before he is aware, is made to take for granted the very proposition, the truth of which may be under discussion. It is certain that Hunne was found dead in prison; but the question in what manner he died is left undecided. The historian speaks of “the legend of Hunne.” What is a legend? It is something read, which is of doubtful authority. It is a narrative, not so certainly true as an authenticated history. It is a story which may be rejected.<sup>F465</sup> Contempt of the story, too, is implied in the very word. Lingard, therefore, implies that the account of Hunne, that is, of the usual narrative of his death, is doubtful. Dr. Lingard’s work was written to produce an impression unfavourable to the reformers; we may infer, therefore, that he means to tell us that the opinion that Hunne was murdered by the papists, is a legend. If his book had been written on the opposite principles, we should have inferred that he meant to tell us, his suicide was a legend. The account of Hall and Foxe is, that Hunne was murdered. Sir Thomas More affirms that he believes he committed suicide.

The two accounts are opposed to each other. Dr. Lingard has not told us, as he ought to have done, that Foxe was attacked by Harpsfield, and that the martyrologist has replied throughout to his assailant, in a manner which has been considered unanswerable. <sup>F466</sup> Foxe has answered throughout, the whole mass of the reasoning both of Harpsfield, and of sir Thomas More, so entirely, that no abuse, either of Parsons or Andrews, can, I think, produce the conviction that Foxe has been guilty of falsehood in affirming that Hunne was murdered, and did not commit suicide.

I refer the reader to the account given us by Foxe himself; but I submit to him the summary of the narrative as it is compiled by Burnet.

“One Richard Hunne, a merchant tailor in London, was questioned by a clerk in Middlesex for a mortuary, pretended to be due for a child of his that died five weeks old, the clerk claiming the beering-sheet, and Hunne refusing to give it; upon that he was sued, but his counsel advised him to sue the clerk in a *premunire*, for bringing the king’s subjects before a foreign court; the spiritual court sitting by authority from the legate. This touched the clergy so to the quick, that they used all the arts they could to fasten heresy on him; and understanding that he had Wickliffe’s Bible, upon that he was attached of heresy, and put in the Lollards’ Tower at Paul’s, and examined upon some articles objected to him by Fitz-James, then bishop of London. He denied them as they were charged against him, but acknowledged he had said some words sounding that way, for which he was sorry, and asked God’s mercy, and submitted himself to the bishop’s correction; upon which he ought to have been enjoined penance, and set at liberty; *but he persisting still in his suit in the king’s courts, they used him most cruelly.* On the 4th of December he was found hanged in the chamber where he was kept prisoner. Dr. Horsey, chancellor to the bishop of London, with the other officers who had the charge of the prison, gave it out that he had hanged himself. But the coroner of London coming to hold an inquest on the dead body, they found him hanging so loose, and in a silk girdle, that they clearly perceived he was killed; they also found his neck had been broken, as they judged, with an iron chain, for the skin was all fretted and cut; they saw some streams of blood about his body, besides several other evidences, which made it clear he had not murdered himself; whereupon they did acquit the dead body, and laid the murder on the officers that had charge of that prison; and by other proofs they found the

bishop's sumner and the bell-ringer guilty of it; and by the deposition of the sumner himself, <sup>f467</sup> it did appear, that the chancellor, and he, and the bell-ringer, did murder him, and then hang him up.

But as the inquest proceeded in this trial, the bishop began a new process against the dead body of Richard Hunne, for other points of heresy; and several articles were gathered out of Wickliffe's preface to the Bible, with which he was charged. And his having the book in his possession being taken for good evidence, he was judged an heretic, and his body delivered to the secular power. When judgment was given, the bishops of Duresme and Lincoln, with many doctors both of divinity and the canon law, sat with the bishop of London; so that it was looked on as an act of the whole clergy, and done by common consent. On the 20th of December his body was burnt at Smithfield." <sup>F468</sup>

Such is the summary of Burnet. I refer the reader to Harpsfield," <sup>f469</sup> Parsons, <sup>f470</sup> and Andrews, <sup>f471</sup> for their animadversions on Foxe's defense. They produce nothing new — refute no assertion — overthrow no fact. They abuse Foxe for enrolling him among the martyrs, though Foxe carefully avoids eulogizing the religion of Hunne, and tells us that he was *not* "a full protestant, but took his beads with him to the prison." Foxe relates the history as a proof that the atrocities and cruelties of the papal holders of power and authority, disgusted even their most faithful adherents; and thus contributed to prepare the way for their own overthrow, and for the establishment of the reformation. <sup>F472</sup>

As I do not find that Harpsfield has been able to prove that the "*veracity and fidelity*" of Foxe are assailable with success, my task may be considered as nearly concluded. The reader cannot be more interested in any discovery of the deficiencies of Harpsfield, than in those of the more modern antagonists of the martyrologist. I might otherwise point out the absurdity of his attempting to prove, by a quotation from Augustine, that every one of the pseudo-martyrs, without exception, deny that Christ has come in the flesh; because such persons have not charity, and he who has not charity makes this denial. <sup>F473</sup> Who can reply to such a reasoner?

*Foxe places Erasmus among his witnesses against Rome.* Harpsfield is very angry at this, and quotes many passages to prove that Erasmus spoke well of the Romanists.

Harpsfield is right in thus affirming; but Foxe is no less right. Erasmus fluctuated much in his opinions. Both parties claim Erasmus as their advocate. He spoke truths which they both received. He denounced errors which they both rejected. But that Foxe was more right than Harpsfield in deeming him to be an antipapalist may be proved from other Romanist writers, when they had no such object in view as Harpsfield when he wrote his Sixth Dialogue. Bellarmine, <sup>f474</sup> for instance, ranks him among the semi-Christians. In another place, <sup>f475</sup> he says, “Quid quaeso Erasmus Roterodamus? Annon Luciani impietatem longo intervallo superavit?” And again, he says that “the doctrine of Erasmus was not far distant from that of Wiclif and Luther.”

Erasmus himself has amply proved that he was no Romanist. In the *Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, can. 6. is the following passage. — “Admiror, potestatis et domini ambitiora vocabula ad ipsos usque pontifices summos et episcopos invecta fuisse.-’Apostolus,’ ‘pastor,’ ‘episcopus,’ officii sunt vocabula, non dominatus. ‘Papa,’ ‘abbas,’ caritatis cognomina sunt, non potestatis: sed quid ego mare illud vulgarium errorum ingredior? ad quodcunque hominum genus se converterit, multa ubique videbit homo vere spiritualis quae rideat, plura quae fleat. Plurimas opiniones deprehendet depravatissimas, et Christi doctrina longe lateque dissidentes.” <sup>F476</sup> ... The whole of his treatise *De Concordia in Religione* proceeds upon the assumption, that the truth of the gospel had been debased by the Romanists, and that it might be purified.

In another place, *Harpsfield condemns Foxe for wishing that in some respects the Reformers were as good as the Romanists.*

Harpsfield ought to admire his candor. Foxe throughout his work seeks peace and truth, and can therefore afford to speak with fairness and candor.

*Harpsfield condemns Foxe for inserting the name of Mirandula in his catalogue of witnesses against Rome.*

Here also Foxe is right. Did Harpsfield never read the language of this nobleman to the emperor Maximilian, in 1500? — “Reliquum est, maxime Caesar, ut quae de te fide et pietate possum, deprecor, ut sanctissimum illud propositum tuum vendicandae in pristinam libertatem christianae

reipublicae, quam citius fieri potest, adimpleas. Concutitur ab externis hostibus, ab internis laceratur; et J. C. Domini nostri sanguine circumseptum et consecratum ovile pejora multum perpessum est, indiesque patitur a lupis magis sub ovina quam propria pelle grassantibus. Age igitur jam, optime; et excitis, qua ratione potes, christianis regibus, te Christo regi omnium, oves suas tam ab hostibus quam a perfidis pastoribus jamjam liberaturo, fidum ministrum exhibe.”

In the year 1406 the University of Oxford is said to have honored itself by giving a solemn testimonial to Wycliffe of their approbation of his labors, zeal, and learning, and to have sealed it with their common seal. Foxe publishes these letters, and believes them to be genuine. *Harpsfield reminds him that letters of the same University condemned the errors of Wycliffe; and the inference is therefore drawn, that the letters in question were forged.* The last biographer of Wycliffe is unable to decide if the evidence is sufficient to convince us, whether the letters of testimonial to Wycliffe were spurious or genuine. <sup>F477</sup> “Considerable suspicion,” he says, “hangs over the authenticity of the document; and it has been affirmed that one Peter Payne stole the University seal, and wrote the letters.” It is not probable that the seal of the University could have been thus stolen; neither is it probable that the University could stultify itself by approbation of a writer, and by disapprobation of his writings. It is possible that, during the vacation, a majority of Wycliffe’s friends in the senate may have ordered the writing of the letters; and that this surreptitious use of the seal may have occasioned the subsequent order, that the seal of the university should be decreed to be appended to no document, but in full congregation of regents in full term, or in full convocation of regents and non-regents in the vacation; and that nothing should be done till after one day’s full deliberation. We cannot now decide whether the letters were forged or not; but the very fact, that Lewis and Le Bas discuss the doubt, proves to us that the “*veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe are not to be questioned, because he believed in and defended the authenticity of the documents in question.

Harpsfield resumes his attacks on Foxe by deriding the accounts of the dying words, the patience, the zeal, and heroism of the antipapal witnesses, who were burned for protesting against the errors of the church of Rome. He derides them; and a spurious liberality, affecting gentle-

manliness, and despising as enthusiastic, or nonsensical, all those higher thoughts and feelings which are peculiar to the sincere and zealous believer in the truths and sanctions of Christianity, despises them also: both are the enemies of the loftier aspirations of the soul of man. Because the martyrs were not papists, this learned but wretched fellow does not or will not see, that their deaths were as glorious as their faith was pure, as their lives were holy, or as their motives were worthy of their christian convictions. I trust that the people of England will never be influenced by the earthborn, creeping learning, which resolves the higher aspirations of the soul after the truth for which it is willing to give the body to death, into the mere ravings of the fanaticism of the blinded or infuriated partizan. I trust that the church of England — the people of England — the *protestants* of England — (long may the antipapal epithet, in spite of our own brethren who would despise it, retain its honorable estimation among us) — I trust that the nation and the state of England will never forget the dying words of the martyrs, upon which such men as Harpsfield would throw contempt and scorn. “See,” said Baynham, whom Harpsfield mentions with indignation and ridicule, — “see,” said the dying witness, “ye look for miracles. Here is a miracle. I feel, in this fire, no more pain than if I were on a bed of down. It is to me as a bed of roses!” — “I will never pray for thee, thou art a heretic,” said the sheriff to Rogers at the stake. “But I will pray for thee,” was the meek answer; and while the flames were consuming him, he waved his hand in triumph. — “The blessed gospel is what I hold,” said Sanders, when they offered him a pardon if he would recant; “that do I believe; that have I taught; that will I never revoke.” And that blessed gospel, by God’s continued mercy, is still taught among us. — “Oh live, my friend!” said sir Anthony Kingston to bishop Hooper, when the queen had requested the knight to induce the bishop to recant; and when he, with many tears, therefore entreated his friend to live. “True it is,” said the bishop, “that death is bitter, and life is sweet; but the second death is more bitter, and the life to come is more sweet!”<sup>f478</sup> — “I have taught you nothing, my people,” said Taylor, on his way to the stake, “but God’s holy word, and the lessons I have taken from the Bible; and I am come hither this day to seal that truth with my blood!” And he kissed the stake when he came to it. “Merciful Father!” he prayed, “for Jesus Christ’s sake, receive my soul!” and the learned, the eloquent, and the facetious, and the pious man (the qualities by which I describe him are not

incompatible with each other) dies as the antipapal witness, to the antipapal truth. — “I will give you the stewardship of my palace and forty pounds in money, if thou wilt recant,” said the bishop of London to poor Hunter. “I cannot turn from God!” was the victim’s answer, and he lifted up his hands to heaven, as his head sunk down in the flames — “Lord, Lord, Lord, receive my spirit!”

*Is it bigotry, is it intolerance, is it a want of liberality, as even protestant divines are beginning to assert, to remember these fearful scenes, when the very power which taught the people that these scenes were necessary for the honor of Christ, and the benefit of the catholic church, still aspires to rule, and still refuses, up to this very hour, to change one doctrine, rescind one decree, or alter one law of its church — and, what is still worse, has strengthened and confirmed all the most objectionable errors since the martyrs suffered? If we did not know, that the God of Christianity has declared, that, under the influence of the Holy Spirit of love and of power, mankind shall be taught union among themselves and obedience to his will, we might despair of the destinies of the holy catholic church, and the happiness and peace of the world. But the time must come, when Rome shall change, as the heathens were changed, and as England has been changed. It shall become ashamed, not only of the scenes I am relating, but of the principles and the laws which occasioned them. Till that change of its laws is begun and completed, while others may affect to forget, we, who study the history of the past to learn instruction for the present and the future, must never forget the record of the testimony to the truth of our present antipapal form of Christianity, established among us. I, for one, will ever be so bigoted, if the word must be applied to me, as to remember how Farrar, the bishop of St. David’s, kept his word, in the flames, after he had told his friend, “that if he saw him stir from the pain of the burning, his doctrine might be disbelieved;” and he stood up in the fire, without shrinking, patient to the last. Some may call his language presumption. I deem it to be the faith of a martyr, conscious of Divine support. — “I would gladly accept my pardon,” said George Marsh, “if it did not tend to tear me away from God.” — “Be of good cheer, brother Ridley,” said old Latimer to his more accomplished and courtier-like brother-bishop, “and play the man!” And Ridley suffered with the same heroism and fortitude as the poorer and more ignoble victims, to prove to*

us, that the witnesses to the antipapal cause were to be alike derived from the gentlemen of the court, as from the loom, or the plough. — “The Bible,” said poor Bartlett Green, when he was reproached by his judge with opposing his opinion against those of the ancient fathers and prelates of the realm, “is of more authority than all fathers, all prelates, and all churches; it is the test by which all their opinions must be tried.” — And if the people of England, after their great deliverances in church and state, ever forget this truth, they will again deserve to see their holy priesthood changed into an unholy priestcraft; and to have the curse, and not the blessing, of the Inspirer of the holy Scriptures rest upon them. — “That unworthy right hand! That unworthy right hand!” said the still hated, still abused, still calumniated Cranmer; and the weakness of his recantation is still remembered by the papal writer, to the dishonor of the archbishop, when his dying prayer is ridiculed, though he spake it in common with the first martyr, “Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!” — “Be of good cheer!” said the lame man to the blind man, when he threw away his crutch, and was fastened to the stake; “my lord of London is a good physician, he will cure thee of thy blindness and me of my lameness.” — “We believe in the holy catholic church,” said others; <sup>f479</sup> and when one of the bystanders told them that he rejoiced at this part of their faith, “We believe not in the papal catholic church,” was the answer, “but in the catholic church of Christ.” — If it be said that many of these persons died for their own general, undefined, and sometimes therefore erroneous views of the conclusions derivable from the word of God, — it is true, I answer! *but the greater part*, like Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, Farrar, and others, *died for the very church which still remains*, by God’s great and undeserved mercy upon us, still established, in their blood, by our protestant laws, among us. Many of them, like Hillier, or Hullier, who pressed the prayer-book to his heart, when it was scornfully thrown to him, thanked God in the flames for bestowing on the kingdom that precious gift. — I feel, however, that I need not proceed to relate their dying committings of their souls to God, their prayers for mercy, their ejaculations of praise, their hosannahs and their hallelujahs to the God of Christianity, who accepted the oblations of their martyred bodies, upon the altars of Smithfield, Oxford, and Colchester, and other towns, honored by their noble deaths, for the cause of the catholic church, and for the religion now established in England. — Harpsfield could not forget them. He lived among the eye-witnesses who

beheld these things. He rejoiced with his brother, the chaplain of Bonner, to do God service, by putting the protestant members of the church of England to death; and he laughed in triumph over their agonies, and derided, when he could not deny, the mournful narratives of John Foxe. He despises them all; but he is more especially angry with the story of Baynham, and with the exclamation, that the fire that consumed him was as a bed of roses. These words, as well as all the other expressions which I have cited, appeared to Harpsfield — and they may appear to others also — to be only the result of enthusiasm, boasting, or mockery. “They boasted,” says Harpsfield, “that they felt no pains in the fire.”<sup>F480</sup> If the expressions be literally interpreted, Harpsfield is right, and Foxe is wrong: but they are not to be so considered. They are to be regarded as the proofs of that heroic patience, that stubborn fortitude, with which the Creator has endowed the human soul, for the best and wisest purposes. Such fortitude is at once the proof of the independence of the soul upon the organs of the body — the pledge that consciousness does not necessarily depend upon organization; and the demonstration, therefore, of the possible, the probable, and the certain immortality of man.

Much railing, also, is vented against Foxe, which requires no notice. He is abused, after much irrelevant matter, for admitting that the supreme power over the church, might be in the hands of a layman. As this question must be decided by the meaning of the two words — “church,” and “head of the church,” it may not be advisable to discuss its details at present. Harpsfield is scandalized at an erroneous assertion of Foxe, that eight only of the Romanists died for their faith; whereas many more could be enumerated, whom Harpsfield mentions and eulogizes. Foxe would have said, that many whom his antagonist praises as martyrs, suffered rather as traitors and rebels. But into this sad and painful recrimination I shall not now enter. The differences in religious opinions are always identified with political controversies, when they are involved in the discussions of obedience or disobedience to the public law: and the only mode of preventing the fearful struggle between our duty to Caesar and our duty to God, is — that Caesar take care, in all matters of religion, to exact that only which God has empowered him to demand. Our fathers identified heresy with treason, and treason with heresy; because the rulers of the people imagined themselves to be unsusceptible of error in religious

opinions, and of folly in political legislation. The rejection of their religious opinions, therefore, was made heresy; and because their political legislation was founded on their religious opinions, that rejection was denominated treason. The only great division among Christians is occasioned by the difficulty of so directing and forming the opinions of our rulers, that their laws should be consistent with the conclusions of reason, and with the discoveries of revelation. The former are discoverable only after long experience, and the latter are continually made more plain and more satisfactory by continued improvements in knowledge. Because such experience and such improvements imply imperfection on the part of rulers and of subjects, — therefore it is that the consciousness of such imperfection, rendering both rulers and people jealous over themselves, and anxious for progressive perfection, is the only source of mutual confidence, — the only banisher of all intolerance, — the only reconciler of the claims of the civil power, the authority of the ecclesiastical power, — the love of truth, which appeals to Scripture, and the love of freedom, which appeals to reason. All, all, these will be united when the several nations which constitute the states and churches of the one catholic church, and the one confederated civilized world, shall learn mutual self-distrust from the long records of the past. Then, and then only, the mighty controversy will cease, which has so long convulsed the world by the collisions between power assuming infallibility, and subjection demanding the extension of greater privilege. Then, and then only, will the lesson with which John Foxe concludes the melancholy history of the persecutions which disgrace the reign of Mary, be learned by states and churches. Then, and then only, will the prayer with which his antagonist Harpsfield concludes his last chapter, be heard and answered. The conclusion of the Acts and Monuments of John Foxe is, — that when those who are in authority, acting upon the union of zeal and opinion, stir up persecution in christian churches, to the effusion of christian blood, they are in danger, while they think they only punish heretics, of stumbling at the same stone on which the Jews of old fell, to their own confusion and destruction. <sup>F481</sup>

The prayer with which Harpsfield concludes his attack on the martyrologist, is — that the dissensions among Christians may cease, and that we may all live, and receive a blessing, in the unity of the catholic church. <sup>F482</sup> I interpret the words “catholic church in a different sense from that of Harpsfield. *He would make the center of unity to be submission to*

*papal Rome. I would make the center of unity to be the primitive episcopal communion, in which there might be friendship with, but no submission to, reformed and antipapal Rome.* In this sense of the words “the catholic church,” I join in the prayer of Harpsfield, and desire to enforce the lesson inculcated on the world by John Foxe. The cessation of all persecution, and the cultivation of christian unity, in the communion of the holy catholic church, is, or ought to be, the twofold object of all christian controversialists. Papists and protestants, states and nations, churches and individual believers, are beginning over the whole civilized and christianized world to join in the prayer which we learn from the lessons which John Foxe has recorded — that the general detestation of persecution is the first and best foundation of all our hopes of union; and happy shall we be if we gather from the unanswered and unanswerable pages of John Foxe, the one holy conclusion, to which all the pages of the history of the past should lead us — that the sad record of the infliction and endurance of suffering should teach Rome to repent, and protestantism to distrust itself, and all churches to reconsider their foundations and their superstructure, till their mutual exasperations and angry jealousies be forgiven, and past persecutions terminate in the cessation of mutual hatred, and the establishment of christian love. The basis of such union must be catholic episcopacy, well-considered discipline, the reception of the holy Scriptures as the rule of the creeds of the churches, and the total annihilation of all laws which enforce and compel the adoption of a religious opinion, because it is the opinion of the civil or of the ecclesiastical rulers. I may seem to be speaking of a dream: but if the prayer of Christ be answered, (and heaven and earth shall pass away before his word shall fail,) the dream will become a reality; and the mode in which it may be accomplished may possibly be obscurely shadowed out. The study of the history of the past may possibly be the guide to the safe anticipation of the future. So may it be! May God’s kingdom of peace and love come! may Christ’s will, as Christ expressed his will in his own solemn prayer, be done, in union among Christians upon earth, as we believe it is done in union among the angels of heaven!

Here, then, I end my review of the assailants on the “*veracity and fidelity*” of John Foxe. None of them, whether ancient or modern, have proved him to be an unfaithful or unfair historian. None have demonstrated that our

ancestors acted unwisely in deeming the martyrologist to have been the most useful servant, which *the university of Oxford* ever yet produced, without any one exception, to warn the people against the consequences of the papal supremacy over the laws of England, and over the consciences and persons of the people. None have disproved his incalculable value in warming the hearts of his countrymen to meet the dangers which threatened them in the reign of Elizabeth; in animating them to meet with bold and unquailing resistance the sabbath-breaking, press-persecuting folly of Laud, — or in preserving the fire on the altar of God, and on the hearth of true liberty, when the last of the Stuarts dispensed with the protestant laws, and aimed at the restoration of the ascendancy of Rome. None of his assailants have appreciated his real value, even at this moment, as the bequeather of a solemn warning to us, and to our children; never to permit the domination of the unchanged papal party, or the influential revival of the unchanged papal principles which our ancestors so justly condemned. That same unchanged power would now hope to succeed, by courtesy, flattery, and an assumed liberality; which once ruled by severity, terror, and fear. It still aspires to govern us. It must necessarily, therefore, still be watched. It must be ever guarded against, with jealousy, vigilance, and courage, whether it wage its open war upon us, or whether it creep silently, slowly, and invisibly into the paradise of our reformed church and free state, among the fogs and mists,<sup>f483</sup> of our liberal opinions, foolish divisions, or revived appeals to the spurious traditions which our fathers rightly undervalued, as unworthy of comparison with the holy light, “offspring of heaven first-born,” of the written and inspired revelation. None of his assailants have convicted John Foxe of intentional mistakes, or of any error but such as might have been anticipated in volumes so numerous and extensive; and such as are common to every author and historian who has ever attempted to instruct the world. The result of every attack we have considered, has served to demonstrate some excellency in his invaluable pages. Whatever be the defects of the humble agent who has arranged the witnesses against him, and enabled the reader to examine their evidence, to compare it with the defense, and to decide on the merits or the demerits of the martyrologist; the labor will, I trust, be so far deemed to be successful, that no man from this time forward will dare to impugn the “*veracity and fidelity*” of Foxe, nor call him by the opprobrious epithets which designate the affirmer of deliberate and wilful falsehood. To produce

this effect is the task which was undertaken, and I trust it has been effectually accomplished.

But are there no errors, no faults in the volumes of John Foxe? Is he to be ranked among our historical authorities, and enrolled among our standard authors? These questions naturally or unavoidably present themselves on the conclusion of this treatise. I will answer each question briefly, and so bid my reader farewell.

*Are there no faults in Foxe?* Ay, truly are there; and many more than his most inveterate antagonists have mentioned. But he has done his best, and there is not one wilful misrepresentation of a fact. His faults are these: — too great carelessness in the printing of the titles of men and the names of places — too careless revision of the translations, which he tells us in his reply to Alan Cope, or Harpsfield, were frequently left to others, while he prepared fresh materials for new editions. The Greek epitaph of Foxe on Jewell, <sup>f484</sup> and the various Latin compositions which have given him a high rank among scholars, prove to us that the inaccuracies which may have been discovered in his translations must have proceeded from carelessness, and not from ignorance. Still that carelessness is indefensible. He has other faults. He is too credulous. He speaks of Hildegardis, for instance, as if she had been endued with the miraculous gift of prophecy. He expresses himself incautiously respecting many things which the church of England has sanctioned, and which, like the Lord's prayer, were common to the early church, and to the church of Rome, such as church music. <sup>F485</sup> He speaks too disparagingly of such eminent men as More and Fisher; though it must be remembered that both these men were guilty of the common crime, the persecution which Foxe abhorred. He mentions the crucifying of children by the Jews, as if he believed the common fable; yet it is not impossible that some fanatical Jews may have sometimes given cause for the popular conviction. He is said to have received the account of martyrdoms without sufficient caution; yet these accounts were open to his contemporaries, who might have refuted them if they could have been refuted. It is difficult to vindicate him from the charge of puritanism. It is certain that if he could have effected a further reform in the church of England, he would have conducted it much too far from Rome. It is difficult to distinguish between his opinions, and those of the persons of whom he is speaking. This is a great defect. These are the chief popular

objections; yet these are not insisted upon by the assailants whom I have noticed. I have heard these mentioned in conversation, and have seen them suggested in various notices of his merits or demerits. They are all great faults; yet they affect neither his “*veracity, nor his fidelity,*” and may be dismissed therefore without further notice.

But the second question is — *Ought John Foxe to be regarded as an historical authority?*

Mr. Maitland speaks of the idea as absurd. Let us consider as our best answer to the question, neither his opinions, nor his motives, nor his objects, but the vast storehouse of materials he has collected, and the mass of undisputed facts which he has related, and which are not to be found in the volumes of any other book. We shall then, I think, come to the conclusion, that he still is, what our fathers esteemed him to be — one of the first, most valuable, and un superseded authorities in the English language. <sup>F486</sup>

John Foxe first made generally known to the public, the value of the historical manuscripts, which he consulted before they were printed. The first English edition of Foxe was printed in the early part of the reign of Elizabeth. He makes constant use of Matthew Paris, which was first printed in 1571; of William of Malmesbury, William Huntingdon, R. Hoveden, Ethelward, and Ingulphus, which were first printed in 1696; and of Matthew of Westminster, which was printed in 1567. He quotes from manuscripts the epistle of Boniface or Winfrid; <sup>f487</sup> the letter of Charlemagne; <sup>f488</sup> the letters of Alcuin; <sup>f489</sup> the laws of Athelstan; <sup>f490</sup> the laws of Egelred; <sup>f491</sup> the oration of Edgar. <sup>F492</sup> All these were printed for the first time, and were added to the public store of our literature. We cannot be surprised that all, every one of the antagonists who assailed him, excepting those who live in this more liberal age, venerated his researches and his learning, and always quote him on every point (but that to which their controversial discussions may have led them) with respect and deference as an undoubted authority. Foxe printed from the records in the Tower the charters of king William. <sup>F493</sup> He confirms his statements from the registers of Hereford. <sup>F494</sup> He analyses the manuscript account of the miracles of Becket. <sup>F495</sup> He refers to the manuscript account of the pacification between pope Alexander and the emperor Frederic, <sup>f496</sup> and to

letters printed from the Tower. <sup>F497</sup> The French chronicle of Thomas Grey is cited (in the same page with the letter of king John to the pope from the Tower rolls); <sup>f498</sup> and one copy only of this manuscript now remains, in the library of Christ's college in Cambridge. It was not printed till the year 1838. The eulogium of the monk of Canterbury, quoted by Foxe in the same page, is not yet printed. All these, as well as the extracts from the episcopal registers, <sup>f499</sup> might not have been printed to illustrate the truth of our common histories, to this very day, if John Foxe had not collected or transcribed them for the general use.

The history of the rise and progress of the Reformation is more fully and dearly illustrated by the labors of John Foxe, from the most unexceptionable contemporary authorities, than by any other writer on that ever-interesting subject. He has collected and printed numerous original documents from the registers of the bishop of London; <sup>f500</sup> from those of the bishop of Lincoln; <sup>f501</sup> from those of the archbishop of Canterbury, <sup>f502</sup> and, what are more valuable still, from the registers of the archbishop of St. Andrews. No one episcopal register of that period is to be found in all Scotland; so complete has been the devastation of such records in that part of the empire. When Foxe wrote, that devastation had not destroyed the registers. Foxe refers to them. "We express here," he says, "the articles against Hamilton, as we received them from Scotland, out of the registers." <sup>F503</sup> Very curious are some of the documents which Foxe has thus collected. Among the most so, are the letter of thanks from Louvaine to Scotland, <sup>f504</sup> Hamilton's treatise on Justifying Faith, <sup>f505</sup> Sir Ralph Sadler's Oration to the king of Scotland on the Papal Supremacy, Articles against Borthwick and others. <sup>F506</sup> Many other records of the same date are cited by Foxe alone, which are essential to every student of history, and which assist in making his work what our fathers esteemed it to be — the completest ecclesiastical-historical library we possess. among these may be enumerated the conferences between the cardinal and the almoner of queen Catharine; <sup>f507</sup> the oaths of Gardiner, Stokesley, Lee, Tunstal, etc. renouncing the papal supremacy. These are printed from the originals, and were probably taken from the proceedings of the convocation, which are now lost. <sup>F508</sup> Foxe prints, too, many letters of Henry VIII. and Wolsey, <sup>f509</sup> which would have been otherwise lost. He

has omitted many on account of the size of his book, which can now never be recovered.

This brings us down to his own times. Much of the history of that period was founded upon written contemporary authority. The story of the three men, *King, Debenham, and Marsh*, who were hanged for burning the rood at Dover Court, was taken from the letters of a living witness, who might therefore be referred to when Foxe's book was published.<sup>f510</sup> Tindal's letters to Frith,<sup>f511</sup> Bonner's letters to Cromwell;<sup>f512</sup> the characteristic conference between Brusierd and Bilney on image-worship;<sup>f513</sup> the highly important document from Bonner's own handwriting against Gardiner, and the letters of Lambert, were all in the possession of Foxe, and all were printed from the originals. The story of Garret,<sup>f514</sup> of Barber, of Brown, were all printed from the affecting narratives of eye-witnesses. In the paper respecting priests' marriages from Parker,<sup>f515</sup> he cites<sup>f516</sup> very many old charters from their originals; which demonstrate that the marriages of priests were allowed by the ancient laws of the kingdom. Foxe is no less to be considered still useful also to the reader of history, for the information he has given to us from original sources, of the foreign affairs of the kingdom. His information from Oecolampadius,<sup>f517</sup> and from Spain,<sup>f518</sup> appears to have been from manuscripts. He communicated also with Calais before it was lost to England; and collected from thence many interesting narratives.<sup>f519</sup> In these memoranda I notice only those documents respecting which Foxe himself has given us any details; and as he generally quotes his documents without informing us of the particular sources from whence they are derived, they form but a *very* small portion of the invaluable and original matter, which is scattered through his laborious pages. Burnet, Strype, and all our best historians have derived their principal information and documents from John Foxe; and many hundred letters, all derived from authentic sources, and only now to be found there, illustrate the period of which he writes; and prove his work to be indispensable to every one who desires both genuine and accurate knowledge of the painful subjects of his history. Raw-head and bloody-bone stories are supposed to be the subjects of his Acts and Monuments by the thoughtless and ignorant alone. Those who have studied his pages, will never dispense with his book.

As this statement may appear strange to many, in spite of all I have said, I will still confirm my opinion of the value of John Foxe, by referring to other original and most valuable documents, which are indispensable to the right understanding of the times in which he lived; and to the general illustration of English history. The record of the proceedings of the convocations in England, for instance, were destroyed in the fire of London, 1666. Foxe gives us extracts from them, of the utmost utility. <sup>f520</sup> The speech of queen Mary, at Guildhall, was taken down by one who heard it, and given to Foxe. <sup>f521</sup> The documents connected with the history of lady Jane Grey, are original. The curious oration of Bonner to the convocation, on the dignity of the priesthood, <sup>f522</sup> was reported to Foxe by a hearer. Ridley's manuscript account of his discussion with Feckenham; <sup>f523</sup> the documents exhibited by Cranmer on his examination; <sup>f524</sup> the papers prepared by Ridley for his defense; <sup>f525</sup> Ridley's own account of his treatment; <sup>f526</sup> were all committed to Foxe, and used by him in the compilation of his work. So also the account of Bonner's actually striking, in his passion, a gentleman of rank, <sup>f527</sup> with other extravagances of anger, were testified to Foxe, by those who were present. The oration of cardinal Pole, the proceedings of the council, and the submission of England to the pope, on the absolution of the lords and commons on their knees before the cardinal, are most graphically related by Foxe; <sup>f528</sup> who gives us also the autograph letter of Philip to the pope, with the letter of the cardinal. The sermon on the following Sunday at Paul's Cross, by Gardiner, are also given <sup>f529</sup> from manuscript notes, "as they came to my hands," says Foxe, "faithfully gathered." Those who speak slightly of the "*veracity and fidelity*" of John Foxe cannot have studied these things. They cannot have read his constant references to original documents, and his no less constant appeal to the contemporary testimonies, by which, or by whom, the truth of his narratives was confirmed. Accumulative proofs of his "veracity and faithfulness" of this nature, will not be valued by some. Others will demand still more proofs of his diligence, and anxiety to give relations of the events which took place in the reign of Mary; and on their account I will still continue my observations.

The accounts, then, of the examinations of some of the prisoners, drawn up by themselves, "left in writing, to remain for a perpetual testimony, in the cause of God's truth, as here followeth, recorded and testified, by his

own writing.”<sup>f530</sup> The memoranda respecting bishop Hooper, who was “spare of his diet, sparer of words, and sparest of time,”<sup>f531</sup> are given to Foxe by those who knew him. The original of Ridley’s letter to Hooper,<sup>f532</sup> the originals of Hooper’s examinations,<sup>f533</sup> and of Hooper’s letters,<sup>f534</sup> with the manuscript letters of Taylor,<sup>f535</sup> Phillpotts,<sup>f536</sup> Cranmer,<sup>f537</sup> and Careless,<sup>f538</sup> were all in Foxe’s possession. Other proceedings against the supposed heretics were copied from the registers.<sup>f539</sup> The public records also are cited.<sup>f540</sup> The letters of Farrar,<sup>f541</sup> of Bradford,<sup>f542</sup> of Ridley,<sup>f543</sup> and of Latimer,<sup>f544</sup> were collected by Foxe. The examination of George Marsh, who read the English Litany every morning with his friends on his knees,<sup>f545</sup> the process against Bland,<sup>f546</sup> the final examinations of Ridley and Latimer,<sup>f547</sup> were all communicated to the martyrologist, who anxiously endeavored to collect original and authentic documents from all quarters. He proves his extreme candor, in his estimation of the value of these documents, by the manner in which he speaks of the account given of Cranmer by his friend Dr. Martin. “Such as that report is,” says Foxe, “I thought good to let the reader understand, that he may use therein his own judgment and consideration,”<sup>f548</sup> His frequent appeals to eye-witnesses of the things he relates,<sup>549</sup> the manner in which the declarations he received from the persecuted of their examinations and sufferings, are affirmed by him, not to be credited for their own words only,<sup>f550</sup> even though in one remarkable case the narrative of their sorrows was written with their own blood, and not with ink.<sup>f551</sup> All these things prove to us that Foxe is worthy of our confidence, and that his “*veracity and fidelity*” cannot be assailed with either truth or honor. Disgrace has followed every attempt to destroy its value. *If Foxe’s Acts and Monuments had not been written, — and this is the best criterion of his merits, — no book in the English language can be mentioned which would supply its place.* Whoever will but impartially and candidly consider the mass of the materials collected, and remember that this work was the first attempt to give to the common reader a history of the church of Christ, as well as a narrative of the evil consequences of the one false principle, that the soul of the Christian is to be governed by authority that is fallible, on the supposition that such authority is infallible, unchangeable and divine, — must, I think, acknowledge, that the work of John Foxe is one of the most useful, most important, and most valuable books we still possess. It has never been superseded. Its loss could not have been supplied. He will also, I think,

confess that our ancestors were justified in their admiration of the volumes of Foxe; and that we can name no other work, on the subjects treated upon by John Foxe, which so certainly deserved their favor, and which still continues to deserve the approbation of their sons. To appeal to the decisions of our fathers, — to speak to the present age of the “wisdom of our ancestors,” I well know to be, among many, the undoubted criterion of narrowness of intellect. The very expression — “the wisdom of our ancestors,” is ranked by Jeremy Bentham, among the fallacies which prevent the free exercise of our judgment, in matters both of political or religious inquiry. I cannot say how this may be. I am too unlearned to fathom the wisdom of our ancestors; but I am sure that their folly in abhorring and disfavouing papistry, was much less than the folly of their sons; who, in spite of the experience of the past, are once more employed in reviving its power, in encouraging its usurpations, and pretensions; and in depreciating and deriding the value and estimation, the “*veracity and fidelity*,” of the martyrologist, John Foxe.

The testimonies that might be adduced, to the value, the faithfulness, and the laborious integrity of the martyrologist, would be burdensome to the reader from their number and extent. I shall merely select a few, from the pens of men who were competent to form an accurate judgment, and who would not lightly have affirmed more than they knew to be true. To commence with the highest ecclesiastical authorities of his own time, we must regard Archbishop Parker as the real author of that injunction which emanated from the convocation of 1571, over which he presided, — that “in the hails and dining-rooms of all bishops, and other dignitaries, there should be kept the great Bible, and the Book of Martyrs” of John Foxe.

Nor was it a slight mark of estimation, that when a code of ecclesiastical law was to be propounded (although Elizabeth’s indisposition to it prevented its final enactment), the duty of editing that work (the *Reformatio Legum*) was confided, most probably by the archbishop, to Foxe.

Of Grindall, Parker’s successor in the primacy, we need only observe, that, as has been already mentioned, he was one of Foxe’s chief assistants in the compilation of the martyrology.

Archbishop Whitgift, the next in succession in the see of Canterbury, styled him “that worthy man, who had so well deserved of this church of England;” and he tells Mr. Cartwright, that “he had read over his Acts and Monuments from one end to the other.” And, in another place, he thus speaks, “Mr. Foxe, who hath very diligently and faithfully labored in this matter (of archbishops and metropolitans) and searched out the truth of it, as learnedly as I know any man to have done.” <sup>F552</sup>

The great Camden thus writes of him: “Ex eruditorum numero obiit Joannes Foxus Oxoniensis, qui Ecclesiasticam Angliae Historiam, sire Martyrologium indefesso veritatis studio primum Latine, postea Anglice auctius magna cum laude contexuit.” <sup>F553</sup>

“We now come,” says Fuller, “to set down those particular martyrs that suffered in this queen’s reign (Mary). But this point hath been handled already so curiously and copiously by Mr. Foxe, that his industry herein hath starved the endeavors of such as shall succeed him, leaving nothing for their pens and pains to feed upon. *For what can the man do that cometh after the king? Even that which hath been already done, saith Solomon.* And Mr. Foxe, appearing sole emperor in this subject, all posterity may despair to add any remarkable discoveries which have escaped his observation. Wherefore, to handle this subject after him, what is it, but *to light a candle to the sun?* or rather (to borrow a metaphor from his book), *to kindle one single stick to the burning of so many faggots.*” <sup>F554</sup>

“I desire my Church History should behave itself to his (John Foxe’s) Book of Martyrs as a lieutenant to its captain, only to supply the place in his absence, to be supplemental thereunto, in such matters of moment which have escaped his observation.” <sup>F555</sup>

Bishop Burnet, who lived one hundred years after Foxe, says, “Having compared Foxe’s Acts and Monuments with the records, I have never been able *to discover any errors or prevarications in them, but the utmost fidelity and exactness.*” <sup>F556</sup>

Strype <sup>f557</sup> also bears witness to the accuracy of Foxe in transcribing, and contradicts the accusation of Parsons. “Foxe,” he says, “was an

indefatigable searcher into old registers, and left them as he found them, after he had made his collections and transcriptions out of them, many whereof I have seen and do possess. And *it was his interest that they should remain to be seen* by posterity; therefore we frequently find references to them in the margins of his book. Many have diligently compared his books with registers, and council-books, and have always found him faithful.”

And again-”The credit of this book of Mr. Foxe is mightily undermined by the papists, and most professedly and earnestly by Parsons, in his book. I leave it to others to vindicate him; but yet he must not go without the commendation of a *most painful searcher into records, archives, and repositories of original acts*, and letters of state, and a great collector of MSS. And the world is infinitely beholden to him for abundance of extracts thence, communicated to us in his volumes. And as he hath been found most diligent, so most strictly true and faithful in his transcriptions. *And this I myself in part have found.*”

And “several passages in his book have been compared with king Edward’s council-book, lately discovered, and found to agree well together.” <sup>F558</sup>

“Mr. John Foxe, the martyrologist,” says Oldmixon, “a grave, learned, and painful divine, and an exile for religion, employed his time abroad in writing the Acts and Monuments of that church, that would hardly receive him into her bosom, and in collecting materials relating to the martyrdom of those that suffered for religion in the reigns of Henry VIII. and queen Mary; all which he published, first in Latin, for the benefit of foreigners, and then in English, for the service of his own country and the church of England, in the year 1561. *No book ever gave such a mortal wound to popery as this.* It was dedicated to the queen, and was in such high reputation, that it was ordered to be set in the churches, where it raised in the people an invincible horror and detestation of that religion that shed so much innocent blood. The Oxonian (Ant. Wood) is not contented with saying, He was a very bitter enemy in his writings to the Roman catholics, (vol. 1.p. 186,) but copies that

profligate libeller, Parsons, the jesuit, in abusing him, as false, impertinent, and ignorant; and this learned and good man has met with many an ill word, from some ecclesiastical writers, purely on account of his aversion to certain ceremonies and habits.” <sup>F559</sup>

“When Foxe’s book was first published,” says Mr. Lewis, “he was thought to have done very exquisite service to the protestant cause, in showing, from abundance of ancient books, records, registers, and choice manuscripts, the encroachments of popes and papalins, and the stout oppositions that were made by learned and good men, in all ages and countries, against them; and especially under king Henry VIII. and queen Mary here in England, preserving to us the memories of those holy men and women, those bishops and divines, together with their histories, acts, sufferings, and their constant deaths, willingly undergone for the sake of Christ and his gospel, and for refusing to comply with popish doctrines and superstitions. *It has been found, by those who have searched the records and registers that Foxe used, that he is always faithful.* Nay, this has been owned by Collier, who takes all opportunities to depreciate his character, and undervalue his work.” <sup>F560</sup>

Such was Foxe’s estimation in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. And, although a fashion has sprung up, among men of Mr. Maitland’s school, of decrying Foxe as neither learned, nor accurate, nor even trustworthy, there is not wanting a goodly list even of moderns, to bear witness to his merits and value.

Dr. Wordsworth, the late master of Trinity College, Cambridge, may begin the honorable catalogue.

“I am well aware,” he says, “that, by the extent to which I have availed myself of Foxe’s *Acts and Monuments*, I fall within the sphere of such censures as that of Dr. John Milner, in which he speaks of ‘the frequent publications of John Foxe’s lying Book of Martyrs, with prints of men, women, and children, expiring in flames; the nonsense, inconsistency, and falsehoods of which (he says) he had in part exposed in his Letters to a Prebendary.’ I am not ignorant of what has been said, also, by Dr. J. Milner’s predecessors, in the same argument, by Harpsfield, Parsons, and

others. But neither his writings nor theirs have proved, and *it never will be proved, that John Foxe is not one of the most faithful and authentic of all historians.* We know too much of the strength of Foxe's book, and of the weakness of those of his adversaries, to be further moved by Dr. John Milner's censures, than to charge them with falsehood. All the many researches and discoveries of later times, in regard to historical documents, have only contributed to place the general fidelity and truth of Foxe's narrative on a rock which cannot be shaken. And surely we are indebted to the popish ecclesiastics of that day for having thus faithfully recorded the opinions for which they persecuted these '*Brethren in Christ;*' and let it be remembered, that it is from their own registers that Strype, Foxe, and other historians, have drawn the greater part of the particulars they relate. How great, then, is the effrontery of those writers who attempt to persuade us that the accounts given by Foxe are forgeries of his own devising!" <sup>f561</sup>

To Dr. Jenkyns, my brother prebendary at Durham, the editor of the works of Cranmer, I wrote on this same point, of the martyrologist's fidelity and truth. He replied in these terms: "I had occasion, in editing Cranmer's Remains, to compare several of the papers printed by Foxe with the original documents; and, on such comparison, I had good reason to be satisfied with the martyrologist's fidelity and accuracy."

Mr. Prebendary Soames, himself one of our best ecclesiastical historians, writes — "Of publications tending to wean Englishmen from Romish prejudices, no one probably had a more extensive operation than Foxe's Martyrology. The first portion of this important work, which is principally an historical exposure of the papacy, was originally printed in Latin on the continent, whither the author had fled from the Marian persecution. Having arrived at home soon after Elizabeth's accession, Foxe was encouraged, by various members of the hierarchy, to crown his former labors, by adding to them copious accounts of those who had perished as religious delinquents under the late queen. Every facility was afforded to him for the completion of this task in the most satisfactory manner; and he showed himself fully worthy of the confidence reposed in him. Invariable accuracy is not to be expected in any historical work of such extent; but it may be truly said of England's venerable martyrologist, that his relations

are more than ordinarily worthy of reliance. His principal object being, indeed, to leave behind him a vast mass of authentic information relating to those miserable times which it had been his lot to witness, he printed a vast mass of original letters, records of judicial processes, and other documentary evidence. The result of this judicious policy was a work which has highly gratified the friends of protestantism, and successfully defied its enemies. Numerous attacks have been levelled at the honest chronicles of Romish intolerance, but they have ever fallen harmless from the assailant's hand." <sup>F562</sup>

Professor Smythe adds his testimony: —

“The real presence in the eucharist, was the great point on which the lives of men depended. The student should, by all means, turn to Foxe's Book of Martyrs; let him look at the doctrines for the affirmation, or denial of which, men, and even women, were thrown into the flames; particularly, let him look at the disputation held before Henry VIII.; and again by Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, at Oxford; he will see, and if he is inexperienced in such subjects, he will see with astonishment, the preposterous manner in which logic and metaphysics were made the ceremonies that preceded the execution and agonies of those eminent martyrs. Let him consider again, what were the reasons for which Cranmer himself had before tied his victims to the stake.

“I do not detail the points upon which the prelate disputed, or the *reasons* for which he put an unhappy woman, and an inoffensive foreigner to death. They are to be found the first in Foxe, the second in Burnet. I cannot detail to you particulars of this nature.” <sup>F563</sup>

“Foxe's Book of Martyrs should be looked at. It is indeed in itself a long and dreadful history of the intolerance of the human mind, and at the same time of the astonishing constancy of the human mind; that is, it is at once a monument of its lowest debasement and its highest elevation.

“The volumes of Foxe are also every where descriptive of the manners and opinions of the different ages through which the author proceeds.

“Foxe may always be consulted when the enormities of the papists are to be sought for.” <sup>F564</sup>

The late venerable and learned dean of Winchester, Dr. Rennell, thus encouraged Dr. Dibdin, when he proposed, a few years back, re — EDITING the Acts and Monuments: — “*Deanery, -Feb.23, 1827.* “My dear Sir, — I return you my best thanks for your kind communication of your intention of giving a new edition of Foxe’s Martyrs. I think it impossible to conceive an undertaking of more importance to the best interests of the protestant cause; and that, in carrying this design into execution, you will have deserved well of your country. To vindicate Foxe’s veracity, as would be done in the course of your most laudable undertaking, would be to render an essential service to the church of England. I admire much the tone of your prospectus, which is timely and animated. My approbation of your design is unqualified, and be assured that every assistance within my humble powers and influence shall be exerted. I shall be proud to be among your subscribers, and think I can answer for our chapter also.

“Yours, etc. “*T. RENNELL.*” <sup>F565</sup>

Dr. Southey, on the same occasion, wrote as follows:

“Is your edition of the Acts and Monuments going forward? I have always intended to take advantage of its appearance for writing a life of John Foxe in the *Quarterly Review*, wherein I might render due honor to a man for whom I have a great veneration.”

Archdeacon Todd thus exhorted Dr. Dibdin: —

“Do not make *needless* concessions in your prospectus; as loud as you can cry, I will (much older though I be,) shout louder for the historian, and exclaim, Foxe for ever!” “On his first visit to me in London, says Dr. D., on coming to take his turn of duty at the Chapel Royal, as one of the king’s chaplains, I perfectly remember his gallant effervescence of speech touching my Foxe. ‘When I read

your prospectus (said he,) methought I rose from my table a foot higher.”

Last of all we may name the present archbishop of Canterbury, (then bishop of London,) who thus deliberately affixed the seal of his approbation: —

“I am glad (said his grace to Dr. Dibdin,) that you have made up your mind to republish the great work of the Martyrs, and most willingly consent to your request of being allowed to dedicate the new edition to myself.”

Other testimonies, and very many, might be adduced, but I end the list as I began it, with the judgment of the ecclesiastical head of the Anglican church. I began it with the archbishop of Canterbury, who was contemporary with the martyrologist himself, and I end it with the archbishop who adorns that headship — and long may his peaceful virtues be continued to us! — in this our own day.

APPENDIX

TO THE LIFE OF FOXE.

CONTENTS.

NO. 1

*Foxe's First Publication—De non plectendis Morte adulteris consultatto*

NO. 2

*On Calvin's application to Cranmer for Episcopal Consecration.*

NO 3

*Extracts from the Christus Triumphans*

NO. 4

*Foxe's Dedication of the Edition of 1559 to the Duke of Norfolk.*

NO. 5

*Foxe's Presentation, etc. etc. etc. to the Prebendal Stall at Durham.*

NO. 6

*Foxe's Letter to the President, etc. etc. of Magdalen College, Oxford, with his Edition of "the Acts and Monuments" of 1563.*

NO. 7

*Foxe's Letter to Queen Elizabeth, on her Visit to Cambridge.*

**NO. 8**

*Foxe's Letter to Cecil, requesting Permission to employ more  
Printers on his Book*

**NO. 9**

*Foxe's Preface to the "Reformatto Legurn".*

**NO. 10**

*Foxe's Letter to Queen Elizabeth in behalf of two Dutch  
Anabaptists. 1575.*

**NO. 11**

*Foxe's Letter to Chief Justice Monson in behalf of two Dutch Anabaptists.*

**NO. 12**

*Foxe's Letter to the Condemned Anabaptists*

**NO. 13**

*Foxe's Letter to the Lord Treasurer concerning  
the Condemned Anabaptists.*

**NO. 14**

*Foxe's Letter to a Foreigner concerning his Son*

**NO. 15**

*Foxe's Letter addressed to the Puritans on the expulsion of his Son  
from Magdalen.*

**NO. 16**

*Epitome of Foxe's "De Christo Gratis Justificante".*

**NO 17**

*Foxe's Address ad Pr-aepotentes, published during the Persecutions in the  
reign of Mary, being the first Treatise in Defence of Religious Toleration;  
published at Basle in the year 1557.*

## APPENDIX, NO. 1

## APPL1

THE following extract from, or rather remnant of, a letter is found among the Harleian MSS., and endorsed "John Foxe to a noble person to receive his wife." The circumstances alluded to in this letter are supposed to have been the origin of the first work of John Foxe: —

"But yow wyl say, thys offense is heynous, and unpardonable. Yf yow can shew me any offense, wch beyng repented not to be pardonable wt God, or yf in ye whole course of your own lyfe, wel examined, you fynd not as grett provocation of God hys severite, as thys, than is it somethynge yt you objecte; but if other wyse then I beseche your honorable good lordship for ye Lord Christs sake, to lerne of hym aboue, how to doo here in earth. Yf S. Paul calleth matrimonie between ma and wyfe, a sacrareSt of ye inseparable coiuction betwen Christ and ye church hys spouse, to whose repentance he dalye pardoneth many and grett transgressions; then let thys example of hym breede in your godly breste some lyke imitation, to do not what flesh and bloud peradueture wold suggeste unto yow; but what christian pietie and clemetie, wch superexalteth iudgmet, as S. James saieth, through ye Lords spiritt doth persuade you: in wch so doing I doubt not, but your honorable goodnes shall find at length ye same to turne to ye beste for both partes; for her, in releauing her sorrowful restless oppressed soule, sufficiently hetherto afflicted; for yourself, in eschuyng such scruples and perturbations, wch may peradurture hereafter encober ye inward quietnes of your mynd, when yt wyl be layte to helpe. Nether do I wryte thys eyther to terrifie you, or to diminish or excuse ye fall of that lady, weh I confess indeed to be great, and to great, if yt had pleased God otherwise for her state and nobilitie; but yet as great as yt is, greater I fynd in ye gospel, wch notwithstanding hath found grace and fauoure, as thys also may fynd wt you, as I well hope by ye Lords grace yt shall, be-seachyng his almyghty mercy, so to work in your noble hart, that her lady-shyp may fynd no lesse fauour wt yow, then she fyndeth wt her Sauour in heauen, who no doubt deliteth in nothing more then in ye conversion of a synful synner; yea, what ifyt so pleased hym to suffer thys inconuenience...unhappy castyng down to

lyght upon her, therby to wyfie hys servant to a better lyre hereafter. As con'only we see so to fall out none to be better then such whom from iniquitie grace reclaimeth to better reformation, for they comonly stand faste for ever. Although in verie truth yt had been rather to be wysshed, if yt so pleased the Lord, thys falle neuer to haue happened.

Notwithstandyng seyng such falles do ouertake roans fraylite sometymes, better it is in my mynd to ryse agayn wt humilitie, than to stand wt pride: he goeth farre, they saye, wch neuer returneth agayn; and deape is ye falle, that neuer aryseth; but whet arysing is by grace and amedmet, ye falle hurteth nothyng, but causeth ye partie to stand more faster. Yf S. Paul consydering ye couersion of Onesim, some tymes a wicked seruat, wrote to Philemon hys master for hym to be receaued: in asseamble wise, why may not I wrytyng to your good honor, not for your seruat but for your owne wyffe, use the lyke speach for her, as S. Paul dyd for hym? What yt she slypte from yow for a tyme, yt you myght receave her agayn much better then euer she was before, beyng now both a trew seruat unto her Sauour, and a true faythful wyfe to you for euer? wch hope unlesse upon ryght sure argumts I certenly I coceaued of her ladyshyp, I would not haue enterprised thys my trauayle and sute in her behalf."

In another hand,

"Joh. Fox to a noble person to receive his wife." <sup>F566</sup>

*De non plectendis Morte Adulteris Consultatio Ioannis Foxi. Impressum Londini per Hugonem Syngletonum, sub Intersignio D. Augustini. Anno Domini MDXLVIII.*

**GENEROSO VIRO THOME PICTONO I. FOXUS SALUTEM ET  
PACEM IN CHRISTO.**

UT semper ab onni contentionis studio natura fui alienissimus, nihil non ferme malens concedere, quam contentionis funiculum cum aliis trahere: ira nullo modo peccatorum causam possum deserere, pro quibus tam lubenter mortuus est Christus, quin simul cum Samaritano saucium ilium semianimem oleo sumptibusque adjutem quod possim. Quanquam scio equidem non defuturos, quibus caussam parum hic plausibilem aut favorabilem videbor sustinere. Plerique ita omnes ad condemnandum quam ad ignoscendum sumus procliviores. Nimirum tam atrox res peccatum

videtur omnibus, tot patitur oculos, tot habet iudices, tot animadversores sustinet, cui nec ipse patrocinari in praesentia aut possim aut velim. Sed miror hanc hominum, Christianorum etiam, inhumanitatem dicam aut philautiam, qui caeteros usque adeo abhorrere solent in vitia prolapsos, quasi Dii ipsi terrestres sint, aut ab iisdem notis prorsus immunes. Neque quisquam fere, ut nunc sunt mores, invenitur, qui in traducendis alienis offensionibus non cupit suam nobilitare probitatem. Atque ut hoc in Deo justissimum esse potest, certe in hominibus nimis quam incivile ac inhumanum videtur mihi. Iam veto cum neque Deus ipse in nos eam exerceat severitatem, qui libenter nobis condonavit omnia, ac quotidie condonat collabentibus. Quanto tum aequius mortales ipsos mitiores in se esse iudices existimandum est; moderatam reprehensionem aut publica magistratuum officia non improbo. Caeterum odium hoc, haec tam acerba indignatio in privatis professoribus etiam, non solum in vitia, set et in homines ipsos, nescio an hominibus convenit, certe Christianorum parum respondet professioni, cujus adeo vis omnis quid aliud est tandem, quam inexhausta quaedam erga peccatores charitas et tolerantia? praesertim qui natura non voluntate mali sunt. Alioqui enim justis ac insontibus quorsum Christo opus erat, aut redemptione? Verum longe diversa est humani iudicij censura. Quos bonos videmus, hos libenter amplectimur. Contra si quis quid paulo gravius admittit per vitae imbecillitatem, quanto supercilio, quam censorea majestate in miserum destomachamur, quam execramur, etiam viri consortium abominantes! Attamen ita humano iudicio nobis obsequendum est, ne Evangelicae charitatis interim praetereamus disciplinam, quae quoniam ubique nunc adeo frigere incipit apud Christianos, non putavi dissimulandam sententiam meam: in qua si quid a me vel imprudentius assertum sit, aut a vero dissentaneum, totum id tibi, mi Picto, limandum defero, ac corrigendum summitto. Opto tibi cum omnibus christianis fratribus pacem et gratiam christianam. Tuus I. Foxus.

### **DE NON PLECTENDIS MORTE ADULTERIS CONSULTATIO.**

Si in libera Christianorum ecclesia liberum sit animi mei declarare sententiam, equidem nec utile nec necessarium iudico, ut in adulterio deprehensi mortis supplicio afficiantur. In qua tamen sententia hoc mihi primum praefandum est, neque me aliorum sententiis praeiudicatum velle, tum neque contra politica iura aut civilem administrationem ullam hic instituere

disputationem. Quod si ita reipublicae ratio suadeat, ut moriantur adulteri, hocque consultis-simum esse videatur ad publicam humanae societatis tranquillitatem, nihil reclamo, quin civiles magistratus praescribant sanxiantque in iis rebus pro arbitrato suo. Gestant enim legitimum gladium, quem nobis nullo pacto ipsis manibus extorquere licet, quibus adeo omnem obedientiam praecipit christiana professio. Caeterum si id agant ecclesiae doctoresque evangelici, qui zelo tituloque ecclesiae huc instigant principes, quasi Christi negotium agentes, id primum videant, ne, suum magis zelum quam evangelicam disciplinam secuti, impediunt potius Christi causam quam provehant. Utcumque enim in rebus hujusmodi arbitraria est principum potestas statuendi ac decernendi pro re nata, minime haec profecto saevitia in ecclesiasticum doctorem competit, qui legum horrorem ac asperitatem delinire deberet, non exacuere principum animos; ad lenitatem ac christianam christotita subhortari, non classicum accinere severitatis, non faces praebere ad incendia, non irae materiam suggerere. Etiam in priore testamento diserte testatur Dominus, non velle se peccatoris mortem, sed ut convertatur ac vivat potius. Quanto id ipsum luculentius expressit Filius Dei Christus tot exemplis concionibusque suis, addita insuper redemptione per sanguinem suum, qua non justos sed flagitiosissimos etiam quosque, quicumque aliquando ad se converterent, e Mosaica obligatione mirabili triumpho expedit. Hic si se tam exorabilem ac propitium ostendit in ignoscendis peccatoribus, in redimendis etiam, cur tum non expriment, non imitantur indolem ac disciplinam illius, qui illius se profitentur discipulos? Si saeculi hujus indies accrescens libido ac impietas tantopere eos commovet, quaeso quae tempora unquam fuere inquinatiora quam et cum Christus cum apostolis suam inchoabat praedicationem? Atqui magis hoc nomine opus erat istorum vigilantia in resecandis vitiis. Infaeliciter medetur morbo qui vitam aufert aegrotanti. Alioqui si morte illico sit occurrendum mortalium vitiis, quorsum opus pastorum cura aut ministerio, quando id per magistratus confici facillime poterat? Quo tum attinet pastorum institutio nisi ut horum salubri cura humanae imbecillitati consulatur? quae alioqui natura sua plusquam praecepta in omne flagitium ruit. Tolle doctrinae praesidium, tolle pastorem functionem, quid habet humana fragilitas quo foveatur, quo instituat? pastores enim ac praesides verbi quid aliud sunt vulgo, quam patrum vice erga filios tenerrimos? Quis unquam pater filium aberrantem occidit? at paterna potius indulgentia castigat ad meliorem resipiscentiam.

Quod si patres ipsi in tyrannos vertantur ac iudices: quid spei amplius superest filiis si quando usu veniat ut prolabantur? Et quis nostrum non est aliquando lapsus, et adhuc labitur saepenumero? Exempla etiam petamus a sanctissimis. Quid Davidis sanctimonia integrius? quid Solomonis prudentia sublimius? et tamen turpis simi ipsorum lapsus abunde nos docere possunt, quid in quemque mortalium queat cadere. Atque illi tum etiam haec commiserant, sub Mosaico adhuc testamento abstracti, nondum evangelica gratia orbi prodita, in quos tamen non usque adeo saevierunt prophetae, nec quicquam illis deferebant aliud, quam quod a Domino aperta voce acceperunt: neque enim tum quicquam agebatur nisi ex sententia Domini, haec sola expectabatur a populo, sine hac nulla edebatur prophetia, nec propheta praedicabat. Atque utinam pari religione id observatum nunc esset apud pastores evangelicos, ut nemo adferret quicquam in suggestum nisi sermones Dei, ut ait apostolus, ac ea quae a Doctore Spiritu audita ac comperta essent. Quanquam ne tum quidem defuerunt personati prophetae, qui commentitia oracula occinebant populo, sed ii suam non Domini sententiam enunciabant. Atque equidem omnibus votis optarim nullos extare hujusmodi in populo christiano, qui eiki physioumenoi hypo tou noos tis sarkos autou, ac frustra sufflati in iis quae nunquam viderunt, quicquid ipsis cerebri sui iudicium aut mentis devotio suggerit, continuo antumant pro evangelico oraculo obtrudendum populo. Mysticus ac divinus est grex, Christi populus, proinde non nisi divinis pascendus sermonibus. Suspectum esse debet quicquid humanum est, quantumvis alioqui plausibile, aut rationi ablandiens: Dei vox, veritas ipsa, fallere non potest, in qua sola consistit omnis reipublicae christianae administratio: graviter itaque Paulus ministros propheticos ad suum exemplum provocat, ne quis dicturus in ecclesia loquatur, nisi ut sermones Dei intelligens nimirum nullam recipiendam doctrinam quantumvis probabilem aut verisimilem in ecclesia spirituali, nisi quae a verbo Dei aut Spiritus illius certissimo instinctu proficiscitur. Alioqui multa afferri possunt ab humano iudicio ac ratione petita, et aequa, et salubria, quae tamen non ut sermones Dei nobis admittenda sunt. Quod quisque a Deo certiore aliqua fide aut instinctu acceperit, vel tuto efferre potest, juxta Davidicum illud:.. "Credidi propter quod locutus sum. Alioqui fallere potest quicquid adfert humana opinio quantum vis aequi aut veri simile. Ita justum fortassis ac equum videri possit, ut moriantur adulteri, si penes humanam rationem sit iudicium rei: caeterum in iis rebus non humana ratio

sed voluntas Dei adhibenda est in consilium, quae non iudiciis nostris sed Spiritu ac verbo suo metienda est. Saepe enim fit, ut quae nobis recte ac legitime facta videantur illius iudicio non ita approbentur, et e diverso: quae nos pro indignissimis habemus atque explodimus, ita applaudit Deus, atque in gratiam recipit. Sic Judaei olim superciliosi virtutum suarum persuasione turgidi, reliquas gentes et publicanos ceu execrabiles fasti diebant. Sic hodie superbus mundus afflictos, squalidos, calamitosos ridet ac nauseat ut catharmata, qui tamen apud Deum sunt fortassis inter acceptissimos. Tantum interest inter Dei iudicium et hominum.

Quemadmodum merito audimus apud Esaiam: “Quantum distat coeli terraeque intercapedo tantum discrepant viae meae a viis vestris et cogitationes meae a cogitationibus vestris, dicit Dominus.” Ideo fit quod mens humana a principio vitata non aliter caligat in illius rebus, quam noctua ad solem, quod dicitur, unde recte propheta clamat alibi: “Ubi scribe, ubi sapiens hujus mundi?” Satis superque nos commonefaciunt antiqua exempla, quorsum evasit illorum temeritas qui in hierarchia christiana humanum adeo admiscentes iudicium tot praescriptiones, tot onera, tot sanxionum sarcinas obruserunt plebi, quibus dum ornate studebant rempublicam Christi, quid aliud quam deformarunt ac vastarunt omnia? Quo magis nobis omnibus oculis advigilandum est, tum maxime pastoribus ecclesiae, ne quid praecipiti iudicio agamus, praesertim in iis rebus quae non habent apertum Scripturae firmamentum. Scio quanta severitate per Mosen mulctata sunt adulteria in lege veteri, sed cur illam appellamus veterem, nisi recentior sub iisset lex, cui par est priorem cedere? Alioqui si nihil arbitrentur in rebus hujusmodi mutatum esse, cur duo edita sunt testamenta? Cur non prius perduravit, si nihil in eo inesset, quod a succedente posteriore antiquari oportuit? Sin ipsi non poterint inficiari, quin jam aliter mutantur res, quid igitur mutatum sit, aut non mutatum, ipsi definiant. Sed scio quid Scholastica Theologia mihi ilico obganniet, quae cum in tres partitiones Mosaicum instrumentum distinguit, nihil aliud praeter ceremoniale duntaxat partem nunc abrogari putat. Verum cur tum Jesus patriae legis secutus iudicium, non iussit lapidari adulteram manifestariam? Cur Paulus incestum excommunicatum Corinthiis restituit? Cur idem palam profitetur nos mortuo prorsus priore marito, in legitimo conjugio nupsisse alteri? non unam videlicet legis partem, sed ipsam universam legem intelligens, quae non tantum in ceremoniis continebatur, sed etiam in decretis nobis adversabatur; neque

enim ceremoniae nobis quicquam obfuerunt, verum iudicia et chirographum praeceptorum Dei, adeoque hoc ipsum dicit sublatum e medio suffixum cruci Christi. Quamobrem si non jam secundo marito nupsimus, nimirum a priore saevitia in alterius testamenti jus ac libertatem traducti, cur tum superiores constitutiones revocamus, veluti a Christo ad Mosen, a calcaria (ut aiunt) in carbonariam delapsuri? Quis tam inscius est Scripturarum, qui nesciat veteres illas sanxiones legis Mosaicae non ita datas, ut perpetuo duraturas, verum pro tempore promulgatas illi populo scilicet, veluti paedagogi vice, propter transgressionem, donec adveniret ipsemet domus Author, patriaeque Pater, Christus, moderaturus videlicet familiam suam pro arbitrio atque imperio suo. Non aliter ac si Tyranno cuiquam Areopagitarum intolerabili novus aliquis, molliorque rex succederet, non necesse haberet omnia pro illius decretis placitisque agere, at ipsi liceret legitimam rempublicam pro ratione facilitateque sua temperare. Non quod censeam Mosen Christi in familia ministrum quasi tyrannum injustis legibus rempublicam Dei administrasse. Quid enim justius lege Dei, aut aequius, quae ab ipsa justitia proficiscitur? Neque omnia quae severa sunt, ilico pro injustis ducenda sunt. tum quid si Deus cum populo suo severius egit in coercendis ac puniendis illorum flagitiis, pro temporis illius ratione justam iram suam de coelo patefaciens, severe is quidem, at non injuste egit. Caeterum ea nunc temporis difficultate defuncti sumus, ali usque in imperium successit Princeps, qui superiores leges non abolet, ut injustas, sed lenitate severitatem illarum ac rigorem temperat: ut jam usu exercent, non damnent vigore, regant, non obligent, pungant, non occidant Christianos perinde ac si serpenti aculeus eximatur, manet quidem serpens, ac sibilare potest, at veneno inficere nequicquam poterit. Cujus rei luculentum apud Mosen ipsum constat documentum. Quippe in Hebraeo populo, primum multos peremerat serpentum virulentia, tamen postquam aeneus serpens suffigebatur, prorsus adempta illis est omnis laedendi facultas. Hoc quid aliud adumbrat nobis quam venturum Christum, qui soluto pro peccatis pretio legem esset enervaturus, cujus lethali maledicto mortales omnes succumbebamus. Verum quid retulit tanto sudore comparasse nobis hanc a lege immunitatem, nisi comparatam nos retinuerimus? Quid aliud tot retro saeculis moliti sunt episcopi, pontificos, ac scribae hujus saeculi, quam ut publica haec novi testamenti libertas ad quam paucissimos pateret, dum tot vinculis ac repagulis miseris adstrinxerant conscientias, quas Christus tanto pretio vindicavit ad

libertatem, quod jam olim etiam Augustini temporibus perspectum est, unde merito vir ille con-questus dicitur, paulo minus tolerabiliorem Judaeorum fuisse conditionem, quam Christianorum. Et quid aliud nunc quam exempla illorum quodam modo imitamur, qui non cessamus adhuc legibus tam cruentis cumulare ecclesiam Christi, in qua peccatores plerique sumus certe infirmi omnes. Non hic ago patronum carnalis licentiae, quo impunitius peccent ii qui nunquam meditantur resipiscentiam. Nec vellico politicas ac ordinarias leges, quae reipublicae nomine pacisque publicae salubriter a magistratibus imponuntur. Verum non probo istam in theologis importunitatem, qui sic acuunt civiles leges praeter omnem necessitatem, certe longe praeter professionem. Horum erat gratiam evangelicam quam latissime disseminare, populum invitare ad resipiscentiam, infirmos spiritu lenitatis ducere, praefractos a peccatis, non a vita abducere, denique ita gregem christianum instituere, ut quam minime opus esset legibus. Id autem non vi ac morte efficient, sed Spiritu ac vigore verbi, non si plurimorum occiderint corpora, sed si internum peccatorem gladio Spiritus confoderint. Siquidem altius penetrat in medullas ossium fortiusque rapit vox verbi efficax, quam mille leges aut ulli gladii. Haec illa panoplia est, qua concionatores belligerare debent, haec unica via ac medela est, si adulteriis vitam humanam repurgari volueris, nimirum ut moechos ad continentiam non ad mortem duxeris. Neque enim vitium est in carne, sed profundius latet in concupiscentia: haec primum medenda pars est, qua semel curata, facile corrigitur quicquid in carne contrahitur. Ea si vitiata manet, nihil efficient legum externarum severitas. Coercere fortassis externam possit licentiam, sed quid hoc ad vitae christianae correctionem, dum nihilominus mens non cessat moechari, manetque adultera. Spirituale hoc hulus, spiritualibus proinde pharmacis medicandum. At qui occidit, non is medicatur: qui corpus aufert, non adfert resipiscentiam. At quo tandem ista subservit concinatorum professio ac institutio, nisi ut collapsos erigant, confractos consolident, oves errantes moneant, aegras consolentur, perditas restituant. Et prohibet Dominus in Evangelio resecari arborem jam computrescentem, at limo fimoque foveri vult spe sanioris fructus. Alioqui quorsum opus esset illorum cura atque opera in ecclesia christiana, si oneratis non est inserviendum ac laborantibus? Validis enim non est opus medico, juxta sententiam Domini. Jam quo pacto subserviunt imbecillitati fraternae, qui morti adjudicandos censent eos qui prolabantur? Quis unquam medicorum operam ministrat aegrotanti occisurus eum quem in

tutela salutis suscipit? Et quid ecclesia evangelica est aliud, quam myrothecia quaedam omne genus alexipharmacis exuberans? Quid aliud ministri Christi quam medici? et populus, quam colluvies languentium laborantium, caecorum, claudorum, paralyticorum, quos quisquis propter aegritudinem deserit, is confiteatur nescire se quid est ecclesiam agere. Olim ea Christianorum vigebat charitas, ut quo plus quisquam autoritatis teneret in ecclesiam id potissimum exerceret in servandis quamplurimis. Talis erat Ambrosius Mediolanensis episcopus. Talis Babylas Antiochonus, quibus laudi summae vertebatur, quod principum saevitiam cohibentes, praecibusque suis intercedentes pro facinorosis, quosdam e iudicum manibus expediverunt alioqui perituros. Et quid aliud tot concionibus agit Christus quam curam discipulis injicit ad tuendos ac fovendos suos, dum eos salem terrae, lucemque mundi appellat, dumque Petro tanto studio commendat pascendum infirmum gregem? Ita admonens eos, “Quemadmodum me misit vivens Pater, ita ego mitto vos.” Non mittebatur ille ad malorum perniciem, sed ad salutem, ne arundinem quidem quassatam proterens, nec fumigans linumextinguens; non malum malo rependens, sed pro inimicis etiam mortuus est; non vindicans mortalium scelera, cum id illi justissime licuisset, sed gratiam ac ignoscentiam concedens omnibus, resipiscentes ultro amplexus est, pernicaces reliquit poenitentiae. Porro doctrinam hanc tot insuper exemplis comprobatur, dum peccatores ac peccatrices toties excusat apud phariseos, dum publicanis comminatur, filium profugum obviis amplexibus recipit, septies septuagenariam remissionem Petro imperat, zizania sinit crescere, Petrum jubet gladium recondere, adulterae patrocinator, cujus causam si non tutandam suscepisset, cur non simpliciter legis subscribit sententiae? cur tam potenti miraculo illius profligat accusatores, relictam cur absolvit, cur dimisit absolutam? Quid si istis nunc rediturus Christus foeditates ac adulteria itidem inscriberet in frontibus, qui tanta aviditate adulteros vocant ad supplicium; aut quid si ipse Mosaica severitate lapidibus committeret, quoscumque novit hujus noxae reos, exorsus primum ab istis; miror si omnes in hunc diem superessent, qui hanc legem tantopere expetunt a magistratibus. Nullius carpo mores, nec vitam cuiquam invideo, sed quam inique faciunt, qui sibi misericordiam adeo expetunt a Domino, ipsi nullam conservis suis exhibent. Non sentio de magistratibus. Tautum de illis loquor qui se evangelicae gratiae dispensatores profitentur, omnisque eorum doctrina converti deberet ad salutem populi, censores atque aristarchos tam

rigidos agunt in ecclesia. Quod si quid sit in vulgi moribus, quod graviorem exigat animadversionem, habet politia magistratus ac praefectos suos, qui si id iudicent expedire reipublicae, ut tollantur adulteri, modo-secuti interim rationem reipublicae non necessitatem legis Mosaicae, quanquam et hi meminerint suis quoque legibus Paulinum illud *to epieikes adtemperandum* esse, non debent profecto iis adversari pastores evangelii. Caeterum ipsos faces praebere, atque huc classico suo instigare principes, (nescio quam sit usitatum,) certe parum respondet professioni. Si civilis duntaxat causa sit, alienum faciunt ab instituto. Si spiritualis sit, proferant in evangelico testamento locum unum ubi Christus, aut ullus Christia postolus, trucidari jubeat adulteros sive etiam consentiat. Scio quid dicat lex Mosaica: sed parum isti advertunt officium Moseah, aut mysterium voluntatis Dei intelligunt, qui ducem illum ecclesiae nostrae coustituunt. Quid enim aliud Moseah, quam prophetica umbra Christi? Quid aliud dux ille plebis Mosaicae deliniabat, quam ducem verum illum orbis venturum Filium Dei? Quid lex illius tabularis, nisi typus quidam fuerat Christiverae ac spiritualis legis per Spiritum Sanctum in cordibus nostris inscribendae? Illius tot iudicia ac minae quid aliud designant, nisi acerrimam ac sempiternam Dei ultionem iis infligendam, qui Filii sui praeceptis non sunt obtemperaturi? Denique quid illius res gestae scriptaeque adeoque omnis vita erat, nisi figurata ac mystica quaedam imago Christi secuturi, in hoc nobis a Deo prodita, ut certiore nunc fide apprehendamus revelatum, quem tot figuris demonstrabat adventurum? Quamobrem ut Mosem equidem fateor principem fuisse prophetarum Dei, ita non alio tamen in ordine ac numero eum collocandum existimo apud Christianos, nisi ut prophetam illum accipiamus, hoc est, ut minister sit Christi, non magister ecclesiae. Id honoris soli debetur Christo, cuius si isti nunc discipulos se profitentur, ex illius praescripto agentes omnia, qua fronte id ausint attentare, cuius nullum in praeceptore unquam exemplum viderint? Neque vero quaero, num per Moseah legem animadvertere licet in moechos, sed quid in hac re statuit evangelium, quid dicat disciplina apostolica? Quod si adeo apud nos pollere debet Mosaici testamenti autoritas, tot saeculis nobis praecessit Christus, praecesserunt apostoli, multaque ab iis gesta audimus, in quibus non omnia quadrant ad Mosaicam disciplinam, cur non istos aequo obligabat testamenti illius autoritas? Immo cur tam libere interdum resilierunt, nonnunquam aperte etiam negligentes illius praescriptiones, si tanta religione nobis ilium recipiendum arbitramur? Quot illi peccatores

procumbentes agnoscebant flagitia aperte a Moseah condemnata, quos tamen ille nihil ominis legitima autoritate indemnes dimiserat, nos videlicet admonens, quales oporteat esse erga peccatores. Alioqui si Moseah adhuc irrefragabilis stat autoritas, quid hoc vult in evangelio, ubi Dominus palam testatur sese etiam Dominum esse sabbati? Et tamen sabbatum celeberrimum honorem in praeceptis Mosaicis habuit, ex quo facile liquere poteat, quid de universo illo testamento sentiendum sit, ubi Christi accedit autoritas. Itaque Paulus toties de lege disputans, quid aliud appellat eam nisi paedagogum Judaeis usque ad Christum, innuens videlicet nihil esse in lege tam sublime, aut divinum, quin Christi multo esset superior futura autoritas. Praeterea cur non idem Corinthum illum incestum abominando adulterio detestabilem tradebat ilico lictoribus juxta praeceptum legis, si tanta incumberet nobis legis servandae necessitas? Postremo quid facit in republica christiana excommunicatio, aut quorsum inducta ab apostolis, si Moseah adhuc judicem in Christianis plectendis sequemur? Quorsum tam sollicite Paulus hortatur tous pneumaticous, ut si quem deprehenderint in delicto, restaurarent hujusmodi spiritu mansuetudinis scopountas seautous, ne et ipsi tententur? Ingens quippe est humanae carnis imbecillitas, et quod cuiquam contingit, cuivis evenire possit. Nec alium fere impotentius impetit Sathan, quam qui maxime christianae studet sinceritati. Quid tum si quis sua victus infirmitate prolabatur in turpitudinem? Et quis adeo sui certus est, qui nusquam impingat? Non jubet Paulus istos ilico rapi ad lanienam, at spiritu mutuae mansuetudinis corrigi ad resipiscentiam. Jam quam longe ab hoc spiritu abest pastorum quorundam violentia, qui tanto impetu feruntur ad condemnandos adulteros. Ad hanc imaginem olim affecti videbantur Christi discipuli adhuc carnales, qui repulsi ab ingratis Samaritanis incendio ac fulmine exoptaverunt illorum flagrare civitatem. Sed quid tum illis Dominus? “Nescitis,” inquit, “cujus estis spiritus.” Vehemens inerat illis ardor, studiumque tuendae praeceptoris gloriae, et tamen non probat hunc in illis affectum Dominus, quia charitate vacabat evangelica. Ita et isti pium quidem ostendunt animum in vindicandis peccatoribus: quem non omnino improbarim, sed quia non conjungunt simul eum spiritum, quem Christus tantopere in suis requirit omnibus, tum maxime pastoribus, non est quod zelo illorum faveamus. “Ita fugienda Sylla est,” juxta proverbii consilium, “ne in Charybdim incidamus.” Ita temperanda sunt pastoribus evangelicis consilia sua ut ne quid peccent interim aut divaricent ab illo spiritu, ad

cujus regulam ceu ad scopum omnis vita actioque nostra dirigenda est. Itaque merito laudatur illa Pauli vox: “Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt.” Ad cujus itidem exemplum nobis quoque perpendendum est, non quid liceat, non quid permittat jus nostrum, non quid ferant tempora, sed quid expediat fieri. Scio quidem hanc Christianorum plusquam ferinam licentiam, scio supra haec atque adulteria, non tam late quam impune grassantia, non aliud promereri, quam ut legum strictissimis cancellis coerceantur. Craterum non necesse est doctores evangelicos ilico exerere vim suam quam suadet humana ultio. Sed spiritu lenitatis sese moderari, reputantes apud se non quid licet, sed quid in quaque re expediat. Quicquid licet magistratibus, externae reipublicae aut apud illos expedit, non expedit continuo apud ecclesiastas ecclesiae spirituales. Habet quoque res ista decorum suum non minus quam comoediae, quod imprimis illi observandum est, quisquis in mundi scena hac personam susceptam cum laude obire nititur. Utcunque zelus hic vindictae in aliis probandus est, nihil in virum ecclesiasticum aptius competit, quam charitatis affectus quae nec saevit nec laedit quemquam, sed cujusque saluti servit spe infatigabili, etiam perditissimos quosque meliorum expectatione tolerans. Non quod perpetua impunitate malorum licentiam fovendam existimem, aut magistratibus non esse exercendum gladium, si quando huc adigat necessitas, sed ministros evangelicos suum officium doceo, quos si lues ac corruptela temporum haec tanta, quanta antehac opinor nunquam in Christianorum moribus visa est offendit tantopere, deberent tamen non in homines, sed in vitia ipsa bilem suam expuere. Haec modis omnibus jugulanda ac resecanda sunt spiritu, ac potentia verbi; hic erat illis omnis exercenda potestas, si quam habent. Qua in re si suis diligenter partibus defuncti essent pastores mystici, minus haberemus profecto in Christianorum moribus quod nunc corrigamus. Nam si rei veram causam scrutari ac fateri volumus, unde tot supra haec, tot adulteria, tot omnis sexus foeditates, unde diluvium hoc atque oceanus malorum omnium tam late inundavit in orbem christianum, nisi ex inscitia vitioque pastorum, sive quia non eam adhibent diligentiam in exequendo munere, sive non ea adest illis enargia, ac potentia coelestis Spiritus, sine quo nihil potest esse felix, quicquid in his rebus agitur. Ea olim vigit vis verbi ac potentia, ut ad apostolorum efficaces conciones ingens ubique sequeretur et religionis et morum conversio, neque enim unquam magis ferbuit inter Christianos probitatis studium. Erat tum Christus tam efficax in ministris suis, nec

minus etiamnum futurus efficax in suis ecclesiasticis, si audiri possent. Neque enim desunt hodie Christi ecclesiae veri ac apostolici pastores, nec unquam defuerunt. Sed nostra culpa fit, qui explosis, atque interfectis iis, quos mittit Christus, nullis praebemus aurem nisi quos duntaxat ad id muneris humana admittit electio. Quod si soli essent sacerdotes, qui sibi peculiari aliquid jure devinctum haberent Spiritum Sacrum, suoque duntaxat juratum ordini, equidem non indignos hosce arbitrarer hoc privilegio. Verum ut ingenue confitear semel quod saepe expertus sum. Nullos video nec accommodos minus ad hanc pro-vinciam, nec magis a Spiritu Christi alienos quam unctos rastosque istos, quos sacerdotum titulo appellamus. Non omnes incesso sacerdotes, inter quos non-nullos scio feliciter diligentes, quosdam doctos atque opipara etiam eloquentia praeditos. Sed quid hac in re humana sedulitas praestabit [aut] eloquentia, ni efficax illa cooperantis Christi vis virtusque accesserit, quae quam latissime sese diffundit per omnes hominum ordines atque aetates, non obligata nominibus aut personis hominum, libere aspirans ubi lubet. Quae tum haec Christianorum est incogitantia, qui sacerdotibus solis suggestum aperiunt, reliquum laicorum vulgus ut effoetum sterileque excludunt, quasi praeter istos sint omnes fungi ac asini, quasi nulla usquam prophetia, nulla cognitio, nullum spiritus secretioris charisma, nisi solis in sacerdotibus inveniatur. At longe aliud perspiciebat propheta ille, qui indubitato vaticinio praedixit fore, ut omnes essent theodi-dacti, doceretque quisque proximum. Quod si verum sit, nostrisque insuper temporibus comprobatum, cur liberam prophetici spiritus dispensationem uni huic sacerdotum alligamus, caeteros omnes ab illius ministerio submoventes, non admodum Judaeis illis dissimiles, apud quos vix erat tolerabile quinquam dogmatisten agere apud populum, nisi qui scriba esset, aut Pharisaeus legis candidatus. Non incuso sacerdotes omnes, sed quod compertum est, liquido me posse affirmare arbitror, complures esse laicos (quorum etiam novi non-nullos), quorum fidei, vigilantiae, ac doctrinae summae, si functionis ecclesiae-ticae administratio committeretur, (absit invidia veritatis,) aut ego fallor, aut ecclesiam aliam, quam nunc habemus, essemus habituri. In iis etenim situm est qui verbi praefecturam gerunt, qualis sit futurus populus; qui si recta via ac exemplis praeceant plebi, non potest non illa consequi. At quo pacto illi de iudicio Dei, de evangelio, de gratia, de pietate, sive de re ulla concionabuntur aliis, qui nunquam sunt in eadem ipsi exercitati? Quo pacto afficient, rapiant, concutient securas

mentes, quantalibet vi eloquentiae praediti, qui nullam secum vim spiritus adducunt ad persuadendum? Res haec ut humana non est, ita non nisi divinos requirit artifices, qui non lingua adeo, non voce, non lateribus, non acumine valent, aut scripturis quamplurimis cumulandis, at spiritu potius efficaces, affiatu potentes, scriptura felices ac opportunos, denique divinam in se vim ac numen spirantes, quo non modo feriant externas aures, sed intimos animorum recessus penetrent ad ossium ac compaginum usque divisionem, adeo-que totam hominis vitam in novum quendam habitum transforment, Haec illa deinosus est non humanae eloquentiae, sed virtus in nobis agentis Christi: quam vel iis omnibus inesse optarim, qui praesunt docendo populo, aut cos saltem acciri ad docendum, quibuscunque haec sit majori mensura collata a Domino. Ea ratione non dubium est, quin ecclesia christiana multo felicius genuinae puritati restitueretur, simulque purgator undique redderetur non solum in moribus officiisque vitae, sed etiam in religione, qua nihil aliud est profecto in vita nostra corruptius. Interim si publicae regni hujus utilitatis videbitur interesse, severius aliquid in adulteros statui, sunt vincula, sunt exilia, sunt carceres, sunt inustiones, est excommunicatio, qua effrenis libido restringi, atque etiam fortassis sanari potest. Continuo autem ad mortem ipsam progredi, nisi de gravissimis et maximis causis, non est disciplinae christianae. Certe nulla est religionis necessitas, quae huc Christianos adigat. Dixi pro tenuitate mea.

**FINIS.**

## **CORONIS AD ADULTEROS.**

Te quaeso, mi frater, me non aliter accipias ac sentio. Vitia nullius foveo, ne quis hac defensione abutatur ad majorem moechandi licentiam. Tantum hic evangelicae libertatis negotium ago, contra quosdam, qui Mosaicae legis necessitatem videbantur reducturi. Quo major nunc tibi incumbit sollicitudo, ne tam obviam hanc Christi beneficentiam rapias ad occasionem carnis, sed ad gratiarum actionem atque resipiscentiam. Ut ne nescias enim, non vocavit nos Deus immunditiae causa, sed puritatis, nec alio spectat haec nostra consul-tatio: quae si quid te ad mutandam vitam flexerit, nil quaero amplius. Sin minus, scias te non a magistratibus quidem tuis, sed ab

exoticis illis duntaxat Judaeorum legibus vindicari. Vale, ac respisce per Christum.

Cum privilegio ad imprimendum solum.

## APPENDIX NO. 2

### APPL2

“PERUSING of some papers of our predecessor Matthew Parker, we find that John Calvin and others of the protestant churches of Germany and elsewhere would have had episcopacy if permitted: but could not, upon several accounts, partly fearing the other princes of the Roman-catholic faith would have joined with the emperor, and the rest of the popish bishops, to have depressed the same; partly being newly reformed, and not settled, they had not sufficient wealth for to support episcopacy, by reason of their daily persecutions. Another, and a main cause was, they would not have any popish hands laid over their clergy; and whereas John Calvin had sent a letter, in king Edward the Sixth’s reign, to have conferred with the clergy of England about something to this effect, these two bishops, Gardiner and Bonner, intercepted the same, by which Mr. John Calvin’s overtures perished; and he received an answer as if it had been from the reformed divines of those times, wherein they checked him, and slighted his proposals: from which time John Calvin and the church of England were at variance in several points, which otherwise, through God’s mercies, had been qualified, if those papers of his proposals had been discovered unto the quæen’s majesty during John Calvin’s life; but being not discovered until about the sixth year of her majesty’s reign, her majesty much lamented that they were not found sooner, which she expressed before her council at the same time, in the presence of two of her majesty’s great friends, sir Henry Sidney, and sir William Cecil, lord Burghley.” — “The hunting of the Romish Fox,” etc. by Robert Ware, Gent. pp. 91 — 93. Dublin, 1683.

## APPENDIX NO. 3

## APPL3

THE following is the title of the work called “Christus Triumphans, Comoedia Apocalyptica: Autore Joanne Foxo Anglo. Accessit, in Christum Triumphan-tem Autoris ejusdem Panegyricon. Apocal. xxii. ‘Spiritus et sponsa dicunt, Veni Domine.’ Basileae, per Joannem Oporinum.”

At the end is this colophon : — “Basiliae, ex Officina Joannis Oporini, anno salutis humanae M.D.LVI. mense Martio.”

Prefixed is the following dedication : — “Clarissimis viris, D. Bynksio, D. AEscoto, D. Kelko, cumque his universo Mercatorum christianae pietati faventium sodalitie, Joannes Foxus salutem, atque aeternam cum Christo societatem.

Si in nuncupandis opusculis, spectari illud a viris literariis solet, ut lucis vel ornamenti aliquid adjungant iis, quibus studiorum suorum monumenta destinant: fateor longe ab eo abesse ingenii nostri foeturas, ut cuiquam splendorem afferant, ipsae potius aliorum egentes adjumentis. Sin ea veto ratio eorum est, quo promptae voluntatis gratitudinem, officiumque hoc pacto erga eos exprimant, quibus se obstrictos credant: multae sunt et graves causae (viri ornatissimi et spectatissimi (etiam collegam vestrum D. Waltonum eadem jungat epistola), cur inter caeteros multos, quibus multum debent bonae literae, meam erga vos observantiam, literario hoc munusculo in primis testari debeam: vel quia seorsim singulari vestrae benignitati, pro non vulgaribus in me officiis, debeam non mediocriter: vel etiam magis publico literarum nomine, quibus adeo exornandis, ac provehendis, mirificos vos Mecaenates praestare intelligo. Praetereo hic reliqua laudum vestrarum decora, singulare pietatis studium, pectoris cordatam prudentiam, cum rara copulatam modestia, mentisque pia possessionem; et quid ego singulas virtutum vestrarum dotes enumerando explicem, quibus multo estis, quam opibus, feliciores? Postulant haec non epistolarem operaro; et nos brevitati studere cogunt urgentes nundinae. Tantum de literis nunc ago, quas si vel favore saltem vestro utcunque benevolo dignaremini, equidem eximia id laude dignum in hominibus mercatoribus ducerem. Solebat enim hoc hominum genus, quaestuariis

addictum artibus, cum philologiae studiis minimum habere commercii. Nunc permutatis rerum vicibus, quos primarios potissimum Atlantas habere conveniebat, ab his fete desertae politiores literae, religionisque sincerae cura, nusquam magis quam apud hunc ordinem vestrum, patrocinium sibi atque asylum reperiunt. Quod quum ex aliis vobiscum, tum ex vobis sane cum primis liquere poterit: quibus satis non est, honestas artes honesto favore, ac propensae voluntatis studio, ceu benigna, quadam aura fovere, nisi et impensae insuper vestrae iisdem suble-vandis accedant, quas quotidie in laboriosissimo hoc literarum ae linguarum cursu desudantibus subministratis, ea liberalitate, ut nemo fusius: ea porro modestia, et simplicitate, ut vix praeter vos ipsos sciat quisquam, quae tanta cum laude geritis. Etsi veto in hoc laudis genere non soli sitis, quin et alios complures tum Argentinæ, tum Francfordiæ mercatores, ejusdem virtutis comites habeatis: his tamen alius dabitur praedicandi locus, et materia forsitan uberior. Haec interim vobis liberius tribuenda existimavi, partim quononnulla ad vos debitæ gratiæ portio redeat: partim, ut alii vestro evocati exemplo, non modo eximiam pietatem vestram pervideant, sed eandem insuper in fovendis studiosorum literis studeant imitari. Venit ergo ad vos, vel, si permittitis, ad universum etiam Mercatorum ordinem “Christus Triumphans.” Utinam et idem omnibus veniat triumpharis, non in theatro, sed in nubibus: non sub aenigmate, sed in conspicua majestate sui Patris, cunctis conspicendus. Quod nec diu fortasse aberit quanquam id nostræ certitudinis non est, quam mature affuturus sit ille. Illud liquido dixerim, eo nunc prolapsus esse rerum humanarum *σχήμα*, ut nunquam adesse posset opportunius. Caeterum haec quae nescire nos voluit, illi permittentes, id interim quod nostrum est agamus sedulo: ita se quisque in eum diem ut paret, ne Sponsus subito irruptens, nos supine stertentes, aut impure dissolutos adoriatur: tantoque id maturius nobis agendum arbitror, quod expletis jam omnibus fabulae partibus, mundi hujus scena properare videtur ad supremum illud, Valet et plaudite: sicque imminente rerum omnium catastropha, emensisque prorsus vaticiniis, ut nil restare videatur, nisi vox illa Apocalyptica, de coelo mox audienda, Factum est. Paulus quondam ad Thessalonicenses scribens, tot abhinc saeculis Sponsi adventum expectantes jussit, ne cito animis permoveantur, quasi ille instaret dies: haud prius venturum illum admonens, quam patefiat perditissimus ille Antichristus, Spiritu Divino profligandus. At nunc si viverent Thessalonicenses, quanto magis adventum illum expectarent

Domini, velut in foribus imminentem: praesertim quum filium iniquitatis ilium tam conspicue, non solum revelari, sed ubique in animis pene omnium evanescentem cernerent? Et tamen perinde quasi nunquam sit adfuturus triumphalis ille Christi dies, tot nominibus promissus in arcanis literis, aut perlongo absit intervallo, tot argumentis vicinus, mirum quam altum interim mundus hic dormit securitatis lethargum. Adeo ubique crapulae, luxui, ambitioni, rapinis, latrociniiis, malitiae, virulentiae, sycophanticae, ac sordi-darum rerum curis passim indulgetur a christiano populo: charitate interim sic refrigescente in animis hominum, cum hujus comite modestia, ut vix tenue ejus, fere inter natura etiam conjunctos, vestigium reperias. Denique eo res rediit, ut si quis e sublimi velut specula demissis oculis res hominum fixius con-spicetur, quaquaversum nunc maturos terrae botros, tempusque esse vindemi-atori angelo falcem mittendi judicet. Quocirca non abs re facturus videbar, si inter caetera studiorum nostrorum exercitia, hujusmodi pararem aliquid, in quo propositis temporum periculis, nostros aliquo pacto ad majorem hujus vitae contemptum, futuraeque curam expergefacerem. Quanquam non licuit in hoc Dramate, singula vitiorum genera, atque crassiora vulgi flagitia, more veteris comoediae flagellare. Id enim in Asoto, reliquisque doctissimae Germaniae comoediis, tum potissimum in concionibus quotidianis, abunde est proestitum. Nobis tantum Apocalypticam historiam prosequentibus, satis erat, ea duntaxat literis sacris in theatrum transferre, quae ad res potissimum ecclesiasticas pertinebant, Primum futurae immortalitatis certitudinem confirmamus, introducta animae et corporis ὑποτυπωσει, adversus Epicumos quosdam ventres, si qui deimmortalitate nostra ambigant. Deinde in Nomocrate vim legis totam adumbratam dedimus, in hoc, ne plus, minusve ei, quam par est, tribuatur. Quo in genere saepe a multis graviterque peccari video, post Martini Lutheri tempora: ut ne frustra in libris toties vaticinatus videatur, sese vereri dicitans, nese extincto, vera ilia justificationis disciplina prorsus apud Christianos exolescat. Nam ut dissolutos istos, nimisque laxae licentiae voluptuarios, damnat etiam profana philosophia: ita nec hi mihi probandi videntur, qui simplices ac imbecilles conscientias legis perpetuo metu captivas detinent, semper cum Deo secundum virtutes suas ac vitia, submoto fere Mediatore, agentes: indeque caeteros omnes judicantes, utinam et sibi non placentes quidam. Non quod legi omnem prorsus metum detrahamus: sed nec Christo rursus sua detrahenda suavitas, aut minuenda gratia est: et pavidis

conscientiis necessario interim consulendum. Plures fateor esse, quibus vivit adhuc Moses. “At sunt rursus, quibus sub Josua ductore militantibus, Moses veteris militiae dux sepultus est, ut ejus nesciatur sepulchrum. Quanquam iidem meminerimus, nunquam nisi cum honore illum sepeliendum. Atque utinam sic omnium affulgeret mentibus Christi gloria, ut Moses omnis splendor exolescat: utinam sic ubique vigeret justitiae amor, sic omnes forent justii, ut nulla sit illis lex posita: utinam sic omnes cum Paulo mortui, ut in sese nemo, in omnibus solus viveret Christus. Sed de his loco opportuniore. Potissimum autem in Ecclesiae persecutionibus describendis versatur comoediae nostrae materia, quibus infelix ille veterator, ex quo e coelo per Christum exturbatus est, nunquam destitit sponsam Christi fatigare. Semper enim ab initio, capitalis ille accusator generis nostri fuit: nec unquam ingenitum in nos odium mutat, etiamsi ministros furoris sui subinde mutet. Primos olim tumultus dedit per Pharisaeos: deinde per Caesares tyrannos, et proconsules: nunc per episcopos et pontifices, mundum non dicendis tragaediis exagitat: id quod in primis testari bodie Anglia nostra poterit. Dominus pro pietate sua dignetur horrendos hos fluctus in serenitatem aliquando vertere. Idque indubie hoc faciet maturius, si nos simul cum precibus enixissime profusis, vitam in melius commutatam addiderimus. Verum ne diutius vos loquaci praefatione detineam, etiam atque etiam vos, eximii ac observandi Domini, rogatos velim, simul cum ejusdem sodalitates vestrae collegis integerrimis, ut hoc quaecunque nostrae in vos observantiae *μνημόσυνον*, procandore vestro et vobis gratum esse, simul et aliis vestra approbatione commendatum velitis. Majora ac nitidiora ab aliis accipietis, majori doctrinae ubertate tinctis ingeniis. Nobis quoniam majora in praesentia non licuit, hoc interim pauperis agelli flosculo qualicunque, hybernis his dieculis apud nos vernante, vobis vel gratificari, vel certe meum erga vos in Domino studium testari libuit. Dominus Jesus suam in vos pietatem in dies magis accumuliet, ac negotia vestra feliciter secundet in omnibus.

In Christo multis nominibus reter, J. Foxus.

Laurence Humphrey prefixed some commendatory Latin and Greek verses, which do not require further notice than to observe, that they contain a long application to England of that passage in the Psalms in which the church is compared to a vine whose hedge is broken down by the wild boar of the forest. Foxe replies in some stanzas, in which he expresses his

conviction that the calamity would not be of long duration, and that peace would soon be restored to Britain.

The Dramatis Personae are these : —

*Eva.*

*Maria.*

*Satian.*

*Psycheponus*, lictores.

*Thanatus*, lictores.

*Adiopylus*, servus.

*Nomocrates*, tyrannus.

*Anabasius*, nuncius.

*Christus.*

*Psycha*, anima humana.

*Raphael*, angelus.

*Peitrus*, apostolus.

*Saulus*, qui et Paulus.

*Archiercus*, pontilex.

*Niomologus*, sacerdos.

*Polyharpax*, scriba.

*Diocetes*, persecutor.

*Pseudamnus*, antichristus.

*Pornapolis*, meretrix Babylon.

*Ecclesia*, mater.

*Africus*, adolescentes.

*Europus*, adolescentes.

*Hierologus*, concionator.

*Chorus* quinque virginum.

It is unnecessary to give a detailed account of the drama, nor could it be done except at great length. It may be enough to state, that it represents the fortune of the church, prosperous as well as adverse, from the fall of Adam to the Last Judgment. The following extract may show how the subject is managed: —

**ACT 4 SCENE 8. EJUSDEM RATIONIS.**

PORNAPOLIS, meretrix Babylon. PSEUDAMNUS, PSYCHEPHONUSS,  
ECCLESIA.

Vos hinc revertite, abite, proh summum Tonantem, quantum in hac  
Nunc forma ac magnificentia est, quod gestiam?

*Pseu.* Quos huc mea Fert plausus Pornula?

*Por.* Pseudamno *χαίρειν*.

*Pseu.* Suaviolum meum, Quidnam istuc gestiens adeo quod  
advenis?

*Por.* Quod vix tibi Credibile sit, si narrem.

*Pseu.* Quidham?

*Por.* Quanto in pretio ac honore sim, Ubicunque sim, omnibus.

*Pseu.* Narra quaeso.

*Por.* Quippe dum me effero E foribus ad te veniens, summare per  
plateam affectare viam Visum est. Hic ubi primum conspicua sum,  
concurrunt ceu ad Deum. Undique Forum ac vias omnes obstipari  
multitudine. Mirari, sciscitarier a meis quae sim. Ecclesiam,  
inquiunt, Omnipotentis Dei, Agni sponsam, veritatis columen.  
Procumbere omnes ilico, adorare oppido: quin et pedum Porro  
osculari vestigia. Mox tres fiunt Reges obviam: Iis propino  
cyathum fornicarium huncce. Vinum ubi Concaluit, vultus primum  
labascere omnium: simul Inter se consusurrari invicem, inde ut  
submoveam rogant Famulos: semovi. Soli ubi sumus, occipiunt,  
forma quae Mea, aetasque sua: amoris pariter quam impotens telum  
siet. Quorsum inquam haec? Vin' scire? Admodum.

Arcanum at id esse: etsi pudeat haud, Posse haud fateri tamen.

Aurem do: faciem quo magis (inquiunt) Spectamus hanc, minus hoc  
ferre quimus. Quid tum? Unius ut Concedas noctis copiam. Quod  
ni impetrent, nullos fore. Suadent, orant, obsecrant, suspirant. Hic  
ego vultum, oculos, Ac gestus hominum attendo satis, lustroque

singula. Ubi serio agere video, coepi detrectare primulum, Suevimus ut meretriculae, cupidos cum cupimus magis esse, qui Nos ambiunt: demum ignescere ubi cerno, magis memet dare His familiaris. Postremo, quid verbis opus? Annui Pignus cepi, cras ut redirent jussi. Siquidem diem tibi, ut Dixi, hunc Pseudamne datura sum.

*Ps.* Vah, ut dulci te osculo capio, Mea lux.

*Por.* At unus restat nodus.

*Ps.* In scirpo fors.

*Por.* Ecclesia haec Quae latitat, nos ne prodat tandem.

*Ps.* Aquilam ex filice metuis. Sine, hos ego gryphos depulverabo facile. Tu interim Telam pergas Porna hanc porto pertexere. Reges temeto tuo Temulentos faxis, nobis ut se obstringant, suaque omnia; nihil Cuiquam legitimum sit, nostro ni initiato caractere prius. At quae illinc mulier erainet pexa, ac vultu turbido?

*Ec.* Horresco misera id quid sit, Byzantii quod aiunt, vae hodie Ecclesiam iuvasse Dei, e coelo auditum clare. At filii Ubinam hic sint, quos cupiam?

*Pseu.* Haec quidnam portitat? heus mulier sodes Quae sis?

*Ec.* Ecclesiae equidem nomen fero.

*Ps.* Proh anathema.

*Por.* Audin' hanc?

*Psy.* Haeretica.

*Pseu.* Tun' te Ecclesiam esse?

*Ec.* Negabon' esse, quae Siem?

*Psy.* Schismatica.

*Por.* Miseret me. Canis quis te mulier Commorsit rabiens?

*Psy.* Lymphatica.

*Ec.* Quidnam tibi hic mecum rei'st?

*Por.* Mihi loquitur.

*Psy.* Vuyclevista.

*Pseu.* Apage sis cum sordibus Hinc: tun' Ecclesia ut sies?

*Psy.* Anabaptistica.

*Ec.* Anabaptista non Sum, Ecclesia sum orthodoxa.

*Pseu.* Proh polum arcticum atque antarcticum.

*Ec.* Quid clamitas?

*Pseu.* Quae si pergas, nae ego te dabo, ubi neque polum Videas arcticum, aut antarcticum.

*Ec.* Quid vis tibi?

*Pseu.* Dico te Ecclesiam non esse, te esse dicit.

*Por.* Ecclesiam ego Me esse inquam, sponsam Christi.

*Ec.* Tune?

*Por.* Tu negas?

*Pseu.* Ita senties.

*Ec.* Ecclesiarune te?

*Por.* Aio.

*Ec.* Asiae, Africi, ac Europi matrem Esse, ego quae siem?

*Por.* Quid agimus?

*Pseu.* Hem, haecine fieri schismata?

*Psy.* Origenista.

*Pseu.* Mulier, dico ego tibi, praestiterat hos non fieri Fucos.

*Ec.* Eho, redigitis me, ut quae sim, nesciam.

*Pseu.* Imo quae sies, Scimus satis.

*Ec.* Quaenam?

*Psy.* Paupercula de Lugduno quaequam. Nam Ecclesiam, qui te videt, an quisquam putet? Ac jam audies. Heus Symmistae, Decretistae, Canonistae, Cosmosophoi Codicillares, Holoporphyri, vos Ptochopluti ordines, Copistae, Sigilliferi, Adeste: haecine nobis Ecclesia est, an non? Chor. Est.

*Pseu.* Iam vides.

*Ec.* Star firma Dei electio, habens signaculum hoc: Scit ille, qui Sunt ejus.

*Por.* Quid air?

*Pseu.* Quid air?

*Psy.* Here, prorsus veto insanit haec Corybantica.

*Pseu.* Sic videtur, heus tenete inquam repagulis Lunaticam hanc, atque ad Bethlemitas insanam abducite, Meque hinc sequimini.

Appended to the work is a long “Panegyricon,” in which the author, after having exhorted all men to take refuge in the death of Christ, and advanced many arguments why they should do so, concludes with a passage which it may be expedient to transcribe.

Una nobis satis pro multis erit Romana ecclesia, quae quamdiu sub persecutoribus tyrannis, sub cote acuebatur, pietatis et continentiae eximia quaedam magistra conspiciebatur, ubi omnes christianae vitre et evangelicae doctrinae dotes cumulatissime inclaruerunt. Post vero, commutatis in diversum vicibus, ubi pro periculis et laboribus, opes, potentia, fastus, luxus, hujusque comes ignavia in ecclesiam corripuere gradum, jamque episcopi pro martyribus martyricidae coeperunt fieri, evangelicae disciplinae paulatim languescente vigore, quo tandem sordium prolapsa nunc est, apud se quisque aestimando cogitet: ego ut rem ipsam pro atrocitate satis explicem, non reperio. Satis in re tam conspicua exemplorum videri potuit. Sed non permittit locus hic, quamvis alioqui festinantem in hujusce argumenti cursu, Britanniam, patriam gentem tam

commode sese aperientem, praetervehi. Quae nuper sub auspicatissimo Eduardo principe, dum paululum a persecutionum respiraret procellis, quo demum tur-pitudinis reciderat, referre puderet, nisi res se ipsa occultare non posset. Nunc quod tot concionatorum continuae voces efficere non poterant, id asperam quidem, sed salubrem hanc ecclesiae illius castigationem, vel hactenus perfecisse, vel brevi effecturam, nihil addubito: quippe sic nos mortales, sive natura pro-duxit, sive formavit educatio, ut nisi malis expergefatti, vix unquam oculos attollamus ad Dominum: tam necessaria res in ecclesia Dei afflictio est, praesen-tissima adversus omne malorum genus antidotus. Quemadmodum contra rerum successus, affluentia et securitas, cum virtutum caeterarum tum potissimum religionis compages luxat, et nervos frangit. Age, circumductis paulisper oculis perlustremus velute Platonis specula res vel omnium publicas, vel privatas singulorum; in monarchis insedabile bellandi studium; in aulicis turpissimam adulationem; in Symmistis ecclesiasticis ad regum usque strepitum luxuriantem ambitionem; Theologorum, omnia in sectas et contentionem pertrahentium, odium tenax, nec minus praeceps leviculis de suspicionibus iudicium; in laicis omnis generis corruptelas; opificum imposturas; in summis pariter et minimis inexplebilem habendi ingluviem; in omnibus fere impotens mundi hujus stu-dium: ut crassiora interim vulgi flagitia, stupra, ebrietates, adulteria, perjuria, fraudes, rapinas, caedes, tumultus, caeteraque id genus supprimam, unde haec tot quaeso malorum scaturigo, nisi quia plerique nulla afflictionis asperitate, quae nos in timore Dei atque intra nostrarum rerum curam satis cohibeat, non incessimur? Quo fit, ut pauci in suis constituendis moribus solliciti, omnes in alienis erratis vel observandis simus curiosi vel flagellandis morosi fere vide-amur. Dum hic injuriam interpretatur, quod forte jus est proximi: huic nihil placer, quicquid dicit alter, aut facit: ille ex festuca trabem, ex musca ele-phantem faciens, si quid in alio naevi conspiciat, ad tragicam usque exaggerat ὑπερβολήν: alter in fratris famam Theonino rictu nunquant latrare desinit, forte quem non satis novit, aliquando et immerentis, nonnunquam etiam bene meriti. Est, qui quicquid usquam terrarum geritur adusque Gades, undecunque omnes captat rumusculos: interim quid intus in sui pectoris larario geritur, nihil sollicitus. At quanto aequius et christiana dignius professione fuerat, quum quisque suum habet iudicem, cui aut cadet, aut stabit, si cum timore ac tremore, juxta Paulinum consilium, suae quisque salutis satagat, ut aliorum nec vitiiis attendere, nec virtutibus

invidere vacet? Tum si qua festuca in oculo fratris emineat, operam nostram flagitans, eam ita adhibeamus: ut sanandi studio, non contendendi, secum agi videat, semper interim mansuetudinem et charitatem exprimentes, quae sola aedificat ecclesiam Dei: sed nimium ego mei oblitus, qui dum caeteros intra rerum suarum curam cohibere studeam, vix memet satis cohibens longius fortassis extra rem propositam pro-rectus sum. Ut igitur eo, unde defluxit, redeat oratio: vides, christiane frater, quid pro te effecerit Christus: qui morris, Satanae, maledictionis omni excussa tyrannide, qui denique chirographum adversus te in decretis situm exautorans, principatus ac potestates expoliavit, palam triumphans de illis per semetipsum, at non propter semetipsum. Imo in tuam gratiam haec omnia ab illa suscepta perfectaue intellige, ut tibi beneficiis, omnique illius victoria, non uti modo, sed et tuo quodam jure vindicare liceat: jamque non accessum modo ad Patrem, sed cum fiducia etiam aditum ad eum habeas. Ad mortalem principem si cui libera contingit admissio, quam suae applaudit felicitati! At majoris id felicitatis, ad Deum omnis potestatis fontem intromitti: quem alio-qui nemo videbit mortalium, et vivet. Jam vero, quum ad tremendum illum montem, ad inconspicuum Dei majestatem penetrandi facultas, non dico cum libertate, sed cum fiducia etiam conceditur: id ego non solum felicitatem omnem superare, sed cum imperio etiam quodam conjunctum arbitror. Quod quum ipsum tale sit, ut nos altius ducere Christus ipse non possit, ego quote longius, christiane lector, oratione deducam, non video. Quapropter ad nos ipsos revertentes, ubi Christus Dominus tot tantaque causa nostra peregerit, vicissim quid nostri sit officii facere persequamur. Quidnam ergo, inquires? Si proximum respicias, multa, plena enim officii est charitas. Sin Deum, unum est duntaxat quod agas, sed idem oppido permagnum: tantum ut in Christum credas, Dei Filium, qui pro peccatis tuis mortuus est, et pro justificatione resurrexit. At hic protinus obstrepentes quorundam sententias, ac propemodum dicam theologicam mihi inscribentes audio, quibus nimis forsitan exiliter, angustisque finibus tam immensum salutis negotium terminate videor. Principio, non hic agimus de iis quae in proximum, sed quae ad Deum referuntur. Deinde, nec clam me est, permulta esse quae praeterea exigat a nobis Deus, timorem, dilectionem, etc. Sed aliud est ad obedientiam, aliud ad salutem requiri. Distincte enim, dispositeque (quoniam in hanc incidimus disputationem) propter morosa haec tempora incedendum est. Ab haerede filio multa exigunt parentes, in quibus

praestandis obsequens quidem ille patri filius, at nequaquam haeres eo dicitur. Id enim ab ortu, non operibus, a natura, non conditione proficiscitur. Non secus in nobis legis obedientia laudem quidem invenit, vel plagas evitat potius apud Dominum: at salutem nequaquam accipit. Quod igitur natura in haeredibus, id fides est in justificationis evan-gelicae causa. Siquidem in uno hoc omnis nobis est salutis, gratiae, et felicitatis ratio proposita, tanrum ut apprehendamus Christum Jesum Dominum nostrum. Neque idcirco putet quisquam nimis arcte conciseque haec a me de salutis negotio comprehendere (ac si quis delphinum pelvi contineat) qui hic nil requiram aliud quam fidem tantum in Christum. Scio rem arduam esse aeternam vitam, et quae naturae nostrae propria non sit. Eoque sola Christi apprehensione eam constare dico; quod nihil in mundo hoc magnum arduumque sit, nisi sola in Christum fides. Quemadmodum nemo unquam Patri placuit praeter Christum, ita in illo Patti adeo complacitum est, ut ejus causa charos habeat, quicumque sunt ejus. Nemini igitur opera sua, quamlibet eximia, sic fiduciam attollant, quasi non sit omnino inutilis, etiam quum omnia fecerit. Solus Christus operibus magnus, nos fide in illum sola magni sumus. Opera itaque ad Christum, ad nos proprie fides spectat: certe quae apud Deum valere possit. Sed fenestram, inquis, hoc pacto caeteris ad licentiam aperis, alioqui natura plus satis ad laxissima quaeque profusis. Imo quicquid apertum hic est, aperuit Deus, aperuit evangelium; non nos, qui testes duntaxat doctrinae sumus. Cum illo postulandum, si quid hominum iudicio displicet. Apetit quidem ille, non nequitiae fenestram, sed coelorum regnum. Quod si qui tam studiose mali sint, ut ex salutari ostio sibi fenestram faciant improbitatis, culpa est non dextre aperientis, sed sinistre ingredientium. Nunquam cum humanis rebus secus actum est, quin pars semper major fuerit, rebus optimis pessime abutentium. Postremo si reliqui omnes, quicquid est mortalium, doctrina hac abuti velint; ac decem tantum in mundo scirem, quibus profutura haec sit consolatio: equidem nihil in hac causa dissimulans, ob hos ipsos testarer confidenter quod dico. Necessarium est enim ut doctrina haec in ecclesia retineatur, quam diu apud Christianos extinctam, nuper per M. Lutherum excitavit sublimis Christi Spiritus: nunc eadem denuo in ecclesia nescio qua temporum infelicitate flaccescere incipit, insidiosa videlicet arte Satanic, qui dum allis contentionum ac factionum, parergis orbem christianum, ubique involvit, id interim quod unice praecipuum est nostrae salutis

caput, fere extorsit e manibus. Sed vivit Christus illo potentior, qui sponsae suae nunquam est defuturus.

**FINIS.**

## **APPENDIX NO. 4**

### **APPL4**

PRAEPOTENTI ac pietate non minus quam generis claritudine ornatissimo Principi D. Thomae Duci Norfolciae, supremo regni Ang. Archimarschallo, etc. Mecaenati suo, Joan. Foxus perennem in Christo cum salute felicitatem.

Si in nuncupandis libris caeteri fere scriptores ad suos quique patronos et Mecaenates vel veteres confugere, vel novos sibi conquirere gaudeant, quibus industriae suae et ingenii monumenta addicant (Thoma Dux, Britannicae nobilitatis decus non infimum) admonet profecto me cum publica haec consuetudo hominum, tum tua in primis in me merita, studium, candor, et voluntas tam propensa et singularis, quid me sequi in his tribuendis Commentariis oporteat. Nam si splendorem nominis aestimemus, quis me facilius attrahere? Si officium spectetur, quis tandem inter heroines quidem patronos justius me sibi vindicare possit, si quid tamen sit in me, quod quisquam vindicare ac non aspernari potius debeat? Accedit porro ad haec philtra, quod multo adhuc arctius meum in te et studium devincit, et officium provocat. Quo fit, ut in te quoque aliquid mihi vindicare liceat; quippe quum in tenens formanda aetate tua, si non optimam, at primam tamen Divina ordinatione, operam posuimus. Quanquam haud me lateat, quam parum mihi hoc nomine tua Celsitudo debeat; quando tam parum in te praestiterim, et tamen at nunquam defuit mihi majora praestandi voluntas, ita vetus illa voluntatis conjunctio adhuc apud me residet: perinde ac si jam contulisset, quae animus in te collcata vouisset. Accipies igitur (mi Thoma) vel a veteri praeceptore, vel si mavis, a nero nunc cliente tuo, literarium hoc, quod sub Christo communi praeceptore nostro tuae inscribere amplitudini libuit, monumentum: quam to dignum nescio, certe ab eo perfectum animo, quem tu fastidire haud omnino debeas. Neque porto accipi solum, atque in manibus esse; sed in oculis etiam versari, ac perlegit otiumque tuum et cogitationes hie sedulo ot

religiose distineri pervelim: tamque distineri diu, quoad te, quantos hic profectus facies ad pietatem non poenitehit. Quid si non gravabitur, C. T. <sup>f567</sup> digna cum attentione facere; nihil diffido, quin in reliqua vita tua, recte et cum virtute instituenda, vice paedagogi non poenitendi, tibi esse poterit. Perro non abs te solum hos de rebus ecclesiae Commentaries legit sed a cunctis tui loci et nobilitatis hominibus; denique ab universis summis pariter ac imist publicis privatisque, nec in Anglia solum, sed quibuseunque etiam undelibet Christianis, spectari atque notari cupiam. Quippe res ipsae etsi intra unam mode Angliam gestae sint, hujusmodi tamen existunt, ut earun exempla non minus pateant vaste, quam ipsa Christi communis nostra patens pateat ecclesia. Solebat quondam apud Graecos vice proverbii hominibus in valde deprecor, si merear: ita nec laudem venor cujusquam vehementer. Dies erit, quando laus erit cuique a Domino. Dummodo illius aecrescat gloria, cum suis martyribus Satanae decrescat tyrannis, abunde est votis meis factum satis. De re autem ipsa et materia, quoniam ad me nihil attinet, sed ad Christum ejusque ecclesiam spectat in universum, si dicam audacius, liquido id me posse arbitror: quum ea sit materia haec, ut quamlibet inelegantem sortita artificem, satis tamen ipsa per se tuis omniumque oculis sese queat ac debeat commendare, tum pro amplitudine rerum gestarum, tum pro fide ipsa et veritate historiae, tum ipsa personarum porro gravitate: sive insuper oblectationem animi christiani, sive utilitatem lectionis, aut temporum necessitatem consideremus. Primum enim quae jucundior esse possit contemplatio, quam, sublimi velut specula Platonis circumferentem oculos, tot tantasque temporum in tam brevi spatio mutationes considerate; tantam videre plebis instabilitatem, ut “mobile mutetur semper cum principe vulgus;” tot prospicere heroas, et summates viros, duces, comites, equites, et patricio genere nobiles, tot generosos, episeopos, archiepiscopos, archidiaconos, ministros, tot doctos pariter et indoctos, tanquam in theatro orbis publico prodeuntes, pro sua cujusque persona partes agentes tam fortiter et mirabiliter; tantum spectare chorum lectissimorum martyrum, summe Jesu, quanta constantia pro Christo depugnantium, quanta fortitudine morientium, quanta disputantium prudentia? Deinde quam non inamoenum illud praebebit spectaculum, divinam in suis castigandis asperitatem, rursusque in eripiendis clementiam, quandoque in vindicaudo sanguine mutuam talionem perpendere? Quis non jure miretur in Moro et Roffensi divinae ultionis vim: qui, condemnato paulo prius Frytho, mox ipsi

plectuntur capite? Neque non juvabit et illud nostrorum fortasse animos, quum multi in his historiae monumentis suos reperient, alii parentes, alii filios, nonnulli uxores, pars maritos, quidam cognatos aut affines, plurimi vicinos aut amicos; de quibus hic legere aliquid, velutique loquentes audire, pro suo quisque affectu avebit. Quemadmodum et tibi ipsi, Dux inclyte, de his si quos Northfolcia tua vicinos habuerit hac in historia cognoscere, sive de praestantissimo viro D. Cobharno, vel de excellenti comite D. Thoma Cromelio, deque disertissimo regni Cancellario Audleo audire, scio non injucundum fore. Nec dubito clarissimi ducis Somerseti clarissimae spei filiis gratum similiter fore, de optimo et mitissimo suo parente legere. Sic et ecclesiis quibusdam volupe erit forsam amantissimorum pastorum veterem sibi refricari memoriam. Quemadmodum Cantuarienses, de archiepiscopo suo; Londinenses cives, de Bradfordo ac suo Sandero, lubenter audituros non dubito. Quid de Edmundo Grindallo meo, quem Edmundo Bonero nunc suffectum et episcopum Londinensem declaratum audio: an illi non adlubescet Ridlei sui, viri doctissimi, hinc memoriam repetere, ejusque in his libris disputationes spectare: in quibus nos recolligendis, variisque coilatis exemplaribus restituendis effecimus fortassis aliquid. Longum esset de Roberto Glouero, Thoma Hauxo, Gulielmo Gardinero, Causono, Hygbeo, caterisque referre: quos omnes etsi aestus pesecutionis in favillas redegit, tamen ne res gestae illorum memoriaque interiret, nobis pro virili praestitum est. Quum igitur tot modis, uti diximus, possit. te delectare hujus cognitio historiae, tum verb utilitas amoenitatem ipsam pluribus profecto nominibus exuperat, quippe quae juveniles annos tuos poreit non solum utilissimis exemplis inflammare ad pietatem, timorem Dei, mundi hujus contemptum, etc., sed etiam preceptis imbuere sanctissimis, ad Christianae doc-trinae cognitionem. Habes hic enim utriusque ecclesiae propositam ob oculos idaeam, ut de utraque jam judicare sine magno labore possis. Habes tot sanc-torum doctissimorumque Martyrum, de gravissimis controversiis judicia, testi- monia, rationes, atque argumenta, ut nullus posthac errandi relictus sit aut ambigendi locus: quum praesertim ad rationes eorum caeteras accedat insuper sanguis, validissimum sine dubio et efficacissimum testimonium. Porro neque simplex haec utilitatis ratio fuerit, quod in his commentariis adversariorum omnia fere omnium objecta, allegationes, distinctionesque et argumenta cunctis appareant; ut quum ipsis posthac nihil sit quod objiciant amplius, nunc quid iis ipsis insit objectionibus excutiamus. Quae res adeo non ad rein mihi facere non

videtur, ut si vertant posthac tempora, aut non vertant etiam, librum hunt non tam jucundum tibi aut utilem, quam necessarium cunctis fore, rein cum hoc nomine genere habituris, existimam. Volebam preterea de iis apud to multo plura: sed vix dieculae pars mihi ad compellendam sublimitatem tuam dabatur, ita festinabant typographi, et urgebant nundinae.

Dominus Jesus, principum omnisque celsitudinis Princeps, celsitudinem, tuam diu nobis velit incolumem: teque cum martyribus et sanctis suis sanctificet in regnum gloriae suae, simulque ad publicam reginae patriaeque tuae utilitatem. Basileae, anno 1559, Septembris 1.

Tuae Cels. multis nominibus devinctus addictusque in Christo,

JOAN. Foxus.

## APPENDIX, NO. 5

### APPL5

UNIVERSIS Christi fidelibus presentes literas inspecturis Decanus et Capitulum Dunelmensis Cathedralis Ecclesiae Christi et Beatae Marlin Virginia salutem in Domino. Noverit universitas vestra nos literas reverendi in Christo patris et domini, domini Jacobi, Dei gratia Dunelmensia Episcopi, sub eo qui sequitur verborum tenore inspexisse.

Jacobus, misericordia Divina Dunelmensis Episcopus, dilecto nobis in Christo venerabili viro magistro Willielmo Whittingham, in sacra theologia baccalaureo, decano ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis, et capitulo ejusdem, salutem, gratiam et benedictionem. Cum nos dilecto nobis in Christo discreto viro Johanni Fox, artium magistro, ac sacri verbi Dei professori, canonicatum et tertiam prebendam in ecclesia nostra cathedrali Dunelmensi predicta, per mortem naturalem nuper reverendi patris Thomae Sparke, Barvicensis episcopi, ultimi canonici et pre-bendarii eorundem, jam vacantem et ad nostram collocationem pleno jure spec-tantem, intuitu charitatis contulimus, et ipsum canonicum et prebendarium eorundem canonicatus et tertiae prebendae cum suis juribus et pertinentiis universis instituimus et investivimus, prout per literas nostras patentes desuper sibi factas et sigillatas latius liquet et apparet, Vobis igitur committimus et mandamus quatenus Johannem Fox, sive ipsius procuratorem quemcumque

legitime in hac parte constitutum, in realem, actualem, et corporalem possessionem predictorum canonicatus et prebendae, juriumque et pertinentium suorum universorum, realiter et cum effectu inducatis inducive faciatis, ac ipsum sic in eisdem canonicatu et tertia prebenda inductum quantum ad vos attinet defendatis: Ceteraque peragere, facere et exercere quae vestro in hac parte ineumbunt officio: Et quid in praemissis feceritis nos debite certificentis, cum ex parte predicti Johannis Fox congrue requisiti fueritis. Data sub sigillo nostro apud manerium nostrum de Awkeland, secundo die mensis Septembris, anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo septuagesimo secundo, et nostrae consecrationis anno duodecimo.

Memorandum quod de mandato dictorum Decani et Capituli Dunelmensis, viz. magistri Willielmi Whittingham decani, magistrorum Roberti Swifte, Willielmi Benett, Johannes Pilkington, Willielmi Stephenson, Rodolphi Leaver, Adam Holydaye...prebendariorum in ecclesia cathedrali Dunelmensi, xiiii die mensis Octobris, anno Domini 1572, Eisdem in domo capitulari Dunelmensi capitulariter congregatis, idem magister Johannes Pilkington, (ut asseruit) procurator et nomine procuratorio superscripti magistri Johanni Fox, per Michaelem Patenson, unum ex minoribus canonicis dictae ecclesiae cathedralis Dunelmensis, vice ejusdem magistri Johannis Fox, in realem et actualem possessionem tertiae prebendae in eadem ecclesia, et in stallum in choro ejusdem ecclesiae eidem prebendae solitum et consuetum, ac in locum et vocem in capitulo eidem solitum et consuetum, inductus erat et collocatus, presentibus tunc ibidem in choro dictae ecclesiae cathedralis Johanne Hakins, Ricardo Johnson, et Ricardo Marshall, notario publico registratore dictorum Decani et Capituliet multis aliis.

Universis Christi fidelibus presentes literas inspecturis et audituris Willielmus Whittingham decanus et capitulum Dunelmensis cathedralis ecclesiae Christi et Beatae Marine Virginia, salutem in Domino Salvatore. Noverit universitas vestra nos literas reverendi in Christo patris et domini, domini Jacobi, Dei gratia Dunelmensis episcopi, et mandatum ejusdem, xiiii die mensis Octobris, anno Domini millesimo quingentesimo septuagesimo tertio recepisse tenorem sequentem complectentes. Jacobus, misericordia Divina Dunelmensis episcopus, venerabili viro magistro Willielmo Whittingham in sacra theologia baccalaureo, decano ecclesiae

nostrae cathedralis Dunelmensis, et capitulo ejusdem, salutem, gratiam, et benedictionem. Cum nos dilecto nobis in Christo Roberto Bellamy, artium magistro et in medicina doctori, canonicatum et tertiam prebendam in ecclesia nostra cathedrali predictam, per liberam resignationem discreti viri Johannis Fox, artium magistri, ultimi canonici et prebendarii eorundem, in manus nostras factam et per nos admissam, jam vacantem, intuitu charitatis contulimus, etc. — And then follows the mandate in the usual form to induct Bellamy, who was so inducted, October 13, 1573.

## APPENDIX, NO. 6

### APPL6

Foxe's Latin Letter to the President and Fellows of Magdalen College, accompanied with a copy of his "Acts and Monuments of the Church."

Multis magnisque dotibus ornatissimo viro, D. Laurentio, Collegii Magdalenensis Proesidi : partier cum universo Choro reliquorum Juvehum, lectissimisque ejusdem Collegii Sociis, Joannes Foxus salutem et pacem in Christo sine fine.

Etsi nihil erat in rebus meis dignum atque idoneum quod Beatae Mariae Magdalenae, veteris hospitae ac nutricis meae, pixidi mitterem; at viduae tamen Evangelicae opulentam illam imitatus penuriam, has qualescunque lucubrationum nostrarum minutias, pro veteri meo erga vos studio, vel officio potius (eximie idemque Doctissime Laurent;, praesidium decus, vosque pariter universi ejusdem sodalitatis collegae conjunctissimi) in publicum aerarium ventrum conjiciendas censui. Vos in admittendo libro statuetis, pro libero arbitrato vestro, quod videbitur. Mihi, ut ingenue fatear, indignius quiddam, ac jejunius esse videtur, quam ut in chartophylacium vestrum recipi debeat, praesertim quum eo sermonis genere conscripta, historia nullum magnopere usum studiis vestris praestare queat. Et tamen huc me, nescio quo pacto, pertraxit, vincens pudorem et judicium meum, Garbrandi Bibliopola, <sup>f568</sup> pellex oratio, sic ad persuadendum instructa, ut non frustra in tali tam diu Academia videri possit enutritus. Auxit porro nonnihil hanc mittendi fiduciam tacita quaedam et jam olim insits mihi erga collegium illud propensio, vestrae deinde erga me humanitatis, simulque mei vicissim erga vos officii

recordatio. Intelligo enim quid veteri scholae, quid charis consodalibus, quid demum universo Magdalenensium ordini ac caetui, sed praecipue quid ipsi imprimis cha-rissimo collegiarchae, viro ornatissimo, D. Laurentio debeam, cui quot quantisque sim nominibus devinctus hullo modo oblivisci aut praeterire potero. Praeter hos stimulos accedit denique, quod quum historiae hujus bona magnaue pars Oxoniensem bane vestram attingat Academiam, unde, ceu ex fonte, prima non solum initia, sed et incrementa sumpsit ac sumit quotidie foelix haec et auspicata reformatae per orbem Christianum religionis propagatio, idcirco rein facturus nec vobis ingrattam, nec meo indignam officio videbar, si de rebus maxime Oxoniensibus conscriptam historiam, ad Magdalenaeum gymnasium vestrum, hoe est, ad primarium ac nobilissimum Oxoniensis Academiae collegium, velut in arce quadam studiorum ae literarum penes vos asservendam commendarem. Hoc unum dolet, Latine non ease scriptum opus, quo vel ad plures emanate fructus historiae, vel vobis jucundior ejus esse posset lectio. Atque equidem multo id maluissem. Sed hue me adegit communis patriae ac multitudinis aedificandae respectus, cui et vos ipsos idem hoc condonare aequum est. Habetis rationes et causas, quibus ad mittendam historiam sum provocatus. Nunc historiam habete ipsam, quam veluti pro tessera Foxianae erga vos voluntatis mittimus. Eam pro candore vestro, rogo etiam atque etiam, benigne susceptam velitis. Atque ne nihil aliud quam historiam nudam et incomitatam mittere videamur, en simul cum historia, inter caeteros, quos in hoe multiplici et numeroso Christianorum militum satellitio Oxonia vestra, tanquam foelix mater, tum imprimis Magdalenae foelicissima foecunditas, produxit, Jocelinum vestrum Palmerum, <sup>f569</sup> e choro ventro proximis his annis ereptum, denuo ad vos tanquam redeuntem et restitutum recipietis, simulque cum eo caeteros, nee paucos, nec vulgares Oxoniae vestrae quondam alumnos, nunc illustres Christianae militiae Agonistas, tanquam veterem suam revisentes scholam, gratis animis suscipite, et Christum in suis martyribus glorificate. Quod superest, quoniam Chartae arctamur angustia, rogo (prae-stantissimi Juvenes) ut Dominus Jesus istum vobis Praesidem, vos orbi et ecclestae Christianae, diu servet incolumes, vestraque studia in dies in majus ac melius provehat ad nominis sui gloriam.

Vester in Christo,

Londini, Mail, 2do. [1562].

JOANNES FOXUS.

From the MS. in Magdalen College, Oxford, whence a facsimile has been taken expressly for this Edition, of which a Lithograph Copy is inserted in this Volume. See also Aubrey's Letters, Vol. II. pp. 42-45.

## APPENDIX, NO. 7

### APPL7

#### AD ELIZABETHAM REGINAM.

QUUM non alia res in his terris existat, quae summi numinis majestatem pro-pius representat, magisque nobis exprimit imaginem, quam principum recte gubernantium autoritas (Principum rios ac decus, Elizabetha Regina set enissima) tum meo quidem iudicio, iidem principes nulla re alia simulachrum aereruae illius majestatis, verius efficaciusque refernut, quam propitio, et continuo quodam. miseros mortales juvandi studio. Quemadmodum enim Dens ipse, rerum opifex ac "luminum pater, a quo cuncta e sublimi defluunt quaecunque dona optima et perfecta sunt," nullins ope cum egeat nec accipiat a quoquam, nunquam tamen desistit ipse de suo impartire quo possit universis; consimile quiddam et its qui vices illius quodammodo gerentes in Republica cum laude imperant monarchis usuvenire solet, quorum quum omnes favore et beneficencia subditi indigeant, atque ab ipsis ditantur multi, ipsi tamen suis abunde bouts opulenti nullins nee ope egent, nec ditiores cujusquam fiunt beneficio. Nam siquid praestet princeps in subditos, id ego beneficium esse interpretor; siquid vero ipsi in Principem vicissim collocent, etsi bene quidem ab ipsis fit quod faciunt, non tamen beneficii sed officii potius ant debiti rationem subit. Atque de caeteris quidem Monarchis omitto in praesentia plura dicere: inter quos Majestas tua, peculiari quodam fato tuo velut in plurimorum nata utilitates, ita praelucere videtur, ut non modo ipsis spectandum esse ad conferendum, sed ad imitandum etiam regula videri poteris. Quanquam immensum hoc pellagus (sic) laudum ac virtutum tuarum, quid incipiam hic ego attingere, quum et universa haec Anglia tua, quanta quanta est, cui imperas, si una voce ei daretur singulorum cogitationes exprimere, non solum non gratias tuis meritis pares agere sed

nec beneficia ipsa, genere tam varia, tempore tam opportuna, amplitudine immensa, numero pene infinita, possit enumerando consequi.

Nam ut vulgaria ilia praeteream, quod in ipsis statim felicissimi regni tui auspiciis tot periclitantes cives et homines extorres ab exilio revocaris, quod patriam ipsis, nec solum ipsis, sed patriam quodammodo patriae reddideris, Angliamque jamjam poene expirantem luci ac vitae suae restitueris, quod pacem tuis illis auspiciis partam pergas quotidie studiis ornare et artibus; bonis legibus suum vigorem revocas, noxias tollis, salutare sufficis, nocentes et otiosos in ordinem redigis, latrocinia et praedonum agmina, quibus regnum tuum foedis modis hodie exundare dicitur, compescis, miseros exaudis, collapsa restauras, nec monetam solum depuratam, sed mores hominum multo magis deformatos, repurgas; postremo, cuncta suo, et plusquam suo, nitore restituis, ac caetera id genus permulta. Quae, etsi per se beneficia levia non sunt, et permagna etiam in aliis monarchis videri queant, tuarum tamen laudum (written laudum), nescio quo pacto, nondum satis magnitudinem exprimunt.

Certo multo majora haec omniumque maxima sunt, quod inclita tua celsitudo rem ecclesiasticam non minus quam publicam propugnans tam fortiter, quod religionis curam atque defensionem in te suscipis tam clementer, quod saevas persecutionum faces extinguis, conscientiam diu interclusam libertatem apperis, templum Dei et evangelicae doctrinae gloriam illustras et provehis; videlicet, modis omnibus hoc agens, ut, profligatis sensim veteris superstitionis reliquiis, sincera evangelii veritas ad nativum suum nitorem redeat. Declaravit id nuper egregia vox ilia ac responsio majestatis tuae ad quorundam preces reddita theologorum, de modo videlicet vestiendi; qua voce quantam uno in die universae ecclesiae pepereris faustitatem, quantum piorum omnium animis solatium, quantum posteritati beneficium, quantam omnibus temporibus lucem, tum tuo insuper nomini quantum quatoque immortale decus, quovis aere perennius, attuleris, vix aestimari poterit, Ingratae omnium Anglorum linguae et literae futurae sunt, si patiantur tam divinum hoc, caeteraque multa tuarum virtutum trophaea, ulla temporum vetustate obolescere.

Accedit ad hunc cumulum singularis porro majestatis tuae erga literarum studia favor; in quibus excolendis provehendisque nunquam tam propensam te declarares, nisi ut ipsa in iisdem exulta tam eleganter et

perpolita fuisses. Sensit id nuper felix Cantabrigia: nee dubito quin olim et Oxonia nostra idem expectatura sit. Persensimus praeterea et nos, etiamsi illinc abfuimus, ex oratione majestatis tuae Latina Cantabrigiae tum habita, quae nuper ad manus meas inter caetera historicarum rerum monumenta pervenit, non indigna, ut mihi videtur, quae transmittatur posteritati: atque etiam transmittere, siquidem tua patiatur sublimitas. Interim hoc unum mihi dolet, quod quum plenam quandam historiae tuae descriptionem meditemur, multaque habeamus congesta, at multa rursus desunt, quae, adhuc nobis incognita, non nisi per tuam ipsius majestatem sciri possunt; et si possent, nullius possent melius quam tuo ipsius commentario describi: quod utinam ab excellenti ingenio tuo per hoc vitro tuae tempus et spatium possit impetrari. Sed de his excellentiae tuae praeconiis alias (volente Christo) nobis videndum erit.

Accedo nunc ad rein ipsam quae praecipue hanc mihi subministravit scribendi materiam. Est hic quidam Gulielmus Masterus tuae sublimitati, opinor, non omnino incognitus. Divina sic providentia evenit, ut nos duos conjungeret unius simul ecclesiae communio, et societas. Me etenim Majestas tua paulo ante fecit Praebendarium: ego ilium nuper ejusdem parochiae feci vicarium. Jam utrique haeremus in solutione illius pecuniae quae tibi pro primi anni fructibus debetur, quum tureen neuter ne teruncium quidem habet ad persolvendum. Ejus pecuniolae ut remissam (sic) nobis faciat reginea tua pietas, etsi rogare vix audeat vereeunda (sic), at necessitate tamen impulsus rogare vel inviti cogimur. Freti deinde mansuetissima tua benignitate, adeo in utilitates subditorum exposira, majorera etiam concipimus rogandi audaciam; nihil diffisi quin huic audaciae, qualiscunque sit, tua facile condohabit pietas, si sciret quanto nobis detrimento quantoque obstaculo ad res gerendas sit infelix hujus aeris remora. Quanquam nihil esse in studiis aut laboribus nostris haud ignoramus, quod vel tenuissimam tui favoris partem promereri queat, eui plus-quam facultates etiamnum nostras debere fatemur. Attamen si serenissima tua pietas, in remittenda huc nobis solatiuncula, gratias nostras maluerit quam pecuniam eam deberi tibi, quid in altero fiscus tuus lucratus sit nescimus, in altero honoris ac nominis tui memoriae et splendori nihilo fortasse minus accrescet apud posteros, si quid tamen apud posteritatem Literariae nostrae valebunt gratiae. — Harl. MS. 417, Art. 16, pp. 97, 98. See also Strype's Annals, Vol. II. pp. 109, 110, Oxf. Ed.

## APPENDIX, NO. 8

## APPL8

SALUTEM, vir inclyte, in Christo Domino et Servatore nostro sempiternam. Supplex ad te venit Typographus noster Joannes Daius, opem, consilium, auxili-um expetens. Non ignorat, opinor, prudentia tua, lege cautum esse publica et municipali, ut cives opificesque, in conducendis operadis et servis, exteros et alienigenas sibi asciscant non plures quatuor. Hunc numerum si quis praevari-cetur, parata est mulcta ilico, nescio quae, dira et grandis, quae transgressorem feriat. Ego veto quorsum tendat legis hujusce praescriptio, nec satis intelligo, nec attinet in praesentia exeutere. Et fieri potest, ut **νομυθηται**, viri prudentes et consulti, suum in eo sensum habuerint, et causas viderint, quas nos ex crassiori hominum classe non assequimur. Verum enimvero uteunque haec res habeat, perquam sane incommode decretum hoc Typographo isti accidit, tum etiam utrique nostrum hoc tempore incommodissime; qui quum trbus proelis materiam continue suppeditamus, accedit insuper, quod in eo opificii genere laboramus, ut neque apud nostrates operas nobis satis idoneas conquirere, nec aliunde ministros ad hanc rem, comparare per legem liceat. Habes modo querelae nostrae summaro, unde quid sit, quod effiagitare abs te velimus, perspicit satis, opinor, tua celsitudo — nempe ut pietas atque autoritas tua hic interposita nos contra legis subleuet periculum, eamque nobis obtineat facultatem, quo liceat servum unum et alterum, supra quos permittat lex, ex quacunque natione ad-movere ad operam hanc chalcographicam, quae in manibus est, perficiendam. Quod si indigni ipsi tuo hoc favore videamur, saltem dabit id Martyribus Christi piis et sanctis tua benignitas, qui jam diu in cinere conditi tanto forsitan maturius prodibunt in lucem. Mitto excellentiae tuae fragmenta Wintoniensis aliquot, in quibus perlegendis utinam tibi per negocia iudicium et censuram nobis tuam accommodare vacaret. Quod olim de Hoperi responsione in Editionem Bro-chianam seu Brachianam potius promiseras, nolim tuae excidere sublimitati. Aut si quid aliud sit domi tibi in Chartophylacio repositum, quod putes ex usu nobis fore, atque ad farraginem historiae attinere, id quicquid sit, vehementer nobis communicari exoptamus. Dolet profecto et pudet, e tam multis, qui Regi Edouardo VI. laudatissimae memorim principi id debeant officii, numinem apparere, qui vitam ejus aliqua dignetur descriptiuncula. Quod si

honoranda tua pietas non gravetur Leges Ecclesiasticas illas mihi, quarum teci apud te mentionem, paulisper accommodare, polliceor denuo ad sextum diem resti-tuendas amplitudini tuae. Quam Dominus Jesus in longam aetatem nobis et reipublicae incolumem florentemque custodiat. e **Τυπογραφείῳ** nostro. Jul. 6. Tuus in Christo ad omnia Christiana obsequia paratissimus. — J. FOXUS.

Praeter haec (ne satis petaces ac molesti tibi videamur) rogamus porro majorem in modum illustrissimam praestantiam tuam, ut huic, quem dixi, typographo sua maneant sarta et tecta privilegia illa, quae jam olim a vobis indulta sibi habet, in psalmorum excussione, atque ut vulgo loquuntur ad Imprimendum solum, siquidem ex hoc uno solo universa illius alitur familia.

Prudentia et Pietate viro cum primis conspicuo et eminenti D. Cecilio Reginoe Secretario. — Lansdowne MS. 10, No. 170.

Indorsement on the back : — Mr. Fox. Concerning printing his Martyrology: That hee might bee dispensed with in regard of that law for printing, that allows not above four strangers, printers; that so his Martyrology might go the faster.

## APPENDIX, NO. 9

### APPL9

#### AD DOCTUM ET CANDIDUM LECTOREM.

Proefatio. J. F.

QUUM nihil sit, quod vel ad communem omnium naturam vel ad privatam cujusque salutem proprius pertineat, quam ut in quaque reipub, societate recta religionis doctrina retineatur, tum ad hanc ipsam optima religionis institutionem non parum retulerit, optimarum pariter legurn accedere disciplinam: Quarum altera nos ad pietatem informet, altera externam hominum inter ipsos vitam moresque componat. Quae duae res simul conjunctae, ut plurimum in omni reipub. recte administranda valent, seseque mutuo juvant; ita si divellantur perinde ac si navem seces mediam, haud ita multum video, quid aut haec sine ilia, aut utraque pars sine altera,

his praesertim temporibus contulerit. Nam ut nulla quantumvis morata civitas, aut regnum, commode haberi possit si absit aut aberret religionis regula; sic neque religio rursus quantumlibet exulta praestiterit ad absolvendam foelicitatis perfectionem, ubi nec morum cura habetur, nec judiciorum servatur severitas. Unde non inscite ab Augustino dictum est, qui de Dei scribens civitate, posse rempub. foeciicem esse negat, ubi stantibus quidem moenibus, mores ruinam patiuntur. Ideoque non abs re a sapientissimis majoribus prospectum arbitror, qui praemia pariter cum poenis temperantes, simulque cum religione legum colligantes instituta, omni reipub. parti consulendum putaverunt, quo videlicet nec bonis deesset quo ad virtutes sincerumque Dei cultum incitari possent; nec malis suppliciorum abesset metus, quo revocentur a flagitio: simulque injuriarum controversiae (si quae emerge-rent) tolli eodem pacto et finiri possent.

Caeterum diligens hic cum primis et multiplex adhibenda cautio est. Quemadmodum enim non omnis admittenda est in caetus politicos religio, nisi quae ad expressam divinae voluntatis normam quam simplicissime respondeat; ita et in condendis legibus prudenti cum primis delectu utendum censeo, ut reipub. accommodentur, non quae temere cujusvis effundit temeritas, ant tyrannis obtrudit, sed quae ad archetypum aequi et honesti atque perfectae rationis regulam accendant quam proxima. Prospiciendum deinde, ne aut fisci lucrum oleant, ant privatam sapiant utilitatem; cujusmodi Epitadoc fuisse feruntur, qui cum legem tulisset, ut liberum esset cuique sua, cui cellet, relinquere, nihil interim agebat, nisi ut ipse filium, quem odisset, posset exhaeredare. Porro ne crudelitatem spirent, quales erant Draconis et Phalaridis Agrigentinorum tyranni, quibus et Episcopi Romani addas licebit. Profuerit et illud insuper cavere, ne leges immodica superfluitate ac multitudine scitorum onerent magis, quam ornent rempub. Quanquam vero longe id praestantissimum fuerat, votisque omnibus optandum, ejusmodi omnium esse Christianorum mores, ut non paucis aut moderatis modo, sed nullus potius omnino opus esset legibus, tantumque posse religionis vigorem apud omnes, ut de nobis vere affirmari posset Paulihum illud (1 Timothy 1.) — Lex justo posita non est, &c.; verum quando hoc in tanta vitae infirmitate obtinere non datur, nescio etiam an sperare liceat in visibili hac Ecclesia, ubi promiscue cum bonis ita permisti mali sunt, ut amplior plerumque pars vincat meliorem, idcirco legum necessario comparata sunt praesidia, ut quos ducere religio nequeat,

disciplinae saltem legumque retineat coercio. Sine quibus nullam posse humanae societatis gubernationem constare, non modo recentiorum temporum exempla, sed vetustissimae etiam antiquitatis ubique comprobant historiae, sive Atticam primum, sive Spartanam spectemus rempublicam. Quarum utraque post varias civilium conflictationum agitationes, tandem acceptis altera a Solone, altera a Lycurgo legibus, multo dehinc pacatior auctiorque est reddita. Sic enim de Athenis constat, quod cron sine certo aliquo jure tres simul per id tempus factiones inter se contenderent, eaque dissensio gliscentibus magis odiis universis exitium minaretur, Soloni respub. mandata est. Is leges tulit, quibus libertatem et otium, per quingentos postea annos, ei restituit reipub. Porto ut non pudit Atticos ea tempestate Aegyptias leges quasdam usucapere, atque in suam transferre rempub. (ut testis est Herodotus), idem et Romanis postea usu venit, quos cum publica cogeret necessitas leges in civitate sua conscribere, missi sunt in Groeciam decemviri, qui ex Atticis legibus Solonis, Zaleuci apud Locros, Charondoe apud Thurinos, Lycurgi apud Lace-doemonios, Phoronei apud Argivos, certas legum formulas colligerent, et de rep. instituenda summos in Groeia homines consularent.

Atque ex iis demure leges duodecim tabularum conflatae sunt, quibus tantum tribuit M. Cicero, ut alicubi de optimo civitatis statu disputans, a natura discedere praedicat, qui a Romanis legibus dissident. Breviter nulla gens, nulla civitas, aut patria, tam immanis unquam aut barbara fuit, quae non leges, etsi non ubique consimiles, non aliquas tamen habuerit, quibus si non omnia propellerentur vitia, at aliquam saltem morum honestatem retineret. Sic neque Angliae nostrae jam olim sua defuerunt legum decreta sapienter a prudentissinis majoribus constituta. Declarant id Bracthonis nomothetica, Inoe Regis, Edovardi senioris, Athelstani, Eadmundi, Eadgari, Aluredi, Ethelredi, Canuti, caeter-orumque principum auspiciis institutae sanctiones. Quae leges quam diu suam tueri auctoritatem potuerunt, viguit aliqua saltem in hoc regno morum disciplina. Tandem non multo post haec descendit in Orckestram Scoenicus plane artifex suam saltaturus fabulam, urbis Romae Pontifex: qui caeteris paulatim explosis auctoribus, solus ipse scenam occupare, omnesque omnium actiones sustinere voluit. Primumque prophanis magistratibus ea tantum relinquens quae prophana videbantur, reliquam partem illam de moribus universam ad se populumque suum transtulit ecclesiasticum, callidissimo nimirum commento, dum se fingit

Christi in terris vicarium, et Apostolicae cathedrae haereditarium successorem. Quod simul atque semel principibus esse persuasum sensisset, hinc illico majora conandi materiam accipit. Neque porro defuit occasione audacia. Perg ensitaque in coepta fabula mirus hic histrio, postquam exordium sibi tam pulchre videt procedere, ad reliquas similiter actionis partes se parat, quas nihilo etiam segnus tractat. Ac primum ad Reges ipsos summosque Monarchas affectat viaro, eorum auctoritatem paulatim vellicare, mox et aequare, tum superare etiam, superatamque sub jugum mittere pertentat. Hoc ubi etiam succedere intelligit, majore sumpta fiducia ulterius adhuc progreditur sese dilatare, ac pennas nido majores distendere, nihil jam humile aut plebeium de se cogitans. Qui prius humili socco incedebat, nunc alto cothurno ingreditus, ex pontifice Rex factus plane tragicus. Quin nec amplius subditi jam nomen agnoseit, qui jubetur a Christo, ne dominetur suis. Denique eousque intumescit magnitudinis hic Ecclesiarcha, ut qui leges prius ab aliis accipere atque in ordine teneri sit solitus, nunc inversa rerum scaena leges ipse imponit allis, ac jura praescribit universis: Quod jus nunc canonicum appellamus. In quo ipso jure neque ullum tamen modum tenet illius impudentia, quin leges legibus, decreta decretis, ac iis insuper decretalia, aliis alia, atque item alia accumularet, nec ullum pene statuit cumulandi finem, donec tandem suis Clementinis, Sextinis, Intra et Extravagantibus, Constitutionibus provincialibus et Synodalibus, Paleis, Glossulis, Sententiis, Capitulis, Summariis, Rescriptis, Breviculis, Casibus longis et brevibus, ac infinitis Rhapsodiis, adeo orbem confarcinavit, ut Atlas mons, quo sustineri coelum dicitur, huic (si imponeretur) oneri vix ferendo sufficeret.

Atque hunc quidem in modum habuit pontificiae hujus fabulae epitasis, satis quidem turbulenta, et prodigiosa: In qua mirum quas ille turbas dedit, quos mundo ludos fecit, et quos errores involvit, foris nonnullam quidem religionis faciem obtendens, sed ira ut propius intuenti haud difficile esset videre, longe aliud mysterium in animo eum instituisse, nempe ut ecclesiasticum imperium aliquod in hoc mundo eminentiae singularis at tolleret. Tum nec his contentus, jus fori sui baud prius destitit hactenus dilatare, quoad totum etiam civilem gladium cum plena potestate in suam traduxisset possessionera: non huc spectans interim, ut morum disciplinam in melius proveheret (quod fortassis nunquam illi serio curae fuit), sed partim ut sedis dignitatem omnibus munitam modis constabiliret, partim ut

opes undecunquequam maximas ad explendam ipsius avaritiam converteret, haudmultum dissimili exemplo, quale de Dionysio Syracusano commemorat Plutarchus, qui quum insidioso consilio quam plurimas tulisset leges, alias super alias ingerens, tum easdem pari rursus astutia, a populo negligi patiebatur, quo cunctos hac ratione sibi obnoxios redderet. Nec aliudin consilio fuisse huic pontifici videtur in tot congerendis legum centonibus, quam ut plurimos canonicis suis articulis irretitos teneret, quo uberius quæstus ei ex dispensationibus et condemnationibus accresceret. Atque hanc puta catastrophem esse hujus choragii. Nam ut veteres olim Comoediae exhibebant fere in nuptias, ita pontificis omnes fere molitiones desinebant in pecunias. Breviter sub hoc pontifice ita gubernata est res ecclesiastica, ut in peiori loco nec alias fuerit unquam, nec tum esse potuerit: quando nihil in religione fere rectum, in moribus nihil sanum, nihil in conscientiarum liberum, nec in cultu sincerum relinquebatur; nee in legibus quicquam, nisi quod ad inutiles quasdam ceremonias, vel absurda dogmata, vel ad ordinis magnificentiam tuendam pertinebat. Et si in consistoriis ostendebatur nonnulla forsitan justitiæ umbra, et morum inspectio, sic tamen res gerebatur, ut pretio nulli non venalis foret impunitas. Cui et hoc porro accedebat incommodi, quod quum ab iis judiciis procul omnis politica potestas arceretur, interim tota fori tractatio nescio quibus canonicis et officialibus patebat, quorum magna pars ex litibus victitans suum magis spectabat compendium, quam virtutis ac morum rectitudinem. Ut multa hic suppressim modeste causa, fortassis non pretereunda, si non pudori magis consulere, quam calamo indulgere hoc loco iibuisset.

Postulabat sane hæc tanta rerum dissipatio necessariam emendationem. Neque fefellit ecclesiam suam divina providentia, cujus singulari beneficio coepit tandem utcunque scintillare, velut e crassa nebula, promicans sincerioris religionis aura, regnante auspiciatissime memorize Rege Henrico octavo, qui regum omnium in hoc regno primus, magno reipublicæ bono, pontificis hujus nomen cum superbissimis fascibus prorsus e regni finibus excusserat. Quin nec eo contentus cordatus rex, ut nomen nudosque solum titulos a se suisque depelleret, nisi et jura decretaque omnia quibus adhuc obstringebatur ecclesia perfringeret, huc quoque animum adjecit, ut universam secum rempublicam, in plenam assereret libertatem. Quocirca cum ex ipsius tum ex publico Senatus decrelo delecti sunt viri aliquot, usu et

doctrina prestantes, numero triginta duo, qui penitus abolendo pontificio juri (quod canonicum vocamus), eum omni illa decretorum et decretalium facultate, nosai ipsi leges, quoe controversiarum et morum judicia relicent, regis norainc et authoritate surrogarent. Id quod ex ipsius Regis epistola, quam huic praefiximus libro, constare poterit, quae et serium ipsius in hac re studium et piam voluntatem aperiatur. Laudandum profecto regis propositum, nec illaudandi fortassis eorum conatus, qui leges tum illas, licet his longe dissimiles, conscripserant. Sed nescio quo modo, quaque occasione res successu carair, sire temporum iniquitate, sire nimia eorum cessatione quibus tunc negotium committebatur.

Sequitur post haec regis tandem Henrici mots, “aequo pulsans pede pauperum tabernas, regumque tures :” Post quem sublit in regni habenas relictus a patre filius nunquam satis laudati nominis Edouardus sextus. Qui in emendanda primurn religione, quam adhuc inchoatam reliquit pater, majores impetus ac vires addidit, nee omnino profecit infoeliciter. Quo thetum, ut religionis fontes multo, quam antea, purgatiores nativo quodammodo nitore sint restituti. Sed iniquissimi illorum temporum mores, longe a professione dissidentes, et religioni laberect bonis omnibus dolorera non mediocrem aspersionem. In causa creditur, quod cum doctrina reformata non item adhibita essent legum idonea repagula, quae effrenam multitudinis impunitatem cohiberent. Durabant enim adhuc haec ipsa, quae et hodie regnant in curiis et consistoriis pontiffeli juris instituta, et constitutiones provinciales, quae praeter verbosam ceremoniarum congeriem nihil fere habebant, quod corrigendae Christianorum vitae magno-pere conduceret. Neque interim hoc nesciebat, pro divina sua indole Edouardus noster. Itaque coacto mox Senatu, indictoque frequentissimis comitiis parlamento, non solum in animo habuit, sed diligentur etiam curavit, paterhum sequutus exemplum, ut quod ille factum prius voluisset, in reformandis pontificiorum canonum decretis, id ipse absolutiori expeditione perfectum redderet.

Quid multis? ex communi ordinum omnium suffragio, datum id negotii est viris, si non iisdem quibus snperius, at pari tamen numero, nec impari excellentia praeditis, triginta videlicet duobus (quod idem etiam ab Henrico prius octavo instituebatur), partim ex Episcopis, partim ex Theologia, partim ex utriusque juris prudentia, partim ex communis quoque juris professlone, ad octenos, in quatuor classes, ad hoc ipsum designatis, ut

ipsorum arbitrio certa quaedam sanctionum capita in legum formulas redacta figerentur, quae, in locum suffectae Romanarum constitutionum, reip. et moribus in melius formandis quam maxime salutes proponerentur.

Nec longum erat, quin regis voluntati satisfactum sit. Res enim, tanquam pensum, in varias distributa operas felicitate non minori quam celeritate confecta est, hoc observato ordine: ut Duo hi et triginta (quos diximus) in quatuor classes, aequa proportione ita dividerentur, ut in singulis octonariis duo Episcopi, duo item Theologi, rursusque duo juris utriusque, similiter et communis juris consuehi totidem continerentur. Inter quos sic denique conventum est, ut quod in singulis classibus conclusum et definitum esset, id per reliquas classes considerandum atque inspiciendum transmitteretur. Quanquam verb ex hoc ipso omni numero, octo potissimum selecta fuerunt capita, quibus prima operis praefectio quasque materiae praeparatio committeretur, quorum nomina Regis in Edouardi epistola comprehensa videre liceat.

Atque hoc modo confectae hae quidem leges sunt, si eas ecclesiasticas, siue politicas appellare libeat. Quarum materia ab optimis undique legibus petita videtur, non solum ecclesiasticis, sed civilibus etiam, veterumque Romanorum praecipua antiquitate. Stunrose negotii praefuit Tho. Cranmerus Archiepis. Cant. Orationis lumen et splendorera addidit Gualterus Haddonus, vir disertus, et in hae ipsa juris facultate non imperitus. Quin nec satis scio an Joan. Checi viri singularis eldora negotio adiutrix adfuerit manus. Quo factum est, ut cultiori stylo concinnatae sint istae leges, quam pro communi caeterarum legum more. Atque equidem lubens optafire, si quid votis meis proficerem, ut consimili exemplo, nec dissimili etiam oratione ac stylo, prosiliat nunc aliquis, qui in vernaculis nostris legibus perpoliendis idem efficiat, quod in ecclesiasticis istis praestitit clarissimae memoriae hic Haddonus.

Sed haec aliorum relinquens perpensionem, ad ecclesiasticas nostras redeo, quae quemadmodum elaboratae fuerint, quibusque authoribus conscripto, iam aperulinas. Restabat nunc de illarum dignitate et aestimatione aliquid porro mihi disserendum. Sed quia nolim meo iudicio caeteris praecurrere, liberam suam cuique censuram relinquo. Nobis sat erit, quoniam jampridem in superioribus Monumentis nostris promissa sunt, studiosis lectoribus

haec propoSuisse; non ut vim illico legum auctoritatemque induant, sed ut specimen duntaxat rei, velut ad gustum ista lectitare volentibus, exhiberemus, quae ubi perleeta fuerint, pro suo quisque captu, quid de iis statuendum putet, libere secum pensitet non aliquid inhaesit naevi, ita neque hie fortasse defutura sunt, quae **δευτέρας φροντίδας** et aeriorem lectoris discussionera fragitare nonnullis videbuntur. In quo gertere praeter alia quae brevitatis causa transilire cogor, hoc unum minime, vel praetereundum mihi, vel doctis judiciis admittendum videtur, quod Jex ista vetat in titulo de divinis officiis, cap. 16 — ne quicquam omnino praeter praescripta peragatur, et formulas illius libri nostra communi lingua scripti, quem proprium et perfectum omnis divini cultus magistrum esse statuit, etc. Nos verb perfectum omnis divini cultus magistrum solum Dei Verbum agnoscimus, cum interim in hoc libro non esse nulla constat, quae per omnia minus quadrare ad amussim ecclesiasticae reformationis videantur, multoque rectius fortasse mutarentur. Sed haec ab allis rectius perspicui, quam a me admoneri poterint.

Interim Illustrissimi Principis Edouardi nostri tam piam vereque Christianam sollicitudinem nunquam satis laudare queo, nee minus praeclare eorum etiam doctorurn hominum navatam diligentiam arbitror, qui congerendis his legibus praefuerunt, quas summa approbatione et applausa illorum tum temporum fuisse receptas constat. Nec dubium quin Parliamentari etiam auctoritate eadem sanctiones istae constabilitae atque in publicum usum consecratee fuissent, si vita regi paulo longior suppetisset. Quod ut vaide tum dolendum est non contigisse, ita nunc vicissim optandum, quod per praematuram mortera regis iilius negatum est, ecclesiae foelicitati per foeliciora tempora Serenissimae Reginae nostrae Elizabethoe suppleatur, accedente publica hujus nunc Parliamenti auctoritate, simulque faventibus doctorurn hominum suffragiis. Quos ut nostram hanc in edendo audaciam boni consulant impense rogamus. — Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum. Londoni. Ex Offieina Johannis Daii, Annosalutis humanae 1571, mense Aprill.

*Note.* — The italic which frequently occurs in the above document is according to the Edition of 1640; but the whole has been collated with the original Edition of 1571.

## APPENDIX NO. 10

## APPL10

To the Queen, in behalf of two Dutch people to be burnt for their opinion.

SERENISSIMA, beatissima Princeps, Regina illustrissima, patriae Decus, seculi Ornamentum. Ut nihil ab animo meo omnique expectatione abfuit longius, quam ut Majestatis tuae amplissimam excellentiam molesta unquam interpellatione obturbarem: ita vehementer dolet, silentium hoc, quo hactenus consranter sum usus, non eadem constantia perpetuo tueri, ita ut volebam, licuisse. Ita nunc printer spem ac opinionera mearo, nescio qua infelicitate evenit, ut quod omnium voleham minime, id contra me maxime faciat hoc tempore. Qui quum ita vixerim huc usque, ut molestus ruerim nemini, invitus nunc cogar contra naturam Principi etiam ipsi esse importunus: non re ulla aut causa mea, sed aliena inductus calamitate. Quae quo acerbior sit et luctuosior, hoc acriores mihi addit ad deprecandum stimulos. Nonnullos intelligo in Anglia hic esse, non Anglos, sed adventitios, Belgas quidem opinor, partim viros, partim frominas, nuper ob improbata dogmata in iudicium advocatos. Quorum aliquot feliciter reducti publicam luerunt paenitentiam. Complures in exilium sunt condem-natl. Quod rectissime factum esse arbitror. <sup>F570</sup> Jam ex hoe numero unum esse aut alterurn audio, de quibus ultimum exustionis supplicium (nisi succurrat tua pietas) brevi sit statuendum. Qua una in re duo contineri perspicio, quorum alterurn ad errorurn gravitatero, aherum ad supplicii acerbitem attinet. Ac erroribus quidera ipsis nihil posse absurdius esse, sanus nemo est qui dubitat, mirorque tam foeda opinionentim portenta in quosquam potuisse Christianos cadere. Sed ira habet humanae infirmitatis conditio, si divina paululum luce destituti nobis relinquimur, quo non ruimus praecipites? Atque equidem hoc nomine Christo gratias quam maximas habeo, quod Anglorum hodie neminem huic insaniee affianem video.

Quod igitur ad phanaticas istas sectas attinet, eas certe in republica hullo modo fovendas esse, sed idonea comprimendas coercione (correctione — Fuller) censeo. Verurn enimvero ignibus ac fluminis, pice ac sulphure aestuantibus, viva miserorum corpora torrefacere, iudicii magis caecitate quam impetu voluntatis errantium, durum istud ac Romani magis exempli esse, quant evangelicae consuetudinis, videtur; ac plane ejusmodi, ut nisi a

Romanis Pontificibus, nutbore Innocentio III., primum profluxisset, nunquam istum Perill taurum quisquam in reiterra Christi ecclesiam importavisset. Non quod maleficiis deleeter nut erroribus fayearn cujusquam, dicta haec esse velim. Vitro hominum, ipse homo quum sire, faveo. Ideoque faveo, non ut errent sed ut resipiscant. Ac neque hominum solum. Utinam et pecudibus ipsis opitulari possero. Ita enim sum (stulte fortassis hoe de meipso, at vere, dicam), macellum ipsum ubi mactantur etiam pecudes vix praetereo, quin tacito quodam doloris sensu mens refugiat. Atque equidem in eo Dei ipsius valde admiror venerorque toto peetore clementiam, qui in jumentis illis brutis et abjectis, quae sacrificiis olim parabantur, id prospexerat, ne prius ignibus mandarentur, quam sanguis eorum ad basim altaris effunderetur: unde disceremus in exigendis suppliciis, quamvis justis, non quid omnino rigori liceat, sed ut clementia simul adhibita rigoris temperer asperitatem.

Quamobrem si tantum milli apud principis tanti Majestatem audere liceret, supplex pro Christo togarein clementissimam hanc Regime sublimitatis excellentinto pro autoritate hac tua, qua ad vitam multorum conservandam pollere te divina voluit clementia, ut vitae, si fieri possit (quid enim non possit iis in rebus autoritas tua?) miserorum parcatur, saltem ut horri obsistatur, atque in aliud quodcunque commutetur supplicii genus. Sunt ejectiones, inclusiones retrusae, stint vincula, sunt perpetua exilia, sunt stigmata et *πλήγματα*, nut etiam patibula. Id unum valde aleprecor, ne pyras ac fluminas Symthfeldianas jam diu faustissimis tuis auspiciis hucusque sopitas sinus nunc recandescere. Quod si ne id quidera obtineri possit, id saltem omnibus supplicandi modis efflagito *τοῦτο τὸ πελαργικὸν* pectotis tui implorans, ut mensem tureen unum nut alterum nobis concodas, quo interim experiamur, an a periculosis erroribus dederit Dominus ut resanescant, ne in corporum jactura, animae pariter cum corporibus de aeterno periclitentur exitio. — Harl. M.S. 416. Art. 95, pp. 151 and 155. See also Fuller, Book 9, pp. 104, 105.

In the Hurl. MS. 416, Art. 95, p. 155, is a Copy of another Letter, similar to the above, in fayour of four or five persons of the same opinions. There are also copies of two others (417, Art. 21, p. 100b. Art. 49 p. 110,) which appear to be rough drafts of the same address.

Foxe concludes one of the above, thus: D. Iesus propitii numinis sul presidio Inclutam Majestatem tuam nobis universaeque reipublicae quam diutissime florentem ac sospitem omnique circumfusam foelicitate, magis ac magis ad nominis sui gloriam provehat, et eustodiat ad vitam aeternam. Amen.

Illustrissimae tuae Majestati Subditissimus, Joa. Foxus.

## APPENDIX NO. 11

### APPL11

CELEBERIMO viro D. Munsono Reginae Justiciario dignissimo, apud omnes bonos laudatissimo, Salutem.

Praestantissime et mihi observande domine. Scripsi nuper serenissimae Reginae Majestati: scripsi et D. Consiliariis litterasque dedi D. Thesaurario, quarum exemplar ad te mitto. Scripsi et ipsis Anabaptistis ante biduum, convellens eorum errores qua potui vehementia; dedique litteras in linguam ipsorum vertendas, quas an adhuc sint illis redditae haud satis novi. Audio nunc totum hoc negotium de constituendo ipsorum., supplicio ad vos esse. devolutum. Quo magis eximiam vestram prudentiam novi, et sinceram religionem, hoc minus de clementia vestra addubito. Quum serenissima Regina morris tam scerbae sententiam ferre ipsa detrectat, spero vos non futuros inclemeniores. Multorum audio hac de re judicia; quanto quisque accedit propius ad mitem Evangellearn indolem, tanto longius abest a duro hoc torrendi ac torquendi genere, quod sine dubio ante Innocentium Etium nunquam inventum est in Christi ecclesia. Etsi nemo sit qui non fateatur eos animadversione summa, dignos, tamen, si vobis, ita videbitur, non desunt, alia suppliciorum genera, vincula, exiha, flagra, nut turtle, ut non necesse sit ad Pontificium hoc Romanae saevitiae confugere. Jam vero qua publica hujus regni lege liceat eos ignibus mandate, quum in doetrina solum delinquant, nisi prius pro Archiepiscopo Ut nihil est, nec unquam fuit, tam foeliciter humano elucubratum ingenio, cui Cantuariensi in provinciali synodo agatur convictio, non reperio. Qua de re licebit vobis jura et statuta hujus regni consulere. Nam statutum illud Hen. Ati de comburendo vim legis nullam possidet. Ut insuper praeter communes leges nostras, illud etiam in divina lege observemus, certe

Dominus Deus ipse in sacrificiis priscis ne pecudes quidem ipsas virus exuri voluit, priusquam sanguis eorum et vita ad basin altaris effunderetur. Quanquam satis per se novit perfecta vestra prudentia, quod facto opus sit: id tantum togare volui, quoniam ad vos delata est hujus iudicii potestas, ita velitis auctoritatem vestram expromere, ne sitis mitissimae vestrae clementiae immemores: durum est flammis aestuantibus viva hominum excruciarum corpora, at durius est in aeternam gehennam cum istis erroribus praecipitari. Et quis noverit, an Dominus gratiam posthac his donaverit, qua resipiscant, si vos vitam dederitis, qua gratiam accipiant? Quod si corporibus miserorum non consulendum esse, nec vita dignos eos iudicatis, at consulite quaeso animis, ne pereant in aeternum. Saepe incidunt morbi in quibus curandis plus efficit pietas quam asperitas, plusque dies afferat, quam manus medici: De his jam loquor morbis, qui spirituali magis medicina egeant, quam corporali: fides siquidem quum errat cogi a nemine possit, doceri possit, muhique moriuntur orthodoxi, qui diu vixerunt Haeretici. Quin et istos in duobus aut tribus articulis nonnihil remittere et cedere audio, atque in ipso etiam primo, capite minus aliquanto praefractos esse; nec admodum diffido, in hoc etiam articulo facile eos reduci posse, si liceret ad Michaelis usque diem plenius institui et informari. Atque utinam bona haec initia significari serenissimae Majestati possent, priusquam ad extremum illud intendetur rigor. Sed de hac re atque allis agetis, viri eonsultissimi, pro libera iudicii vestri raftone; sicque agetis spero, ut in decernendo hoc iudicio omnes auctoritatem persentiant vestram, **ἐπιείκειαν** praedicent; utque non solum bono rum omnium linguae, litterse, historiae clementiam vestram testentur, sed etiam ut hi miseri Anabaptistae aliquando conversi vobis gratias agant. Neque enim omnino spectandum arbitror, quales slat homines, sed quales esse possint. Quod etsi in publicis iudiciis et legum executione locum non habeat, at certe in rebus ecclesiae et conscientiae, atque in iudieils illis quae nulla certa lege publica constituuntur, locum habere arbitror. Atqui veto si hujusmodi hoc esset iudicium vestrum, quod certis et necessariis legum praescriptis constaret, verbum non dieerem. Nunc autem quum clementissimae Reginae Majestas hoc totum libero vestro arbitratui permiserit, utrum istos exustos esse an alia qua cunque raftone plectendos malitis, supplex aleprecor honorandam vestram celsitudinem, pro libera hac potestate vestra ita hic misericordiam cum iudicio tem perare dignemini, ut quam p.ii viri .sitis' non solum quanta auctoriitate. praediti, pii omnes viri intelligant,

Christus ipse videat, parique vos iterum misericordia in suo iudicio remuneret. — Harl. MS. 417, Art. 51, p. 111.

## APPENDIX, NO 12

### APPL12

#### AD ANABAPTISTAS QUOSDAM CONDEMNATOS.

EGIMUS causam vestram apud Serenissimam Reginam: egimus apud Dominos Consiliarios. Nihil perfecimus. Videtur Dominus contra vos obfirmasse voluntates, offensus improba et detestanda pertinacia vestra, dum contra voluntatera Dei, contra apertissimum ipsius verbum, contra Christianorum omnium piam et sacram institutionem, et veram fidem pugnare videmini, et stolidas movetis factiones, scandala gignitis, pestiferos errores inducitis, ecclesiam Christi non mediocriter laeditis, hostibus et papistis materiem in nos insultandi et calumniandi in manus praebetis, etenim quicquid id est, quod vestra dellrat inscitia, nobis imputant, evangellure accusant, vestraque culpa fit, quod sana doctrina nostra tam male audiat apud adversarios; putant enim ex evangelio nasci sectas istas, haereses, et dissidia. Nec solum ecclesiam Dei probro et contumelia afficitis, sed Deum etiam errore doctrinae graviter offenditis, dum verbo ejus non acquiescitis, nec veritati ceditis, nec spiritum ejus sacrum in scripturis expressum adhibetis in consilium, sed phanaticas quasdam mentis vestrae conceptiones, vel deceptiones potius, pro scripturis colitis: et dura de Humanitate Christi contenditis tam obstinate, interim salutem vestram et remissionem peccatorum, in Humanitate Christi et fide sola nobis propositam, vel non tenetis satis vel non curatis admodum. Nam si ilia vobis satis esset peccatorum remissio, quae vobis est in Humanitate et sanguine filii Dei, nunquam istas de rattone Humanitatis turbas moveretis, seal cum ecclesia Dei gratias simul nobiscum laeti et quieti ageretis Patri pro incarnato Filio, et pia quadam humilitate cum fratribus conjungeretis iudicia vestra. Nunc, cum suavi quadam philautia vobis ipsis applaudentes plus iudiciis vestris quam caeteris hominibus omnibus tribuatis, id efficitis, ut non solum Deo odiosi sitis, sed omnibus fere hominibus execrabiles, Quaquam de hominum execratione baud multum laborandum esset, si cum Deo saltera pax vobis constaret et

amicitia. Qua in re ne inanis mentis vestrae vos decipiat opinio, videndum est. Praeterea vetus est exemplum ut falsa veritatis imagine seducti multi in maximis versentur erroribus et Monasterienses Anabaptistae veriosem penes se eausam esse aliquando somniabant; Et Papistae hodie praeter suam nullam credunt catholicam esse ecclesiam; Idem de Iudaeorum et Turcarum immanissima persuastone iudicare possit. Scitum est nos intra verbi divini lineas nos continere: Paulus nihil ferre minus potuit quam contentiosas de Genealogiis quaestiones: Idem et de Christo secundum carnem dicit, “St Christum aliquando etiam novimus secundum carnem, nunc amplius non novimus. Nam si quis est in Christo Iesu, nova est creatura.” An non satis erat vobis simpliciter nobiscum fateri, Christum venisse in carnem, nisi etiam de ratione carnis tam ineptas moveretis difficultates? quas nec ipsi expedire potestis, nec quicquid ad rem faciant, dum videmini Domino non materialiter carnem tribuere sed supernaturalem nescio quam; quasi quae ingenua sit in Maria Virgine, non generata de Maria Virgine. Et quo pacto igitur liber Generationis Iesu Christi Domini, et non potius liber Nativitatis, iuxta vestram translationem. Qua in re vanisstream vestram ineptam nequeo mirari satis; nam si generata non fuit caro Christi de natura Matris, certe naturalis non erat illius caro, nec connaturalis cum carne nostra; et falsum erit illud S. Pauli qui factum eum dicit, non in muliere sed de muliere. (Gal. iv.) Sed video unde omnis haec fluit effortus vestri inscitia; ex eo scilicet quod modum rei cum substantia rei imperitissime confunditis; et quae ad modum solum pertinent, ea vos transferitis ad substantiam; et quia modo supernaturali concepta est caro ipsius, idcirco carnero ipsius esse supernaturalem impie contenditis: At ne nesciatis, aliud est de modo, aliud de substantia quae creata. De modo enim ira et nos vobiscum fatemur, Humanitatem Christi modo non naturali conceptam esse; sed naturalem tamen dicimus humanam carnem eam quae concepta est nata de Maria Virgine; et si non eadem ratione Homo factus sit tile, qua nos facti sumus, ex patre et ex matre, at nihilo minus tile, qui homo factus sit ex matre, ex eadem conditus est substantia eandemque gerit naturam carnis, quam nos gerimus; ut sit tile nobis connaturalis. Alioquin si nobiscum non sit connaturalis secundum carnem, certe nec redemptor est, nec semen mulieris, nec Filius Davidis, nec Sponsus ecclesiae. Nam si sponsus et sponsa una caro sunt, certe aut Christum oportet sum ecclesiae non esse spiritum, aut ut eadem sit caro cum sponsa necesse sit, non solum secundum gratiam, sed etiam secundum naturam. Neque enim in haec

concepttione Filii Dei ita solum spectanda est gratia, ut natnram omnem extinguiamus; etsi enim modus conceptionis gratiae erat non naturae, at illa tamen substantia quae concepta estet nata, Naturae erat non Gratiae, quoad substantia, id est, solum ex humana natura et substantia erat, nullo modo ex substantia Dei: ut jam inter Christi humanitatem et nostram nulla sit distantia, niai quod cato illius immunis a peccato erat, nostra peccatis scateat. Atque haec nostra fides est de incarnatione Christi, cum verbo Dei analogae et congruae plena summa consolatione quam ex Christi suavissima conjunctione cum carne nostra concipimus. Hanc conjunctionera et fraternitatem nobis cum Christo junctissimam dum yes impuro vestro dogmate dissolvitis, quid aliud quam verbo Dei vos opponitis, fidem extinguitis, salutem perturbatis, omnemque consolationem pits mentibus eripitis? Hortor itaque et rogo in Domino, etiam atque etiam, videte quid agitis; satis sit quod hactenus tamdiu turbastis ecclesias vestro scandalo et offendiculo gravissimo. In caeteris opinionibus audio vos nonnihil remollescere. Dominus Jesus Spiritus sui sanctissimo ductu aperiat vobis oculos roentis, et corda permoveat ad veritatis suae cognitionera. Amen.

— Hark MS. 417, Art. 52, folio 111 b.

## APPENDIX NO. 13

### APPL13

Dynastoe cum primis splendidissimo, ac spectatissimo, D. Thesaurario, coeterisque ejusdem senatus Reginoe consiliariis viris lectissimis, dominis colendissimis, prudentia ac gravitate suspiciendis in Christo Domino, *εὐφρονεῖν καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι*.

MAGNIFICI viri, concilii duces, justitiae principes. Etsi negotium de quo scriptures sum nihil ad me attinet, tamen quia curare ac providentiam senatorice vestree dignitatis attingit nonnihil, confido vos benigne consulturos non ternere susceptam hanc ad vos scribendi audaciam. De inauspicatis illis Anabaptistis, et execrandis eorum deliriis, quod nuper constitutum sit, minime vobis incompertum esse arbitror. Qua in re Reverendus D. Londinensis, egregii pastoris functus officio, preestitit pro virili quod potuit et quod debuit, nihil ad summare praetermittens diligentiam, quo sana institutione eos ad sanitatem reflecteret, reduxitque

pie sedulitate sue nonnullos. Alios e medio profligavit. In quosdam irrogata sententia est, qua seulari iudicio relictis mortis, ut arbitror, supplicium ferant. Ac dignos quidem supplicio nefarios eorum errores nemo ambigit. De supplicii vero genere non ita apud omnes convenit. Clement nonnulli, Papistarum maxime filii, ad Ignem, ad Ignem. Qui moderatori sunt ingenio, haud ita sentiunt, nec putant id necessarium, quod ad summum illud atque extremum Romanae saevitiae exemplum sub evangelio nunc recurratur; maluntque aliud adhiberi coercionis remedium, quod vulneribus potius medeatur quam homines ipsos ad gehennam perdat, quodque cum legis asperitate aliquid simul aspergat mansuetudinis evangelicae. Hic verbum quid vestra factura sit potestas, qui seculares sitis, ignoramus, nisi quod ex legis Weescripto vos acturos esse credibile videtur. Quod si facere pertenditis, id prius a vobis vehementer effragito vestramque in eo maxime appello prudentiam, etiam atque etiam, velitis prospicere, quo tandem publico jure, aut legis auctoritate, eos qui solum in doctrina impingunt ignibus ac flaminis addicere liceat. Quod si ad senatus-consultum illius Parliamenti confugit sub Hen. 4to, edim (hanc legera nullam allare incendiariam habetis), liceat quaeso quod verum est aequa pace vestra profiteri, statutum illud Hen. 4ti vim nullam legis satis idoneam habere, quum viz. in statuto illo condendo defuerit communis ordinum omnium consensus; sine qua irrita est quaecunque legis Parliamentariae promulgatio. Ad haec, etsi maxime valeret legis istius constitutio, tamen idem statutum in primordiis serenissimae Reginae nostrae sublatum aequa antiquatum intelligo: quod etiamsi non fuisset factum, tamen hullo firmamento ne lex quidera ipsa niteretur, quemadmodum in libris Monumentorum (ubi in vita D. Cobhami Alano Copo respondimus) abunde a nobis demonstratum est ex authenticis publicarum tabularum rotulis. Nam quod vulgo impressi vestri statutorum codices cum superiorum ordinum suffragiis inferioris etiam curice admiscunt assensionem (ut id obiter Reipublicae nomine admoneam) foveus est et dolus, subdole et sophistica papistarum malicia injectus, quum vera exemplaria in Archiris vestris conscripta et consignata aliud indicant. Quapropter saecularis potestas illa quae in Mariana tempestate funibus aequa flammis tam immaniter in Christianorum corpora desaevit, qua legis auctoritate vim illi suam tuebantur non video, nisi huc confugiant tribuissent, quod ignorantes fuerint. Atque esto hoc quidera, quod ignoratio justam pariat erroris anteacti defensionem, non tamen eadem petit nobis generalem errandi regulam. Quae quum ita se habeant, eximii

proceres, quum nee ulla proferri possit lex hujus regni publica, quae ad incendiariam bane necessitatem justa autoritate vos adigat, supplex obtestor, ne plus velitis hac in re licere potestati vestree, quam legibus ipsis liceat; quod potius prudentia vestra id cum habeat, ne antiquus error novo exemplo vires nunc eas sumat, quae postea in graviores reipublicae perniciem emigrant. Nam si Caminus, vel Camerina potius ista Smithfeldiana, diu faustissimis Reginae nostrae auspiciis haec ensonata, nunc iterum in nova incendia coeperit reantere decreto autoritatis vestrae, quum nulla necessaria regni lege id defendi possit, quid futurum existimetis, nisi ut hoc facto vestro tanquam auctoramento confirmati Papistae, non solum tyrannidem suam tanto defendant audacius, sed etiam majorera postea sibi arripiant in bonos grassandi confidentes. Jam, si quid contingat, quod Clementissimus avertat Dominus. Postremo de inauspicatis istis avibus (quae utinam in hoc regno nunquam advolassent) nihil estis facturi melius, quam ut e finibus nostris eo rursus abigantur, unde evolarunt: ut quod meriti sunt, id apud suos potius aliquos magistratus ferant, ibique de his exemplum edatur maxime, ubi maximum metuitur infectionis periculum. Num quod ad Angliam nostram artinet, etsi ea aliis laborat vitis, tamen ab hac contagione (sit Christo gratia) nihil adhuc periculi video, quamobrem nostris hominibus sit metuendum. Sed satis per se sapit, multoque oculatius prospicit hac in re (sicut in caeteris rebus omnibus) oculatissima prudentia vestra, quod facto sit opus. Et tamen quum ex grati animi officio [haec literae] profectae sint, rogatam velim celsitudinem vestram ne alio animo tandem a vobis accipiantur, praesertim quum non monendi, sed tantum supplicandi gratia hanc susceperim scribendi audeam. Amplissimi senatus vestri ordinem universum summa in dignitate incolumem ac florentem diutissime tueatur Ille per quem Reges regnant et principes justa decernunt.

Vestrae celsitudini in Christo deditissimus, Joa. Foxus. — Ad D. Thesaurarium et coeteros Consiliarios. — Harl. MS. No. 417, Art. 50, p. 110.

## APPENDIX. NO. 14

## APPL14

HONORIFICE Domine ac heros inclyre. Quo magis intelligo illustrem tuam praestandam assiduis negotiorum curis occursantibus defatigari, hoe magis me pudet pigetque strepitum hunc publicae tum sollicitudini obstreperis meis litteris interpellare. Sed ita me premit durum necessitatis telurn, ut velim nolim praesidium favoris tui necessario sit implorandum. Atque ne dignitatem tuam detineam multis, rem ipsam paucis accipe, simulque miseriam meam inteilige. Erat hic filius mihi adolescens, quem litteris politioribus pro mea tenuitate instituendum curavi sedulo, in quibus et ipse pro sua indole progres-sus non omnino poenitendos jam feeerat: Nunc quid accidit? plectus ille suoapte ae consiliis sui corniris, elam a nobis aufugit, relicto collegio in quo versabatur, inconsulto suo praeside ac praeceptore, relictis libris et litteris, inseiis parentibus, doleutibus amicis ac cognatis omnibus, patriaque nune deserts, ultro se conjecit in exilium, nescio in quibus tetrus fugitans, neque ubi sit, an vivat, an ubi eum investigem, seio; nisi quod ex litteris ad quendam hie merca-torem nuper scriptis e Caleto dicebat se velle Lutetiara petere. Qui si istic fuerit, rumrum (ut credo) ut penuria coactus ad praestantissimam tuam celsitudinem vel scribat, vel accedat ipse. Qua in re vehementer rogo elementiam tuam, pietatem appello, fidem operatoque imploro, .per omnia sacra, perque omnes sacrarum virtutum pietates deprecor, te mei misereat, ut siquidem fugitivus ille meus acoluthus te adierit, consilium operatoque tuam mihi in eo asservando ac retinendo accommodes tantisper, quoad, per litteras certiores facti, quid de illo factum sit quidque nobis faciendum sit intelligamus. Nomen est adolescentis (si vivat) Samuel Foxus, natus annis ferme septendeeim, corporis statura pro illis annis sat grandiuscula. His notis si quis forte tibi oceurrerit, iterum atque irerum aleprecor honorificam tuam praestantiam, in eo ut ostendas beneficio, quantum vel ipse mea causa praestare, vel quantum me debere tuae benignitati veils. Eximiam tuam dignitatem magis atque magis florentem cum omni familia diu nobis et reipublicae tueatur Servator Dominus clementissimus.

Dominum Nicasium, quem solum ex omni tua familia novi, cupio salvare plurimum in Christo Domino, quem etiam precor obnix, ut hic se mihi

adjutorem praebeat, praestetque mea causa quod poterit. Lond. An. 1577, December 5.

Tuus ac tuorum omnium in Christo, Jo. Foxus. — Harl. MS. No. 417, Art. 69, p, 116, b.

## APPENDIX, NO. 15

### APPL15

QUANDO, quomodo, quibus verbis, qua dicendi figura pares agam gratias singulari vixque credibili humanitati tuae (vir reverende idemque doctissime Praesul), qua me miserere, tot tantisque aerumnis obsitum imo obrutum, literis tam amanter scriptis et erigere jacentem, et erectum refocillare, volueris! In quo pulchre tu quidem hoc exemplo representas, quid sit vere Episcopum agere in Domo Domini. Quid enim Antistitem vere Christianum, verius vel arguit, vel commendat insignius, quam charitas toties in Christianis literis exhibita? Aut ubinam hsec ipsa charitas vim snare poterit illustrius explicare, quam in sacro hoc consolandi officio, ἐν τῷ παραμυθεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀθυμοῦντας, καὶ γὰρ εἰς τοσαύτην ἀθυμίαν ἐνέπεσον τότε, ἐν τῷ ἐπιστέλλειν σε, ὥστε οὐδεπότε τί τῶν οὐδεν ἔμοι συμβῆναι εὐκαιρότερον καὶ ἀκμαιότερον τῶν τῆς θεοσεβείας σου ἐκείνων γραμμάτων. Usque adeo tot simul adversae res omnem mihi et constan — tism et patientism pene expectorabant. Cui enim, quamlibet adamantinum, pectus non consterneret inaudita haec hominum ingrattissimorum inhumanitas, in ea praesertim Academia eoque Collegio, unde nihil unquam minas expectabam quam tale aliquid ab ils mihi eventurum? Quos si non meae senectutis et paupertatis ratio commovere, at ipsorum tamen vel humanitas, vel literature quas profitentur consuetudo, polire ad humaniorem modestiara debuisset. Quod autem de meis vel erga alios meritis honorands tua pietas humanissime praedicat, in eo τὸ τῆς εὐμενείας σου μέγεθος satis contemplor: In me nihil agnosco eorum quae tribuis. Illud confiteor, semper cavisse me sedulo, ut si minus prodesse multis licuerit, ne sciens tamen obessem euiquam, tum minime vero omnium Magdalenensibus: quo magis id mihi admiratione habetnr, quis tam turbulentus Genius factloss ista Puritanorum capita affiaverit, ut sic violatis gratiarum legibus, spretis meis ad se literis et precibus, contemptis ipsius Praesidis intercessione, nulls praemissa admonitione, nee

causa reddita, tantam hanc in me filiumque tyrannidem exercuerint. Atqui vero ut hoc illis concedam, non tam purum esse et immunem ab omni naevo filium roeurn, atque sunt isti ter purl Puritani, at in his tamen naevis illius nullum adhuc cornperi τὸ κάρφος tam magnum, quam majores forte τὰς δοκοὺς in moribus ipsorum conspiciere liceat. Et ubi interim fraterna illa inter fratres admonitio, quam tantopere exigit Evangellea eaurio? ubi disciplina illa Apostolica ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον? Certe plusquam atrox facinus intercedat oportet, quod tam atroci ejectionis vindicatione luendum sit. Sed latet in hac herba alius fortasse anguis, quam quid isti proferre non dudertl, ego in lucem producam. Flagrat Colicglum hoc horribili factone, cujus altera pars propensioribus studils incumbit in suum Praesidentem: Altera istorum est quos dico τῶν καθαροτέρων, qui modis omnibus dant operam ut partes sui Praesidis labefactent, ipsumque vel in suam redigant potestatem, vel sede prorsus evenant. Quid veto filius meus cum altero ejus Collegis Praefecto suo, ita ut par erst, inclinatio videbatur, propterea societate exhaeretur. Acedit huic et alia causa, quam tam filio quam mihi ipsi imputo.

Quod si enim is essem, qui perbacchari cum eis contra Episcopos et Archiepiscopos, aut scribam me praebere illorum ordini, hoc est, insshire cum illis voluissem, nunquam istos in me aculeos exacuissent. Nunc quid torus ab illis alienus partes illas seetad mainerim, quae modesrise sunt et publicae tranquillitatis, hinc odium, in me concepturn jam diu, in hanc demum efferbuit acerbitatem. Quod cum ita sit, non jam quid mea causa velitis facere id postulo, quid potius quid vestra ipsorum causa cogitandum sit. Vos qui Proceres estis ecclesie, etiam atque etiam deliberate. Quod ad me antea attinet, quamvis erepta filio societas haud leni affieit animum aegritudine, tamen quid res privata agitur, hoc fero moderatius. Magis me commovet publica Ecclesiae ratio. Video enim suboriri quoddam hominum genus, qui si invalescant viresque in hoc Regno colligant, piget hic referre, quid futurae perturbationis praesagit mihi animus. Olim sub Monachorum fucata hypocrisi quanta sit nata lues Religioni Christiana, minime ignorat prudentis tua. Nunc in istis nescio quod novum Monachorum genus reviviscere videtur, tanto illis perniciosius, quanto callidior fallendi artificio sub praetextu perfectionis personall isti Histriones gravius occultant venenm, qui dum omnis exigunt ad strictissimae suae disciplinae et conscientiae gnomones, baud videntur prius desituri, donec omnis in

Judaicam redigant servitutem. Sed de its alias fortassis pleniore manu, ἕαν  
ἐπιτρέπη ὁ Κύριος

Interim celeberrimae tuae dignitati, Vir honorsade, cum publico ecclesiae nomine et animum tatum et sedem quam tenes merito gratulor, tum mea privatim causa ob singulare tuum in me studium gratias habeo permaximas; precorque Dominum, omnium gratiarum fontera cumulatissimum, ut ecclesiam suam periculosissimis its temporibus propugnet ae tueatur, et Pastores se dignos foveat provehatque; tum intra istos, Te imprimis, sacris ipsius bonis domsq̄e indies magis magisque locupletet, ὅς κ' ἄν ἀναποδόιη τὰς ἰσομέρους ἀμοίβας τῆς παρακλήσεως, ἧς μὲν μοι παρέιχε τὰ παρακλητικὰ τῶν γραμμάτων σου, amplissime, juxta ac ornatissime, Praesul.

Tuus in Christo κατὰ δυνάμιν

Joannes Foxus.

— Fuller, Bk. ix. pp. 106, 107.

That Foxe was right in stating that the College was torn by internal dissensions is evident from a letter he received from Gelybrand, dated August 26, 1578, giving him an account of what was doing. He says that a bachelor had been expelled by a majority: he appealed to the Bishop of Winchester, who said the punishment was too severe, and called them rebels against their president, hypocrites and factious. After this the Bishop summoned six of the fellows before him, Barbon, the vice-president; Smith, the proctor; Fisher, Day, and two bachelors. Day could not attend from illness; the rest endeavoured to excuse themselves: the vice-president, Fisher, and the two bachelors, were expelled, and the remainder deprived of their suffrages for a year. — Harl. MS. 416, Art. 124, p. 194.

## APPENDIX, NO. 16

### APPL16

The title-page of Foxe's treatise is as follows: —

De Christo gratis justificante

Contra Osorianam justitiam, caeterosque ejusdem inhaerentis justitiae patronos, Stan. Hosiu, Andrad. Canisiu, Vegam, Tiletanfi, Lorchium, contra universa denique Turbam Tridentinam et Jesuiticam,

Amica et modesta defensio Johan. Foxii.

Londini, Excudebat Thomas Purfutius impensis Geor. Byshop, 1583.

Foxe thus states the reasons which induced him to undertake the work.

Ad afflictas et perturbatas fidellure in Christo conscientias, epistola auctoris praefatoria.

De Christo gratis justificante hanc editurus Apologiam, quo magis causam a derto quam institui, hoc magis mihi gliscit animus ut pergam. Rursus verb ubi tempora nunc ipsa in mentem revoco, moresque hominum quo defluerint perpendo, dubia oboritur diverse animum distrahens haesitatio, non sine aliquo adjuncto metu. Quod autem subdubito, illud est, ne maior nostrorum pars, ut ingenia aunt hominum ad levissimas semper occasiones intents, ex mitt et pla-cida hac evangelicae justificationis doctrina ad majorem peccandi impunitatem aliquid contrahant lieentice. Unde nonnihil propterea subvereor, quid possit aut velit hic mihi obstrepere tacita quorundam eogitatio, qui etsi vers haec ease, quae de Christo a nobis dicuntur, minime denegabunt, at parum tamen eadem haec temporibus opportuna, moribusque nunc hominum tam ecrruptis et fer-mentatis haud multum conducere, quin potius iisdem officere, ae fenestram aperite ad audaciorem peccandi securitatem, judicabunt. His itaque ut respondeam, simulque ut facti met rationera exponam, paucula quaedam prius hic praefari visum eat: Primum, haud. q. uaq. uam id me ignorare, quae passim hodie vulgo grassantur prodigiosae impuritatis portenta; tum, neque minus etiam toto pectore deplorare, quae videam. Atque utinam tam in me situm esset aliquid, quod posset his mederi malls, quam serio mihi dolet tanta haec indes magis ac magis invalescens omnium vitiorum eluvies.

Towards the end of the Preface he alludes to a work written by Stapleton upon the same subject, which had not come to his knowledge until the present treatise had been nearly completed, and he intimates his intention of refuting it when leisure was afforded him. Foxe's work is written for the express purpose of refuting the doctrines which Osorius <sup>f571</sup> had advanced, respecting the manner in which Justification is obtained by mankind. The

motives which induced him to enter into this discussion, and the mode in which he proposed to manage it, may be gathered from the commencement of the Treatise.

De Christo gratis justificante.

Contra Osorianam justitiam arnica et modesta Defensio Jo. Foxi.

Lectitanti mihi Libros de justitia tuos, Hieronime. Osori, etsi minus vacavit accuratiore pervestigatione singula consecretari, quae abste declamata sunt; ex its tamen quae sparsim hinc inde delibavi satis perspexisse videor, quorsum tendas, quo spectes, quid agas. Agis enim, quantum perspicio, non ut levem aliquam partem Christianae institutionis impetas, sed ut jngulum ipsum petas, ut anitaare ipsam spiritumque Evangelii extinguas, ut universum statum nostree felicitatis, ut arcera & acropolin totius libertatis Christianae obsideas, cuncta denique pactis vitaeque praesidia, uno velut impetu, ab, ipsis fundamentis conveDas. Nam quid aliud preestas tortis illis libris decem, quibus clarissimum illud gratuita justificationis nostrae lumen, Christi maximo beneficio partum, sempiterno Dei feedere sancitum, e manibus, e studits, ex animis et conscientiiis hominum. ex orbe terrarum, tanquam e mundo solero, abripias. Quo demure subleto, quid reliqui nobis facias, praeter Cimmericas et Osorianas, in quibus ceu Talpae caeci palpitemus, tenebras, nihil video. quae tuae molitiones, licet per se evanidee et jejunaee baudi multum habeant, cur metuantur, adversus invictam divinae vertatis vim, tamen quia in id incumbunt tam acriter, ut quod in omni religione prestantissimum sit nobis intercludant, necessaria proinde ratio mihi visa eat, cur te his literis compellandum existimarem, nullo inimico in te studio aut odio percitus, quote ex agitem, sed ut et amice te commonearn et libere, tantoque etiam liberius, quanto graviore te periculo implicitum video, nisi reducto pede rectiore itinere ὀρθοποδοῦσθαι ad evangelium Christi enitaris. Quid enim censes, o praeclarissime? itane futurum, ut factis ullis quamlibet praeclare gestis gradibusque virtutum tuarum aditum tibi struas ad regnum Dei? aut quenquam vivere in lubrica hac naturee conditione arbitrare, qui excisis omnium cupiditatum fibris, amputatisque illecebris, ira sese in regionibus officii contineat, ut sedes illas sempiternae dignitatis pari justitiae dignitate exaequare possit, aut polliceri eas sibi audeat, nisi hoc honore nos ultro donasset divina benignitas? Ne

putes, Osori. Non sic itur ad Astra. Aut mutanda tibi sententia haec est, aut apes haec deponenda.

Quanquam neque sententia haec tua solum, sed communis tibi cum permultis ease videmr, recenttorts nimirum scholae theologis, praesertim his, quibus potior esse solet pontificiae censurae quam Apostolicae scripturee autoritas. Qui omnes, codera erroris correpti contagio, idem quod ipse affirmas profitentur sedulo: at non eodem tamen omnes tractandi modo ac methodo ingrediuntur. Illi suas scholas et articulos ita instituunt, ut omnes intelligant, professos esse hostes divinae gratiae ac gratuitae nostrae in Christo justificationis, quam illi manifesto anathematismo e scholis exsibilant. Tua disceptatio paulo aliter procedit: etsi idem ipsum quod illi mordicus tibi retinendum suscepisti, at tectiore tameh artificio eadem venena ita occultas, ut et facilius influant minusque pateant reprehensoni. Scribis enim de justitia libros, ut video, nec paucos quidem illos nec illaboratos. Argumentum quum specto, honesrum video et plausibile. Quum dicendi genus non incompositum, quum orationis picturatae phaleras, quum laudatorias amplificationes, quibus ad tragicos usque cothurnos justitiae decus, elegantiam, pulchritudinem exornas, intueor, nec illud in te illaudandum ceuseo. Quis enim non merito eum laudet, quem justitiae laudibus sic incalescere videat? Ceeterum quo animo, quo fine, quo praetextu, quibus argumentis partes istas justitiae tantopere laudetas sustineas, si quis proplus reductis oculis recta secum rattone perpendat, ac cum Christi Evangelio conferat, multa in te cogetur desiderare. Breviter de tota hujus operis confectione quid censeam, quanquam de mea censura baud multum spud te retulerit, tamen si permittea libere spud te **παρρησιάζεσθαι ὡς δεῖ**, facism pro officio in eo, sicque faciario, ut ipse sentiaa nihil mihi ini consilio minus fuisse, haec ad te scribenti, quam improbam scripta aliena carpendi voluntatem. Ita vero sentlo, versari te in suscepto hoc argumenti genere, in quo philosophum satis te quidera Platicurn ac rhetorem non male Ciceronianurn video, at theologum vero parum, mihi erede, evangelicum, neque ad eausam ipsam justitiae, Christianae perorandam satis exercitatum. Primurn igitur, quod ad libri titulum attinet, quem “dejustitia” inscribis, nihil adhuc reperio, quod criminemur. Quanquam naturae nostrae imbecillitas suaderet, ut de misericordia potius occineres nobis aliquid: tamen quum de justitia philosophari malueris, nec in eo quidem indignus videris tun myrto.

Suscepisti enim de justitia scripturus honorificam cum primis materiam, nescio an humeris tuis grandiolem, provinciam certe perdifficilem, summeque praestantem. Quid enim in omni rerum divinarum et humanarum natum excellentius justitia? Quae — cum suo complexu virtutum omnium omnia genera, laudem pietatis universam, summam denique non legis modo perfectionem, sed Dei etiam perfectam imaginero, contineat — in coelo inveniri certe poterit, in tetrīs vero, quum omnia dixeris, nunquam poterit. Quo magis mirari et cogitare mecum soleo, quidnam arcani tibi consilii in mentem insederit, ut de justitia libros tam accurate exquisitos contexeres. Si ut tuae praedicationis buccina et encomiis panegyricis commendatiorem earn nobis efficeres, nactus es in eo materiam et tuo ingenio accommodam, et theatrum explicandis facundiae tuae opibus satis amplum, ut vere tibi confitear. Sed quo consilio nunc fine id faceres, demiror. “Ut pulchritudinem, inquires, justitiae certius spectent mortales, et admirentur impensius”? At hoc jam ante a Platone, ab Academicis, et Peripateticis permultis tentatum est, nec infeliciter. Et quis adeo ad omnem naturae sensum obsurduit, qui etsi ipsa justitiae careat excellentia, divinum tamen ejus splendorem non animo concipiat, non summa roentis admiratione, votisque etiam omnibus prosequatur? si quid vota hae in re proficiant.

In treating this wide subject he discusses the doctrine of Grace, Merits, the Gratuitous Imputation of the Merits of Christ, and the Remission of Sins. Since this remission is to be attained by faith alone, without works (p. 226), the doctrine of faith is next discussed at some length, and he concludes by refuting the arguments of those who substitute inherent justice for the justification which is attained by faith. There seems no fitter mode of giving an outline of the nature of the work than by copying the headings prefixed to the several chapters of which it consists.

Justitia Inhaerens, ad cam perfectionera, quam describit Osorius, in natura hac nusquam inveniri petest.

Duplex et Diversa doctrinae ratio: altera legis, altera Evangelij.

In Doctrina Justificationis quam facilis sit error.

Fides Justificat non aliter, nisi ratione bonorum operum juxta Osorium.

Discrimina inter justitiam legis et Evangelij. De Justitia .Evangelion.

Fidei vis et efficacia, quae sit, quos et quo modo justificat.

Fides qua ratione et quo modo justificat lapsos peccatores.

Responsio ad orationes Osorij, pro Luthero. Fides unde vim suam accipit.

In Justificatione non tam factotum, quam personarum conditio estimatur.

Absurda quae ex Osoriana justitia nascuntur.

Argumentis Osorij, quibus justitiam operibus astruit, respondetur.

De Poenitentiae laude, alignitate, et fructu, proprioque ejus officio.

De peccato, ejusque sanatione per Christum.

De studio et cura bonorum operum necessario adhibenda.

Oppositae Adversariorum assertiones, contra gratuitam justitiae imputationem, productae et excussae.

De Justitia, ejusque definitione apud Osorium et alios.

De Justitia inhaerente, et imputata.

Opera humiliter vitio quam procul absunt a justitiae perfectione.

Contra Jesuitas et topica eorum argumenta, quibus inhaerentem justitiam ex Aristotele confirmant.

Christi Justitiam nostram esse justitiam, exemplo Adami confirmatur.

Objectioni Osoriana respondetur, ubi de imitatione Christi copiosius.

De Divinis promissis, quae, quibus, et quo modo promisit Deus.

De perfectione Justitiae, et integra obedientia legis.

Peccata quo modo delet Christus, cum responsione ab objecta Osorij.

Christus inchoat sua beneficia in praesenti vita, in futura perficit.

Assertio Osorij, qua probat nullam coire posse cum Deo conciliationem, nisi recisis prorsus omnibus peccati reliquiis.

De Peccatis sanctorum, assertio Lutheri contra Osorium defenditur.

De gratia Dei, quo modo ea definitur apud Osorium, cum confutatione definitionis.

Pontificii et Evangelici quatenus conveniunt et discrepant in vocabulo gratiae intelligendo.

De vi et efficacia Divinae gratiae uberius contra adversarios disceptatio, eorum objectis respondens.

Quae beneficia nobis ex Christoveniunt, quidque in his beneficiis maxime spectandum sit.

Tridentinorum in definienda Gratia error excutitur.

De Mercede et Meritis bonorum operum.

Dei vocatio et gratia libera et gratuita, praeter omnia ruerira nostrorum operum.

Absurdum Tridentinorum paradoxon, quo negant nos ex solo Dei favore justificari.

Contra Tridentinos, Gratiam Dei qua justificamur tantum Dei favore gratuito et remissione constare, non operum meritis aut infusione charitatis, ex scripturis ostenditur.

## LIBER SECUNDUS

De fide et promissione.

Quae fidei propria natura sit et definitio, qua coram Deo justificamur, ex certis et veris scripturee fundamentis exquiritur.

Fides non quaevis justificat.

De triplici causa Justificationis, 1. Conditionali 2. Formali 3. Meritoria. De causa formali Justificationis, p. 240. De causa justificationis meritoria, p. 242. Qua proprie conditione nititur justificationis promissio, p. 244.

De fide et fiducia, et quod proprium sit fidei objectum.

Questio utrum fiducia misericordiae sola per se justificet.

De certitudine Christianae fiduciae, contra Hosium.

Causa Justificationis a sola fiducia seu applicatione misericordiae non pendet.

Fidei vera et genuina definitio quae sit.

De voce Justificationis quid significet in scripturis: utrum ea constat sola peccatorum remissione, an secus. Quibus denique modis ac mediis justificata comparatur.

Contra definitionem justificationis a Thoma positam arguitur.

Contra Tridentinos, qui negant sola nos Dei misericordia aut remissione justificari.

Adversariorum frivola objectio fusius excutitur et refutatur.

Qui per Christum peccatores justificantur.

Responsio ad eos qui preedicationem fidei perniciosam esse dicunt corrupendis moribus.

Dilectio et Poenitentia quid agant in justifieatione.

De poenitentia eorum qui fide justificantur,

### **LIBER TERTIUS**

Argumentorum refutatio, quibus inhaerentem suam justitiam contra justitiam fidei propugnant adversarii.

Quaestio, An sanctis iudicium Dei sit terribile?

De veste nuptiali explicata parabola.

Responsiones adversariorum contra octo argumenta D. Fauli, cum earum responsionum refutatione.

Responsio ad adversarios, qua futiles ipsorum argutiae et cavillationes sophis-fiche redarguuntur.

Fides quid, ubi, quo modo operatur per dilectionem.

### **LIBER QUARTUS**

In quo Subsequitur gravis et erudita concio eximii Doct. D. Guliel. Fulsii, de duobus Abrahae filiis, ex D. Paulo, Galat. 4. De lingua populari in Latium sermonem reddita per Joan. Foxium.

This sermon constitutes the whole of the fourth book, and is independently paged 1-47, with the head-line "Concio, de Christo gratis justificante."

## APPENDIX, NO. 17

## APPL17

AD INCLYTOS AC PRAEPOTESTES ANGLIAE PROCERES, ORDINES, ET STATUS, TOTAMQUE EJUS GENTIS NOBILITATEM, PRO AFFLICTIS FRATRIBUS SUPPLICATIO. AUTORE IOANNE FOXO ANGLO.

## BASLE, 1557.

NIHIL equidem addubito, Principes, Proceres, Patres nobilissimi, quin eximia autoritas vestra, divinae eujusdam potentiae vicariam nobis imaginem reprae selltans in terris, semper et egit sedulo et actura est, ut cum privata dignitate vestra publica simul vestforum tranquillitas conjuncta salusque contineatur. Quid enim aliud vel a splendidissimo hoc loco expectare, vel de singulari vigilantia vestra suspicari convenit, quam in vobis, qui ductares sitis reipublicae, paratissima fore omnia, sicubi vel auxilii fidem, vel juvandi voluntatem res communis desiderabit? Quapropter ut summa ac singularis haec, quam dico, industria vestra, cum absoluta prudentia parique fide conjuncta, neququam consiliis meis aut documentis egere potest, ita neque ego hac nunc oratione vos interpellandos existimavi, quod aut facultati vestrae quicquam adjici sive in voluntate aliquid desiderari queat. Verurn fit, nescio quo modo, ut quam hactenus interclusam mihi vocem ingens quidam stupor diu compressit, eandem nunc dolor ac miseranda temporum horum contemplatio necessario aperiat exprimatque. Quis enim, vos obtestor, non toro inhorrescat pectore? Cujus id ferant aures? Quis non deploret? Quem non ad gemitus, ad lachrymas pertrahat (cui nunquam conspecta sit Anglia) tantum in Anglia effundi Christiani sanguinis, tot cives ingenuos, tot liberos et innocentes promiscue cum feeminis viros, capite et fortunis quotidie periclitari, caedi, exuri, laniari prope sine modo et numero? Adeo, ut non hos modo universos qui audiunt, sed et faroare ferme ipsam suppudeat, ea quae apud vos quotidie geruntur referre. Quod si barbaras ex ultima Turcia Barbarossa, aut Scythicus hostis quispiam aliunde irrumpens in Angliam, tantam hanc gentis vestree stragem designasset, haud minor fortasse calamitas, at minor profecto esset querimonia. Saevitiam, etsi omnino per se gravem, nationis tamen minueret distinctio. Nunc quorum saluti apud vos potissimum esse perfuglum conveniebat, eosdem vos ipsi capi, exagitari,

discerpi, dilacerari, Angli Anglos, Magistratus subditos, Christiani Christianos, cernitis, et toleratis. Quique nuper sub Edouardi auspicatissimi Principis divino imperio florentissima tranquillitate, cum omni vitae non securitate solum, sed dignitate etiam, perfruebantur; nunc iidem, vertente se rerum humanarum scena, miseris cruciatibus pariter cron tranquillitate et patriam et vitam, quam tueri nequeunt, deserere coguntur. Non quia ipsi jam alii sint quam olim fuerint, aut quia non eadem horum causa maneat quae prius; sed quia tempora duntaxat ipsa mutata sunt, ac cum temporibus commutantur iudices. Atqui o miseram interim gentis sortem, remque Britannorum prorsus perditam, postquam nunc non ratlone firma sed temporibus, nou certo iudicio sed vicissitudine quadam potestatis, causae decernuntur hominum, nec ad leges tempora, sed temporibus leges accommodantur! non dissimili fere conditione, quam aestuariis vicibus maris cursus ac recursus circumagitur, nunc huc nunc illuc, qua vis fluctuum fortissime inclinatur, undas seorsum rapiens. Et quid tandem his rebus dicendum, Iudices? Nam cui id dubitandum est, quin quos auctoritas vestra sic premit capitaliter, lidera si in eadem qua nunc sunt causa in alia inciderent tempora, facile indemnes ac integri absoluerentur? Unde clare videtis, opinor, si recta rein ratlone reputetis, iudices ac Heroes, non tam in hominibus ipsis culpam, quam in temporibus infelicitatem esse; quae si vobis nunc faveant, at eadem rursus possunt posthac fayere allis. Quod vel ex ea re facile vobis cogitare licet, quum nec ipsi id ignoretis, ternpus non ita pridem recentissima adhuc memoria vestra fuisse, quando nec vos ipsi horum quenquam quos nunc affiigitis in litera vocare audebatis, nec culpa haec in illis sed virtus, non error sed veritas habebatur: et poterit idem porro, mutatis rursus temporibus, pari similiter vicissitudine evenire. Nam alioqui, quod ad causam attinet, eam ut ante superiorem aliquando et meliorem habebant, ira eadem et nunc vincerent, si par maneret temporibus libertatique conditio. Ea quum secus habet, temporibus magis quaca causa jacent; ipsique non tam re ulla mala scelerosi, quam temporibus solum calamitosi existunt: quibus si obsecundare cron caeteris possent, dissimulantes, tuti forent; id quia nequeunt, ob constantiam periclitantur. Quod quum ita sit, auctoritas sane vestra eos sublevare, saltera pietas commiserari debuit: certe jacentes opprimere, tantisque injuriis violate simplices, a quibus laesi dicto factoye nunquam estis, non erat nobilitatis vestrae: quae quo propius ad sublimitatis divinae imaginem accedit, hoc magis debuit similitudinem illius

moribus referre. Quid enim tam Deo proprium, quam miseris et succumbentibus parcere? Quiet vobis ipsis saepe comparcens multa condonavit, et condonat quotidie: et vos in tenues conservos, nihilque in vos unquam commeritos, ignoscentiam contrahitis? Vitam hanc vestram tantis cumulavit honoribus, et vos misellis fratribus vitee invidetis copiam? Solera quotidie suum super vos oriri facit, quotidie agros vobis largissimis imbribus compluit et foecundat peccantibus: vosque non solum agros egenis civibus, sed et solis hujus aspectum eripitis? Quod si commissus hic vobis potestatis gladius necessario stringendus fuerit, tot scatent in ditionibus vestris latrones, homicidae, sicarii, peculatores, adulteri, scorta, lenones, et lenae, quorum tamen multis subinde praeter bonum et aequum publicum parcat gladii vestri acies: et istis nullo modo parcendum existimatis? At quam tandem ob rem, aut quid soli isti prae caeteris tam soticum admisere? Nunquid in Rempublicam? Nihil. An rein privatam cujusquam vexant, aut compilant? Tantundem. Numnam caede aut ferro grassantur? An patriae libertatem produnt? Aut conjurati vim moliuntur reipublicae? Minime. Num qua in re vestram aut imminuunt, aut laedunt dignitatem? Non opinor. Nunquid quisquam denique vestrum in vita eorum moribusque deprehendat secus quam dignum est bonis et pacatis civibus? Non. Sed in doctrina aberrant religionis. Et quid si istud regem quoque? Nam ea de re uberior erit, aspirante Christo, postea pertractandi locus. Sed age procedat oratio: fingamusque id interim vobiscum, quod vultis. Quidvis enim animi opinione libera cogitando effingimus, vel chimaeras etiam, si libet, licet a natura omnique ratione sejunctas. Age itaque fingamus, ut dico, non quod res est, sed quod vohnt tempora, errore teneri istos. Atehim qualis hic error, iudicii ne an voluntatis est? Nam si a voluntate disjunctus sit, facinus esse non potest. Sicut praeclare ab Augustino quidem, peccatum quod voluntarium non sit, nullum esse dictum est. Proprie enim delinquent hi, qui quum se rectas rationis et officii lineas praetergredi non ignorant, pergunt tamen: unde eosdem mox insequitur, quam ipsi sequi quum possent noluerunt, conscientia. Sin autem iudicii sit nimirum ea res, Iudices, esse eos homines arguit: quemadmodum neque vos sane esse Deos arbitror, qui nusquam et ipsi abetrare iudicando poterids. Et tamen lidera, utcunque errare dicuntur, errorem suum magnis tumentur autoribus, Christo, Verbo Dei, Apostolicis literis, exemplis purioris ecclesiae, doctorum si non omnium, lectissimorum certe testimoniis. Jam si vobis ira penitus persuasum inhaereat, vestra omnia nullo erroris admixtu vera esse atque

orthodoxa, iidem quoque hoc ipsum non minus de se existimant, iudiciis etiam liberis convincunt, quin et sanguinis denique luculento argumento confirmant. Et utros nunc vestrum errare, aut non errare, sciemus? Neque enim vel vos non errare, quia sic vobis persuasistis; neque idcirco errare illos, quia a vobis dissentiant, necessaria probatio est. Unde igitur veritatis colligetur fides? Ex potentiae autoritate? At eadem etiam illi polluerunt non ita pridem. Argumentis? His densius pugnant illi, et fortioribus, si audiri possent. Eruditione? Dicam, si liceat, hac semper fuistis inferiores. Numero et multitudine? At corruptissimus semper fuit testis veri vulgus: neque alia res fere oppressit Christum. Quanquam si in Anglia liberorum singulorum suffragiis res ageretur, suaque daretur cuique quod vellet eligendi optio, forsitan baud ita multis punctis vincerent Mariani. Mortene et martyrio? Atqui utinam hac parte non ita innumeris parasangis praecederemus. Quid ergo? An quia fortiorem solum habetis causam, propterea veriozem existimatis; quosque non autoritatis gradu, non argumentis, non literis et eruditione, non testium pondere, non iudiciis liberis potestis superare, eos ceu causa victos, prius ob errorem e medio tolliris ferro ac facibus, quam in errore esse ratione ulla docuistis? Suspicio hic vos intelligere, causa haec si apud alios mihi ageretur, quantam contendendi atque exclamandi materiam, quos orationis impetus, quantos ardores, ipsa rei atrocitas non solum praeberet, sed flagitaret. Sed parco vobis, et me cohibeo, Iudices, ne nimis pugnam contra hos esse videar, quibus supplicaturus accedo. Ac videte qua nunc modestia causam hanc totam tempero, vobis quod non sit aequum concedens, quo vos aequiores in vestros habeam. Nam ut caetera jam ante, quae necesse non erat, ita nunc quoque ponamus illud, non dico oratione (res enim non patitur) sed cogitatione tamen — omnem in illis errorera, in vobis nullum inesse. Quid autem, idne tam prodigiosum viderut vobis, sicubi homines quum sint, in errorem prolabantur? Qui si tam emuncti, tamque Cassiani, ut ita dicam, esse censores volumus: age quotumquemque mihi dabitis eorum quos vel pro sanctissimis aut doctissimis habuit aliquando Ecclesia, uno excepto CHRISTO, in quo non aliquas erroris labes, si opus sit, produxerim? Principio, tam diu tamque crassos errores in discipulis tories institutis Dominus ipse toleravit. Et vos neque cum Christo erratula fratrum toleranda, neque cum Apostolis posse vos exorbitare suspicamini? Quid quod iidem coelesti postea delibuti Spiritu, non tamen sic omnes perfectionis implebunt humeros, ut omni prorsus erroris reprehensione

caruerint ipsorum etiam praecipui. Doctorum patrumque post hos noti sunt singulorum fere errores: ut non frustra Hieronymus de se ad Ruffinure scribens, Erravimus, inquit, juvenes, emendemur senes. Foelix profecto Hieronymus, cujus juvenilis error in ea incidit tempora; nam si inter nos hac tempestate agens Hieronymus errasset juvenis, nunquam emendatus ea scripsisset senex. Idem et de Augustino referri potest, quem si tum jurenero, quum Manichaeus aut semipaganus esset, temporum illorum similis asperitas sustulisset, cogitate quanto Ecclesia caruisset orna-mento. Quae res ergo illum, quae ceeteros summos hodie in Ecclesia interpretes conservavit, sola pietas et misericordia fuit temporum in quibus vivere. Accedo proplus advos ipsos (Judices et Heroes illustrissimi), quos nisi eadem conservasset pietas et misericordia temporum superiorum, nulla foret hodie non modo potentia vestra, sed nec vita, quae allis nunc vitam eriperet. Videtis ergo quid in vos aliorum pietas effecit, et clementia: vobis rursus quid in alios praestandum sit in mutua errorum ignoscentia, cogitate. Si nos ea conditione natura produxisset, ut errare, nescire, ac decipi non possemus, minus aberrarent haec a ratione quae agitis. Nunc quum nihil naturae, nostrae conjunctius videatur, quam roentis insira quaedam caecutientia, ad veri obtutum caligantis, atque cum ipsa simul humanitate impressa nobis errandi proclivitas, nihil sane aliud agere videmini in vindicandis tam acriter hominum erroribus, quam communis vesttee conditionis, non pietatis solum, oblivisci. Consultius erat in tanta naturae infirmitate, errores, si incidant, ratione emendare, doctrina, judicio, ingenio mederi. In-foelix emendandi ratio, quae evitam hominis non morbum, homines ipsos non errores tollit: praesertim cum ejusmodi non sint, qui adeo permagni momenti vel ita grandera autoribus impietatem, vel Ecclesiae perniciem invehant. Quid hoc enim ad rein adeo aut fidem Christianam, si Pontificis Romani potestas Romam suam non exeat? Si sacerdotes eoncubinas in uxores verrant? Si templa nullas ostendant imagines? Si populus, quae credere jubetur, nota sibi lingua audiat atque intelligat? Si Missis, ceremo-niis, meritis, ac traditionibus, quae ultra modestice ripas accrevere, modus prae-scribatur, minusque impediuntur conscientiae? Nam si Ecclesia sine his aliquando, nondum audito Papae, Missae, aut sacerdotis nomine, integra per-fecta-que constitit, quidni eadem sine iis nunc quoque constare poterit? si non tam onerata, non minus tureen perfecta: Siquidem in preecipuis fidel capitibus nulls, opinor, dissensio est. In quibus etiam ipsis si quis lapsus aut vacillatio forte enascitur (multa enim humana fert

imbecillitas ejusmodi), tamen τὸν τῆ πίστει ἄσθενοῦντα D. Paulus non ilico proterendum, sed suscipiendum admonet. Quos itaque in gravioribus prolapsos rebus arnica sublevare manu debebatis, eos in tam levieulis minutiis a vobis dissidentes morte tam horribili inflictis in cineres vertiffs? Et ubi interim ἐπιείκεια ilia Paulina? Ubi clementia vestra? Ubi inveterata ilia semperque laudata erga hostes etiam Anglorum pietas, si in amicos et cives tam efferi tamque exitiales esse velitis? Scio ingeniorum immensam ac infinitum prope varietatem esse in mundo apua homines, haud seus quam apud belluas. Quidam natura mitiores: sunt contra quos natos seevitiae dixeris. Alii consuetudine prays hoc delectantur vitio. Nonnulli rursus ab allis ceu eontagium arripiunt. Verran utcunque aliis aliud natura inseit, certe nihil viris generosis tam proprium ac genuinum, nihil natures ipsorum (si naturam tueri velint) quadrans magis, quam generosa quaedam indoles ac morum ingenuitas, quae prosit omnibus, officiat nemini, nisi laces-sita: ac ne tum quidem, nisi coacta magis, quam sua sponte; idque potins reipublicee ratione, quam sua seevitia: aec ne tum quidem sui oblivisci potest generosa pietas, semper ad salutem, miserorum quam perniciem intendor, ex-cusans, patrocians, sublevans, relinquens, quo misericordiae esse locus possit. Et quae haec tanta nunc — hominumne dicam, an temporum? — degeneratio, in viros non solum non improbos, sed innocenti ac inculpata vita, a quibus vestrum nemo leesus aut lacessitus sit, sic inardescere saevitiam quorundam, ut nusquam natio sit tam barbara, ubi non tutius conquiescant, quam spud suos? Quondam spud priscos Romanos plusquam sonticum censebatur, quod civem in discrimen adduceret capitis. Ubi et octo erant suppliciorum genera, quorum mots ut ultima, its nisi rarissime, haud indicebatur. Quid quod ne rum quidem deerant etiam vitae defensores, ac libera in judiciis actio? Ex quo effectum est, ut eloquentiae studium tanto in honore et usu spud omnes esset, ut urbem prope universam ad sui contentionem excitaret. Tantus in gentilitio populo patriae amor et salutis curs spud patricos Vigebat viros: quorum omnis ferme laus in conservandis quam plurimis cernebatur. Atqui istos nondum ulla religionis gratis tinxerat. Tantum natura ipsa, atque litersrum humanitas, ad tantam excolere potuit civilitatem. Et o Brutorum jamdudum in Anglia extinctum genus. Quod spud ethnicos natura, quod literae valuerunt civiles, non idem valebit pietas, non Evangelii vigor? Non a Christo toties inculcata impetrabit charitas, quirt ob quamlibet levem aut nullam causam ad poenas rapiantur? adeo frigescente his temporibus

charitate, ut baud sciam an hoc ipsum capitale futurum sit, quod pro afflictis fratribus routire audeam: idemque hac in re eveniat mihi, quod Justino olim pro Christianis ἀπολογοῦντι, qui pro martyribus dum deprecatur, fit et ipse martyr.

Atque hactenus its causam egi, quasi erroris nonnulla, quam impingres, penes cos resideat reprehensio. Nunc, quid si immunes ab omni erroris labe eos, quid si innocentes esse, quid si causa tots vobis etiam ipsis superiores demonstrem? Neque enim its valde id difficile fuerit. At obstat alia magis difficultas: vel quia Latine scribenti mihi metus fit, ne non intelligar, quum exigua pars hujus (ut audio) ordinis literis perpolita sit, vel quia librorum hujusmodi, si qui: sanlores sint, de medio atque usu hominum omnis sublata sit copia, atque aditus etiam interclusus; quum tamen caeterarum mercium hullo non generiomnes ubique portus ac ostia pateant. Quae duae res ejusmodi profecto videntur mihi, ut non tam meae causae officiant, quam totam ipsam a fundamentis Rempublicam pessudent ac labefactent. Quarum alters facit ne possint, alters ne velint videre quae temporibus esse remedio queant. Quod si recte id judicavit inter philosophos merito laudatissimus Plato, eam demum quam optime hahere Reipublicae ideam, ubi vel philosophi agant principes, vel principes ipsi philosophentur; quid tum de ea censendum Republica, ubi nec principes ulla imbuit philosophia, nee ipsi philosophantium monitis sanioribus aures semel aperiant? Verurn ne nimium diffldere aequitati vestrae videar, Agite, ingenui atque observandi Proceres, quaeso; relegatis paulisper affectibus, quibus iudicii fere sinceritas exosculatur, trutinam iusticiae vestrae aequo utrinque libramento tenete, resque ipsas suo pondere, non personarum circumstantiis locorum aut temporum, pro prudentis vestra metimini. Quid hoc retulerit, quantumlibet vicarlure Christi se jactet Romanus Pontilex, si non vicarium, sed adversarium Christi, res ipsa clamitet, facta loquantur, gesta, exempla, mores, instituta, studia, vita denique tots arguat illius, ex adverso cum Christo pugnans? Torus Ille mitis, demissus, mansuetus, cunctis expositus, omnibus obsequens, omnis tole-rans, servus omnium, quum esset omnium Dominus. Contra, quid hoc super-cilio elatius? Uter quis unquam inflatio? Quae vipers nocentior? Nero quis aut Mezentius crudelior? Quid truculentius, aut magis irritabile? AEstuat Ille, laborat, sudat, alget, esurit, sitit, pascit, praedicat, omnes perambulans patriae fines. At quid hic tandem praeclarus viearius, quid agit? quid laborat? qui

sudores illius, aut quae pathemata? ubi praedicat? quos docet? quas peragratur regiones, disseminans verbum fidei? Quid? An materia nunc deest illi expli-candae dillgentile? Tot stupris, adulteriis, incestibus, scortis, fornicibus, cinaedis (cogor hic mussare quaedam, vincitur enim calami mei pudor turpitudinis magnitudine) tot veneficiis, tot caedibus, rapinis, furtis, homicidiis, luxu, crapula, mollicie, strepitu, conviviis, insidiis, perfidia, non Roma, non Italia solum exundat; Mundus ubique tam ferax est vitiis. Fidei vigor extinctus fere in animis homi-num jacet. Charitatis vix usquam vestigium. Pietas interns externis obruitur ceremoniis. Inter sacerdotes tantum ambitionis, fastus et avaritiae, quantum jam oranera humanam rationem, pene ad ipsam usque insaniam, excessisse videtur. Populus in nummis, Principes in bellis, nullo Dei timore, minitoo amore proximi, tumultuantur. Atque his neglectis omnibus, vicarira sedis ter adorands sanctitas stertit, dissimulat, indulget, psallit, ovat, triumphat, potit, at, ineptit, nugatur, ridet re quasi bene gesta, ludit, scortatur, aleatur, ociatur, olet unguenta, pro grege curat cuticulam; aut se cohibens intra coelum suum, ne cui prosit; aut si quando obesse vult, nunquam exerens fulmen majestatis suae, nisi ad perniciem hominum. Quasique non satis sit bellorum in mundo, principes etiam ultro armis laccessit, pro vicario Christi vicarium agens Bellonae. Clamat scriptura, “Mihi vindictam et ego retribuam,” et caetera: atque hanc obedienciam ublque praestitit pacificus ille Agnus, ad crucis usque mortera et ignominiam se dejiciens.

Componamus nunc cum Archetypo vicarium. Quae jam compluribus his annis turbee aut bella conflagrarunt in orbe Christiano, quorum ad hunc Pontificem vel initia, vel fines, vel allqua certe discordiae societas non pertinuit? Videlicet sic Capiti responder vicarius. Tenuis Ille ac parvo contentus, non babebat quo caput reclinaret: quum huic non unum palatium, plusquam regali exstructum magnificentia, sufficiat. Subduxit se Ille, ne in regem a populo poseeretur. cum hac indole, hujus conferamus ambitionem: cui non una, non gemina sat est corona, nisi triplici diademate suam populo venditet dignitatem. Layit Ille discipulorum pedes, quorum esset magister. Quique magistri personam gerit, summos etiam Ceesares tantum non ad pedum oscula abjicit. Divinus Esaias prophetico oculo in Christum intuens, omne decus liii atque aspectum, juxta hujus mundi figuram, adimit. Contra hic quam ambiciose fulgore auri et gemmarum, ceu radio unico suee divinitatis, orbis capit ac perstringit oculos! Clamat Ille, regnum suum non esse de hoc nundo. Et qui mundi oranera maxime afrogat

dominatum, hujus vicarius videri postulat. Pertulit Ille crucem, sed in quam subactus est. Praefert et iste crucem, quam nunquam subit, sed infligit allis. Non potuit preferre igneus Illius zelus, in templo externo yendentes etnundinantes. Et istum feret vicarium non solum in templo venditantem, sed qui templum ipsum, totas hierarchias, cumque ils una hominum animas quaestui habeat et lucro? Quid enim tam sacrum usquam, aut profanum, quod sub auctione non venit, quasi sub hasta Pontificis preetoria? Imo, ut res nunc rediit, quid aliud Ecclesia ipsa ante hosce annos aliquam multos fuit, quam mercatus quidam Pontificis Romani, omnia ad quaestum et ad riscurn prostitu-entis? Nec mirum, si mitras, sedes, cathedras, praefecturas alias allis divendat quum ipse tam magno ad suam penetrat. Quae quum ita sint per se luculenta, an quisquam est tam caecus, Judices, qui id non videt, in tanta rerum dissimilitudine, aut Evangelinto hoc Christi non esse, quod habemus, aut hunc certe vicarlure hullo modo Illius existimandum? Qui si leviter tantum a praescriptis Illins deflecteret, lapsus utcunque condonari communi hominum infirmitati potuisset. Nunc, quum toro vitae genere cum Illo pugnet ex adverso (quippe Ille coelestis, hic mundanus: Ille servus omnibus, hic omnium magister: lugens, lachrymans Ille, hic lasciviens: denique tot modis afflicto Ille, et crucifixus pro Christianis, iste crux Christianorum omnium), non ego eum Christi — non vicarium, sed — confessum esse hostera statuo? Cujus rei si fidem argumentis quaerimus, quis illustrius capiat indicium, quam ex operibus ipsis viteeque fructibus? praesertim quum Dominns ipse de pseudo-Christis ac mentiticiis prophetis tam accurate admonens, pro certissimis reliquit notis, ut ex fruetibus eorum cognosceremus eos. Itaque quos vitee fructus manifestarii, ac mores excussi ad Evangellore, nobis omnibus modis carendos arguunt; quos puritas Evangelii, quos indoles et doctrina Apostolica in Christianorum non admittunt numerum, vix etiam inter honestos cives; vos pro summis Christianorum ductoribus Christique legaris vicarils recipietis?

Ac quoniam se vendidat tantopere Apostolicee successlonis titulo, age ut id etiam ipsum in disquisitionera advocemus: quo tandem jure tuebitur, ejus quod vendicat ambitio? Successionera obtendit Apostolicam. Quid ita? Quia Romee sedet, imo desidet. Et quid si Romee sederet Turca, num sedes illurn Pontificem faceret, an doctrina potius, et confessio? Sedebant super cathedram Mosis Scribae et Pharisaei, qui tamen nullam illius, opinor, successionem arrogabant: sane nulli a disciplina Mosis abfuerunt longius.

Sed Petrus, aiunt, sedebat Romae, Apostolorum summus. Principio unde id liquebit? Certe Paulus neque ad Romanos scribens allunde, neque istinc scribens ad alios, Petri usquam mentionera facit: facturus, opinor, inter ceeteros quos tam multos salutatur, si id temporis adfuisset. Deinde Zosimus, caeterique Pontifices cum Aurelio et sexta Carthaginensi Synodo contententes tam acriter de primatu illius sedis, dum omnia circumeunt argumentorum praesidia, neque Petrum obtendunt praesessorem, neque scripturam afferunt, neque consuetudinem allegant: quod tamen postea cepit fieri a Bonifacio, ut scitis, secundo. Nam ad ejus usque tempora Ecclesiae aequa administrantium autoritate regebantur, parvusque respectus (ut Pii II. verbis utar, Epist. 30.) ea tempestate ad Romanam Ecclesiam habebatur. Erant tum inaudita nomina, Universalis sacerdos, Episcopus oecumenicus, princeps sacerdotum, Episcopus Episcoporum, etc. nec solum inaudita, sed vetita etiam legibus Conciliorum. Tenetis, scio, memoria, vel facile ab exemplaribus repetitis licet, quid Nicaena, quid Milevitana Synodus in decretis habeat: quae singulis provinciis suos tribuebat metropolitanos, qui aequabili potestatis sorte, hullo inter se discrimine, Ecclesiae negotiis invigilarent: Ut Gregorianas interim epistolas, ut VI. Carthaginensis Synodi Decreta taceam, quae quanto stomacho ambitiosam hanc dominandi insaniam et fumosum (ut cum illis appellem) seculi typum in Episcopis flagellent, nemini qui literas novit non legendi copia est. Ex quo perspicue Mamerani, et consimilium, vanitas coarguatur, qui contendunt, nullam unquam Ecclesiam extitisse, quae aut Romana non fuerit, aut Romanae non paruerit. Pergunt porro mentiri belli artifices. Petrum aiunt annos xxv. consedissee Romae.. At qui ille potuit aut debuit Romae sedisse tam diu, aut ullo modo? Primitim, cujus vita functioque nihil erat quam perpetua in universum orbem legatio. Deinde, cui peculiari designatione creditum esse circumcisionis Apostolatam referunt Sacrae Literae. Porro annos octodecim post conversum Paulum in Judaeae Asiaeque finibus commoratum esse liquet, ad quem Paulus conveniendi gratia paulo ante ascendisse se commemorat, Galatians 2. Quo ipso tempore concilium cogebatur Hierosolymitanum, ubi cum caeteris simul adfuisse Petrum ex Actis compertum est. Et ubi postea quinquennium illud, quo in Ponto, rursusque septennium, quo Antiochiae est versatus, constituemus? Nam illic quoque sedisse, prosodia decantat Ecclesiae: “Petrus sedit Romae, et Antiochiae: Paulus invasit Greciam.” Quod si externae politiae amplitudo quicquam ad Apostolici mysterii splendorera efficiat, mentitur igitur

Hieronymus Epist. ad. Evagrium: “Si autoritas quaeritur, orbis major est urbe, etc.” rursusque idem Distinc. 40, c. 2. “Non sanctorum filii sunt qui tenent loca sanctorum, sed qui exercent opera eorum, etc.” Sin nihil conferat, cur non ergo pari pollster existi-matione Antiochenus, quum is non minus cathedram ostendat Petri, quam Romanus antisres? Pressertim quando Nicaenus Can. vi. hunc ipsum Metropolitanen eodem pariter loco et honore cum Romano conjungit Episcopo.

Sed ecquid istud est, sedere Romae, ab istis quaerendum est. Si Romae sedeat, qui docet Romae, sedit fortasse iliic Petrus: non sedent nunc Pontifices, qui non docent. Sed non solus sedit Petrus. Sedit item hoc modo Paulus, nulla (opinor) Apostoli parte Petro inferior, laboribus etiam docendi superior, denique genuinus Gentium Apostolus et Doctor: cujus, ut vere dixerim, omnes sunt Gentium Episcopi successores, nisi forte Romanus Pontilex se inter circum-cisos, quorum Petrus praecipue fuit Apostolus, magis quam inter Gentes habeat. Sin eo sedere dixerint, quod ei potissimum peculiari aliqua electlone dele-gata sit Ecclesiae illius et imposita praefectura, quis id muneris illi imposuit? Ubi facta electio ea est? Quorum suffragiis est designatus? Cur in historiis horum nulla mentio, nec memoria? Cur hic silet longa ilia, nomine quidem Clementis, re vere supposititia epistola, caetera persequens tam accurate? Denique, quo tandem in templo cathedram electus babebat positam? Postremo, si in cathedra Petri tam esse religiosi volumus, cur non electionis perinde formula, ut successionis, manet?

Sed age fingamus id quoque, Romae fuisse et sedisse Petrum. Advertire rogo, Judices, quam multa in hac causa clara et facilia habeam, non modo ad vincendi fiduciam, sed ad ludendi etiam libertatem, quum quod adversariis caput est controversiae, ultro ipsis concedam: idque ubi concessero, nequicquam illis sit profuturum. Fingamus, ut dico, Romanae ecclesiae unice et nominatim Petrum Apostolum praesedissee, triplici etiam, si volunt, mitrarum diademate. Quid? An ideo protinus Romana ecclesia jus imperii, et gladium, ut vocant, utrumque in caeteras Christi ecclesias obtinet? AEquumque ilico putabimus cum Mamerano, nullam esse usquam ecclesiam quae aut Romana non sit, aut Romanae non mancipetur atque obtemperet? At cur ergo sodera tempore praesidente Petro, non Timotheus episcopus, non Titus, non Cretenses presby-teri omnes, huic cathedrae paruerunt? Cur non Asiaticae, non Africanae ecclesiae jus throni hujus

agnoverunt, ac cervices submiserunt? Quid quod longo post intervallo Nicaeni concilii, Milevitani, Carthaginensis tempora non item huic addicta sunt, in quibus parvam hujus Ecclesiae ratione habitam esse testatur Sylvius? Quid de Moscovitis, Rutenensibus? Quid de Mediolanensi, de Aquileiensi ecclesia? Quid de Wallia vestra, et tota Graecia commemorem, quae vix demum, ubi diu restiterit, sub Romam jugum ante annos non multos missa et redacta est? Quamobrem si quis usquam sit in Ecclesiis Christi principatus, quem sibi quisquam astruat, is certe Petro in primis debeatur, Romae et episcopo, et Apostolo. Nunc quod Petrus nec ipse unquam expetivit, nec alii ecclesiae detulerunt, aut, si detulissent, is tamen admittere non debuisset: qua fronte id ejus vendicabunt successores? Si divinum jus adlegant, illud cur non perinde apud priores valebat Christianos? Sin humanum obtendunt at non ilico rectum et legitimum est quod humanum sit, nisi idem verbum Dei dicat et voluntas approbet. Excusamus itaque scripturae divinae vim et sententiam, quae etsi potestati omnem animam subjiciat, ubi tamen hanc potestatem permittit istis? Ubinam Christus Petro primatum aut cuiquam apostolorum denunciavit? Immo nisi aperte et simpliciter interdicit, prohibeat, detestetur, equidem pietatem vestram nihil deprecor. Et quod Christus toties in Evangelio vetuit, id ejus arrogabant ministri? vosque civibus vestris necem irrogandam, qui Christo quam pontificibus dicto esse audientes malint, existimatis?

Sed quoniam urgent isti tantopere primatum Petri, atque in eo tam libenter commorantur, nos paululum hic quoque consistere necesse fuerit. Qua in re duo esse inclusa video: ut Petrus vel ab urbe primatum, vel haec ab illo acceperit. Quorum alterum omnino per se futile et ridiculum, alterum minus aliquanto leve videretur, nisi omnino falsum esset. Illud itaque (opinor) non dicent, Apostolum sedis sure primatum ab urbe accepisse. Quanquam quod verbis negant, re ipsa fateri coguntur. Nam alioqui, quum ille non minus ceteris in urbibus sedebat episcopus, cur non ecclesiis illis idem tribuerent, quod sibi assumunt Romani pontifices, si nihil in loco inesse existimarent? Restat ergo ut ab apostolo primatum accepisse Romanam sedem confiteantur. Quaero igitur, unde Petrus primatum illum acceperit, priusquam se contulisset Romam? Nam a Christo non accepisse vel hinc liquet, quod apostolis Ipse de primatu decertantibus responderit; qui adeo eorum nulli locum concedebat altero superiorem, ut qui primus

inter eos futurus esset, hunc infra creteros ad servileto usque conditionem publicumque ministerium dejecerit. Proinde si jam ante princeps fuisset apostolorum Petrus, cur illi inter se de principatu ambigebant? Sin postea Dominus illi contulisset quod prius denegavit, cur id nusquam exprimunt, imo cur diversum exprimunt, Evangelia? Cur Apostoli, illisque vieina posteritas, illius nullum agnoverint principatum? Cur Paulus suum ausus principem redarguere tam aperte? Cur Petrus, se compresbyo terum vocans, suis compresbyteris omnem interdicit dominatum? Sed repulsi Scripturis, patrociniū forte sibi e Conciliis colligent Romani pontifices. Nam hanc proximam fere habent anchoram, sicubi Scripturre asylum destituat. Verbin si tam sacra apud eos Conciliorum religio constet et autoritas, cur ipsi primium Nicrenam synodurn non audiunt, quae canone vi., non solum Antiochenum, sed et Alexandrinum, ereterosque patriarchas eparchiis ecclesiasticis, nullo autoritatis discrimine, p̄reficit? Quo in loco Grrecorum vetusti com-mentarii quatuor numero Patriarchas p̄reter Constantinopolitanum recensent: sic ut hi praesint, Metropolitanis, Metropolitanis archiepiscopis: atque hi rursus τὴν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐπισκόπων πρόέχουσι. Nec contenti tantum recensuisse, insuper suas cuique patriarche provincias et p̄moeria ascribunt, ut Alexandrinus AEgypto, Lybire, Pentapoli p̄reficiatur: Antiochenus Syrire, utrique Ciliciae, et Mesopotamiae: Aelianus seu Hierosolymitanus Palaestinae, Arabire, Phoeniciae, ditionem complectatur, &c. Et ubi inter hrec Romani patriarche potestas oecumenica, quae sola ecclesiarum omnium potiri affectat? Et quoniam in conciliorum incidimus suffragia (quae nec ipsi omnino aspernamur), age proferatur p̄reterea secunde Synodi tertius, itemque quartae xxviii. Canon. Qureso an non prima mox fronte perspiciam deprehenditis ἰσότηατ τῆς νέας καὶ πρεσβυτέρας ῥώμης, hoc est, inter Constantinopolitanum et Roma um metropoliten.? Primurn verba ipsa expendamus: διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεία τῷ τῆς νέας ῥώμης ἀγιωτάτῳ θρόνῳ &c. Deinde, ne verba sine rebus liii dare videantur, certas insuper ac peculiare dioeceses, Ponticam, Asianam, Thracicam, creterasque barbaricas provincias, Bulgariam, Cyprum, Iberiam, illius legitimae administrationi subjiciunt. Omitto hic Graecorum scholasticwn argutam magis quam necessariam disceptationem de praepositione μετὰ, tempusne an dignitatem significet. Quanquam prisci illi canonum autores non solum μετὰ ἐκείνην, sed etiam ὡς ἐκείνην addunt, quarti Concilii

canone xxviii., ne quis ea in re impune erret. Sed in ils, quia superfluae forsant subtilitatis videri possunt, minus moror. Illud ad rein valde, meo iudicio, facitq ut sententiam ipsam **κατὰ ῥητὸν καὶ διάνοιαν** nobiscum trutinantes expendamus quaenam causa fuerit, cur urbes istas potissimum sedis honore caeteris praetulerit antiquitas. Quid? Num lege aut jure divino? An quia singulare aliquid Petro indultum sit? Aut quia Petrus sedebat Romae? Nihil horum adfertur, Iudices. Atque ne desit testimonio fides, recitentur Canonurn verba, quae attendus ut perpendaris rogo. Sic enim habet ejus quam dixi, Synodi locus: **διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδώκασι τὰ ἴσα τῷ τῆς νέας ῥώμης ἀγιοτάτῳ θρόνῳ, εὐλόγως κρίνοντες τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ σύγκλητῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν καὶ τῶν ἴσων ἀπολαύουσαν πρεσβείων τῇ πρεσβυτέρῳ βασιλίδι ῥώμῃ, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι.** Ex iis QUae recitavi, videtis (viri principes) non tam illud, quo pacto Ecclesiae istae pari simul conjunctae sint autoritate, quam causam ipsam expendere licebit, quamobrem in eum honoris gradum sint potissimum constitutae: non ob jus, ut dixi, aliquod divinum aut apostolicum cujus hie nulla fit mentio, sed **διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν, καὶ εἶναι βασιλείαν καὶ σύγκλητῳ τιμηθεῖσαν πόλιν.** Quippe sic tum existimabant prisca illi patres (viri bene simplices, sed male rerum futurarum providi), quia tum majestate imperil et senatus autoritate duse bae potissimum Respublicae efflorent, consentaneum quoque fore, easdem **καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι.** Verrim quam gravis haec causa sit et Christianae philosophiae magistris digna, relinquo Theologis definiendum. Illud dixerim, si externae politicae exemplum par sit in rebus quoque Ecclesiasticis valere, semperque has eum illa pariter congregari oportere, jamdudum tempus esse, ut translata Germaniam summa imperil potestate, illuc quoque rerum ecclesiasticarum se transferat autoritas. Omitto hic, brevitate studio, multa de Conciliis et necessario et opportune hoc loco proferenda, quae etiamsi initio Romani pontificis maxime farerent dictaturae, tamen in tanta perturbatione et confusione rerum, injusticia, scelere, tyrannide. vi, errore atque furore, ad fidei ac religionis labem et calamitatem illi nihil debebant patrocinari. Nunc verb quotumquemque mihi ex Conciliis omnibus, praesertim gravioribus, eanonem proferet is Pontilex, qui manifeste et **ῥητῶς** oecumenica hac se potestate inautoret? Namque Nicaena synodus nihilo magis illi, quam Aegypto, quam Libyae, Pentapoli, Antiochlae, caeterisque eparchiis attribuit. Imo, nihil quidem ipsa omnino

tribuit: tantum sexto aphorismo consuetudinem in haec verba allegat, *ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστι*, &c. De secunda et quarta Synodo jam dictum est: Carthaginensis etiam ex confesso refragatur — Ut interim de fide et autoritate Conciliorum, quatenus nos astringant et quousque, nihil hic pronunciem. Quamquam, quo tandem ore e Conciliis patrocinium is sibi corrogabit, qui ipse, omnium maxime rejectis Conciliorum repagulis, nullis se sanctionibus teneri sustinet? Legat, qui volet, Canonum apostolicorum (ut existimantur) decretum xxix. xxx. xxxii, xxxviii.; rursus Nicaeni concilii canonem quartum, et Constantinopolitani secundum, porroque alterius in eadem urbe Synodi sub Theodosio canonem ii. Legat historiam Apiarii, praeter jus et consuetudinem majorum recepti. Legat denique omnes patrum et Conciliorum canones: vix multos ab hoc episcopo non violatos reperiet, nonnullos etiam suppressos, et quosdam aperte condemnatos. Ut ne recenseam alia vetustissimae consuetudinis monumenta, quae a patribus bene instituta et fixa, is aliter privata autoritate quotidie mutat et corrumpit pro libidine. Quod genus varia quum sint, nos multis unum, etsi minutius quidem illud, tamen quia peculiariter ad Rempublicam vestram attinet, producemus: quod quum prisca majorum autoritas inter archiepiscopos triginta novem in Chartophylacio descriptas Lontopolin vestram (sic enim in Graecorum vetustis exemplaribus appellatur) enumeravit, eam postea in Cantuariam transtulit Romanus metropolitans. Non agnoscunt pro episcopo canones apostolici, synodus Chalcedonensis, Syntagma Genadii, denique patrum omnes fere sanctiones, quisquis externis principum praesidiis usus, vel pecuniis, sibi τὴν χειροτονίαν aut alioqui quamcunque Ecclesiae dynastiam comparat, aut divendit. Quumque Romanus antistes nihil aliud his multis annis egerit, non solum pro episcopo haberi se, sed nullius vice tantum non adorari postulat. Caeterum de Conciliis hactenus, deque legitima Pont. Romani potestate, satis dictum est. Quanquam cur ea in re tamdiu haereret oratio, nihil erat. Sic enim existimo, neminem tam vecordi esse ingenio, cui, si mediocriter Evangelii literas spiritumque degustavit, tantus vitae Pontiffitiae fastus et magnificentia non exemplo foeda, professione indigna, ac turpis etiam auditu videri possit.

Jam quoniam ex his labyrinthis et salebris, impedita aliquandiu, evolavit tandem oratio, eo veniamus, quod praecipue in Episcopo spectandum est, ut doctrinam simul cum moribus excutiamus, quo non dubitandi modo sed

nec cavillandi etiam ansam cuiquam relinquamus. Nam quae haetenus disseruimus, licet per se gravissima sint, attamen quia communes duntaxat abusus vitro attingunt, minus forsitan jus ipsum sedis premere videbuntur. Hicque primum mihi respondeat velim istorum aliquis, sed sanior paulo, cuique aliquid sit aequae mentis: Num censeat, quae a Christo autore relicta nobis proditaque sint, satis ad salutem esse? Si neget: rogo de Apostolis et Apostolorum auditoribus quid sentiendum, qui omnes simpliciter Christi contenti Evangelio, nihil sibi ad salutem requirendum praeterea existimarunt? Sic enim scribunt: Et nos in Christum Jesum credimus, ut justificemur ex fide Christi, et non ex operibus legis, &c. Sin satis fateatur esse quae Dominus praestitit et praestanda docuit, quid tum opus tot praescriptis et rescriptis Pontificum, tot sanctionibus, ceremoniis, legibus, tot distinctionum et articulorum formulis, tot amaxaeis loqua-cissimorum codicum laqueis, et laqueorum plaustris? Quae omnia si eadem tradunt: quae Christus, superflua et ociosa sin diversa, etiam impia sunt. Sed bellam hic elabendi rimam reperit Theologorum argutia, ad traditiones communiendas. Verum, inquit, sed promittebatur Spiritus sanctus, quo suggerente cuncta perfectius justoque ordine patefferent. Audio, et agnosco Christi verba, quae praecedunt. Ipsi vicissim audiant quae idem subjungit, inquit: Quaecunque ego dixi vobis. Docuit ergo ille veritatis Spiritus, sed quae prius docuit Jesus: nec tam novam instituit religionem ille, quam eandem confirmavit: magisque fiduciam hominibus, atque testimonium veritati, quam novam aliquam doctrinam advexerat, Itaque testem eum promittit Dominus. Nec sane aliud declarant Petri et Apostolorum conciones, qui jam perfusi promisso Spiritus charismate audacius quidera loquuntur apud plebem, sed non aliud tamen, quam accepissent a Christo prius. Caeterum quod ad leges alias novasque sanctiones Ecclesiae inducendas attinet, ea de re explicatissima extat ipsius Spiritus sancti in Actis sententia, ubi Petrus, inito inter Apostolos Concilio, in haec verba testatus, Visum est, inquit, Spiritui sancto, et nobis, ne quid praeterea oneris imponatur gentibus, nisi, etc. Quanquam neque horum etiam quae imponebantur, quicquam novum erat, sed cuncta e veteri lege repetita. Deinde ut paucissima quidera illa, ira nec duratufa omnia, sed ad tempus duntaxat non-nulla pro ingenio ac imbecillitate quorundam dispensabantur. Et quorsum ergo tot decretis opus et decretalibus onerariis, nisi aliam nunc sentiamus Spiritus sancti mentem esse, quam olim fuit? Quanquam nec id adeo querimonia, dignum, quod ad turbam attinet et immensitatem

decretorum. Quin nec id rursus tantopere quaero, utrumne in tanta traditionum multitudine nihil insit humani lapsus? Non enim vel tam caeci sumus, quippe homines ipsi, ut quid humanae imbecillitatis ferat conditio nesciamus; vel tam morosi, qui in multis bene dictis pauculos interspersos naevos condonare non velimus. Omitto hic de panis, salis, cinerum, cereorum, palmarum, templorum, campanarum, aquae, ignis, et elementorum omnium consecratione, de purgatorio, de temporum et dierum observatione, de cibis et nuptiis interdictis, quas Paulus doctrinas vocat daemoniorum, de reliquiis, imaginibus, votis, jejuniis, ferris, pompis, idque genus sexcentis ceremoniarum nugis dicere. quae etsi Siculis gerris sint vanlores, ac majestate Christianae religionis indignae, tamen quia periculo minus sunt exitiales, minus in his consisto. Illud specto, quis scopus tandem doctrinae illius, quis finis, qui fructus, ac quaenare pertendat denique.

Huc itaque post multa tandem devecti, consistimus in hoc, Judices: jam non quam scelerosus, quam contaminata vita, quanta superstitione opertus, quam incultus, stupidus ac barbarus, quanta inflatus ambitione, quam alienus ab omni jure illius tituli quem prae se fert, quamque prorsus cathedra illa indignus sit Romanus Pontifex — verum illud nunc in iudicio versatur, ac oratione nobis perquirendum: Hi duo, Christus et Pontifex, an sibi adversentur mutuo: an eorum doctrina iisdem principiis et fundamentis constet, an diversis: an ex eodem spiret fonte, num in eundem conspiret finem breviter, an altera ullo modo cum altera consistere queat. Quod si planum oratione fecero, non posse, nunquid restat, Judices, quin Pontificem Romanum non jam Christi vicarium, ac ne Christianum quidem hominem, sed Christi confessum hostem et perduellionem ipsi confiteamini? Neque vero difficilis adeo ejus rei probatio fixerit, modo impetrari a vobis tantisper poterit, ut sepositis externis rerum nominibus et titulis, res ipsas, ut sunt, nude simpliciterque velitis introspicere. Quantumvis Christi insignia, vicem, titulum mentiatur Romanus Episcopus, quid tum postea si re ipsa nihil omnino Christi, nihil non adversus Christum habeat? Quid adeo ad rem, quamlibet in loco ter sancto sedeat, si ipse ter quaterque omni iniquitatis genere vitam ostendat abominandam: praesertim quum e prophetion scriptum non ignoretis, abominationera desolationis in loco staturam sancto: rursusque in templo Dei sedere eum oportere, quem Apostolici Antichristum venturum

praenunciabant, Imo hoc ipso nomine, probabilior etiam hujusce rei videri poterit suspicio apud prudentissimum quemque, quo sanctior sit locus quem occupat. Submoveamus itaque paululum externa ista, quae etsi per se simpliciter mala non existant, tamen quoniam ejusmodi sunt, ut malis aequae ac bonis evenire inter alia queant, nae certum de se iudicium constituent, nos rem ipsam potius, quid verum, quid falsum, quid cum verbo Dei commune, quid diversum habeat, consideremus. Quae omnia ut plana vobis oratione fiant, possem hic communi disputantium more varia e Scripturis testimonia, hinc inde, ceu puncta colligere. Verum qui sic disputant contra Pontificem, diligenter illi quidam multa, at minus tamen quam omnia videntur mihi dicere. Nam ut multa contra eum graviter et recte congerunt, ita multa simul relinquunt illi, quibus se ex adverso tueatur. Deinde in hoc etiam plus satis causae, quam impugnant, indulgent atque concedunt; rati ea solum, quae e diversis Scripturae locis sparsim contra eum citant, adversari Pontifici. Ego contra sic existimo, Judaeis, in verbo Dei non solum multa contra eam hanc Pontificiam inveniri, sed ipsum etiam fundamentum, vim, naturam, corpus denique et animam totius Scripturae huic *ἐκ διαμέτρου* repugnare dixerim. Quod ut illustrius a vobis intelligatur, animum quaeso studiosius advertite, Christiani proceres. Nam ut res recte suis finibus metiamur, nec partes solum Scripturae aliquas, sed principia, progressus, finetoque illius universum intueamur: quid aliud mens ipsa vult, sensus, ratio, tota denique series ejus et methodus, quid aliud inculcat, quo collimat, quo tendit denique, nisi ad unum scopum, ut Christum nobis ac gratuitam cum illo et in illo salutem polliceatur? Declarant hoc tot ab initio Dei promissiones, tot umbræ et typi vetustae legis, tot prophetarum oracula, regni Judaici praeludia, et seminis continua conservatio: donec demum Semen veniret Christus, in quo benedicendae erant omnes gentes. Unde Paulus ut praeclare omnia, ita illud divine dicebat, finem legis esse Christum: quem alibi fundamentum, alibi corpus quoque vocat, caetera omnia pro umbris statuens quae praecesserunt. Hoc qui non intelligit, aut aliud in Scripturis quaerendum sibi putat in quo conquiescat propter Christi solam notitiam et fidem, ad quem omnes Dei voces properant, omnia festinant tempora, omnes omnium conjiciuntur oculi, is methodum ac mentem aream Scripturae se ignorare fateatur. Solum hunc, tot seculis, lex prisca parturiebat: Evangelium demum peperit: sponsa suscepit Ecclesia. In hoc uno omnes laborant et constant Dei promissiones, Amen. Nae aliud nunc habet fides nostra quod recipiat, eui inhaereat, nisi

hunc solum Christum eumque crucifixum. In hoc uno omnis proposita medela est, quaecunque ingruant adversitates. Peccator es: hoc solum habes propitiatorium. Animus te accusat: hic major est animo tuo. Ira ac timor Dei te consternit: habes hic mediatorem, cui tuto fidas. Concutit te mortis horror, nut morbi gravitas: hic mortera profligatam ac spoliatam habes. Injuriam pateris: ultionem hic addueit retributionis (Esa. xxxv.). Pauper es: in hoc abundas, non caducis, sed veris bonis. Servus es, miser es, caecus aut mancus es, sterilis eunuchus, infamis, exosus, tardus, imperitus, fatuus es: denique quicquid adduxeris malorum, nihil homini accidere potest tam magnum, quin hic infinitis partibus sit major, caeteris omnibus salutaris: nec ullis formidabilis, nisi his potissimum, qui minime juxta hunc mundum infelices sunt, maximeque praeferoces. Postremo, ex hac unica testamenti area omnes saintis et gratiae thesauros gratis et abunde haurimus quotidie per fidem solam, quotquot in eum credimus. Unde quisquis sitit, bibit: quisquis esurit, epulatur: non precio, sed prece: non meritis, seal gratis: non quia digni simus, sed quia promisit Pater: quo nomine aeterna sit illi laus et gratia per omnes Ecclesias, Amen.

Habetis Scripturge methodurn summariam: videamus nunc Pontiffcite theologice summaro. Quae si ad Christum nos unice traducat, si ejus potissimura gloriam spectet, conscientias in illo erigat, me etiam in primis applaudcute erincat cansam. Sin alio ducat, ad indulgentias, ad satisfactiones, purgatorium, aa Francistum, Dominicum, divos et divas sexcentas, ad monasteria nos releget, ad regulas obstringat, ad meritis humanae supererogationis transferat; in summa, si quum divina volumina nihil magis doceant quam Christnam hie nihil minus spiret quam Christum, non ego hunt omnis Scripturae ignarum, indoc-tum ac stupidum, non Christi vicarium, non Apostolicurn successorem putem, sed inimicum crucis Christi et publiege consolationis et salutis humanae perduellionem liquido profiterar. Non patitur D. Paulus vel seipsum vel angelum coelo audiri sine anathemate, aliud afferentem Evangelium quam ipsc docuerit: et nos Pontificem, Evangelium tot modis diversum statuentem, nondum anathemate explodimus e templo? imo, in templum Dei, atque in Christi vicem reponimus? Vis videre, illius atque Christi quam diversum sit Evangelium? Clamat sublimis Christi Apostolus, sub lege non esse nos sed sub gratia. Contra Pontificum tot leges, tot scita, jura, sanctiones, decreta, cautiones, articuli articulis sine fine cumulati, quid clamant aliud, quam sub

gratia non esse nos sed sub lege? Non fert in Evangelio Dominus frustra colerites Deum praeceptis et doctrinis hominum: contra sine iis frustra coli Deum putat ceremoniosus Pontifex, nec alia re fere pietatis metitur summam. Toties tamque graviter in eos effervescit igneus Apostoli spiritus, qui e libertate in quam vocati sunt ad egena mundi elements relabuntur, quibus denuo servire volunt, dies observantes, menses, tempora et annos. At quid aliud universa Pontificis tradit philosophia, quam elements mundi hujus obsoleta: Ne tetigeris, ne gustaris, ne contrectes: ham in his tribus illins omnis consumitur liturgia. State, inquit ille, in qua libertate vos liberavit Christus, et jugo servitutis nolite iterum contineri. Quid iste? Accipite, inquit, jugum castitatis, obedientiae et paupertatis, quod semel admissum nunquam deinde excutietis. Breviter, illius glossemata omnia, volumina et codices, quid ubique spirant, nisi servitutem? Quid in tots illins theologia libcrum? Tot argumentis infulcit Paulus, Christum in ils evacuari, qui in lege justificantur (Gal. v): Et tot suppliciis saevit Pontifex in eos, qui aliter quam admixtu legis gratuitam salutem statuunt. Melius est, inquit ille, nubere, quam uri. Affirmat hic, satius esse uri, qualm nubere. Propter fornitionem, suam cuique uxorem designat Apostolus: e diverso Pontifex fornicationem, modo cantata, apetro praefert matrimonio. Tam accurate literis Apostolicis praemonemur, novissimis temporibus affuturos, qui connubia, cibosque legitimos prohiberent, eorumque doctrinam daemoniorum appellat Paulus. Jamque haec ipsa non tempora solum, sed et doctrinas, et autores ipsos, ob oculos prsesentes cernimus, audimus quotidie, ac manibus fere terimus nostris: et tamen nae cavemus admoniti, nee instituti sapirons, denique nec luminihus nostris nae Apostolis Christi habemus fidcm. Clamat apud prophetam misericors Dei Spiritus: Misericordiam volo, non sacrificium. Reclamatpraepostera Pontificis religio: Sacrificium volo, non misericordism. Audiruns ex ore Domini semel atque iterum: Non facies tibi sculptile, nec omnem similitudinem. Contradicit Pontificis autoritas, statuens, mandans, interminans, indicto incendio supplicio, si quis contra imagines hiscere audeat. Denique quaqua versum res inter se conferamus, nihil in natura rerum dissimilius, qualm hujus cum Christo undique pugnans professio. Quae quum its sint, vestrae erit prudentice (ingenui Principes) vobiscum deliberare, quum utrique simul, in tanta diversitate toorum et disciplinae, favere, sine alterius injuria nequeatis, idne malitis, ut Christo magis an Pontifici vestra serviat antoritas. Nam si homines hi, in

quos saevit tantopere potestas vestra, non suam agant eausam sed Christi, non suum captent compendium, non vitam expetant, non tranquillitatem ambient, non opihus inhiunt, sed haec omnis studio Christi potius pro rejectis habeant, ut illius jus, non suum, cum Ecclesiae incolumitate retineatur: — cogitate, non tam illos esse, quam in ipsis Christum, in quem universa persecutionis vestrae consilia conspirant. Quod qualm diutumum sit futnrum, nescio: certie perpetuo vobis tutum esse non poterit. Nam utcunque nunc se habeant procemia, utut miseri ac imbelles videantur quos nunc opprimitis, tamen post epitasin tam turbulentam, catastrophe demum et exitus fabulae declarabit, nequaquam mise-rurn esse Eum et imbellem, qui in suis plectitur. Unde non tam ego crudelitatem deploro quorundam, quam stultitiam adverto, qui tanto eonatu pughaut contra eum, qui natura nec vinci, nae loco moveri potest: nihil agentes aliud, quam calaes jacent contra stimulum. Et quid unquam Pontilex de vobis tantum est bene meritus, si rem velimus ad calculos subducere, quamobrem tam derotis animis in illius conspiretis patrocinium? An unquam pro vobis mortuus est Romanus Pontifex? An vobis sedare iram Patris, an offensas condonare, an mortis acerbam, acerbiorem diaboli servitatem cervicibus vestris excutere, potentinto frangere, mortuos vos resuscitare ad regni sui immortalem foelicitatem potest? Et qui. haec unus potest omnia, quique se praestiturum pollicetur, quum nemo posset ahus, ejus vos desefta causa, tam sancta et mansueta, ad inimici impuri homuncionis perditissima castra, hoc est, ad vestram ultro perniciem sic ruitis praecipites? Solent, qui deserto imperatore suo ad adversarias partes desciscunt, allqua navatae militiae metcede attrahi. Vosque quid tandem emolumenti Pontifice homuncione vobis pollicemini, etiam quum in illius gratiam omnes piorum animas sub ara miseritis? Ut victoria una cum illo fruamini? Scitis victurum esse Agnum, invitis omnibus. Quin et nunc magnam quoque hujus sedis pattern debellatam cernitis, in tacito optimi cujusque pectore. Ut opibus vos augeat amplioribus? Imo has illi vos impenditis. Ut hbertatem largiatur? Majorem amittitis. Ut vitam reddat beatiorem? — quum Eum deseritis, qui solus est vitae autor. Et quid tandem homini possit ab homine contingere tanti, ut vos adversus Dominum incitet et adversus Christum ejus? Aiunt vulgo, multum valere fascinum. At quo tandem fascini genere sic corripiuntur Christianorum animi, ut in Romani nescio cujus barbari et externi homuncionis gratiara, qui nec cognitus nec cognatus ipsis vel profuit hactenus vel unquam profuturus est, in charissimos amicos,

propinquos, sanguine, patria communi, officiorum denique quotidiana necessitudine conjunctos, forsitan etiam bene meritos, plusquam parricidalibus odiis tam atrociter efferantur: idque non alia causa, quam qua summas illis deberent gratias, nisi sibi ipsis summam foelicitatem cum publica regni dignitate conjunctam inviderent!

Quamquam non tam haec generosis animis vestris, quam allis potius male feriatas quorundam ingeniis imputanda duxerim. De iis loquor, quos falso nomine theologos et episcopos, veto lupos, ursos, et leopardos-diceretis. Qui quum se lumina orbis profiteantur, omnes scintillas et vigorera verae pietatis extinguunt, natura saevi, religione praeposteri: quorum alteri Reipublicae, alteri Ecclesiae sint exitiales. Non perinde eodem omnes carbone notandi sunt. Neque enim aequum ruetit, quum non aequa endera in omnes competant, paucorum malitiosam improbitatem in torres ordinis redundare infamiam. Quin in hoc genere multos scio civiliores, quibus merito seditiosi caeterorum tumultus displicent: alii rident, quidam dissimulant, alii spe commodi, nonnulli metu aut favore privato verius quam iudicio applaudere videntur fabulae, quam inviti spectant: qui etsi errent cum caeteris, tamen quia simpliciter errant, et sine aliorum injuria, minus hac oratione mihi exagitandi sunt. Verum quemadmodum inter animantium (ut dixi) genera, quaedam innoxia, alia ad usus necessarios accommodata, nonnulla si non natura, officiiis tamen mansuescunt, sunt rursus quae in hoc tantum nata dicas, ut allis molestiam et perniciem moliantur: sic in humanis rebus nulla Respublica, nec vitae genus est, quod solum non vomicas habeat et *κακοβούλους*. Iterum atque iterum admoneo, non omnes esse istiusmodi: ne quisquam putet haec affectu magis quam iudicio in ordinis ullius dici contumeliam. Nam ut pro bonis libenter supplico, ira nec improbos nisi invitatus attingo: idque admonendi magis quam arrodendi studio, vitia scilicet hominum insectans, non homines: famosos enim libellos et desultorios, si quisquam odit alius, ego in primis detestor. Itaque in reprehensione tam necessaria, quum nemo se nominari videt, nemo se accusari putet. Et tamen utinam nulli essent istiusmodi, qui nunquam satis reprehendi mereantur, quum ipsi nihil sint quam faces et pestes reipublicae. De quorum turbe et immanitate si dicendum mihi tantum esset quantum deberem merito, efficerem forsitan oratione, ut nulla fera aut tygris vobis, si cum horum conferatur virulentia, non citius videri possit. Sed quid ego importunam horum crudelitatem, saevitiam,

superbiam, malitiam vobis depingam, Iudices, si haec ipsi non videaris? quaeso quid vox illius declaravit hominis (si non belluae magis), qui frequentissima conclone non ira pridem dixisse auditus est: Rempublicam illam nunquam sibi nec Reginae tranquillam fore, quoad, funditus ad internecionem deletis omnibus in Anglia Evangelicis, ne unus superesset virus.' Quasi non satis huc Reginae mens propenderet, nisi isti nimis velut cessantem instigarent. At cur non Alecto haec, cum tyranno illo, universae genti Britannicae unam optabat cervicem, quo, uno ictu Anglis semel extinctis omnibus, sola sibi omnes possideret mitras? Huc enim tanquam ad unicum suae foelicitatis scopum omnia tendunt studia istorum et cogitationes, nihil fere spitantes aliud quam bonorum caedem, quo ipsis impune regnare liceat. Zelum quidem ostendunt Dei, sed citra scientiam optimo cuique perniciosum. Charitatem lingua gerunt, factis nihil quaerunt nisi sanguinem fratrum et lanienam. Pietatis mire praetexunt studium: sed haec pietas sola in ceremonialis sita est, quas nec ipsi adeo magni faciunt. Sed vident isti ad quaestum suum oculatissimi Argi, ex his ceremoniis quam opimum metant lucrum. Vident hinc suppetere, unde alant aves, canes, caballos, famulitia, et Pamphilas fidicinas: unde satrapas et Lucullos agant, et reverendissimos titulos demereantur apud populum. Citius quam haec amittant, coelum et terram patientur misceri incendio. Dominari volunt quoquo modo, et haberi in precio. Unum obstare perspiciunt, bonorum et doctorum iudicia. Quoniam itaque, nisi ils sublatis, nihil se vident proficere (homines quippe per se abjectiores, quam ut quicquam Republica dignum praestent), tubam omnibus modis intendunt ad saevitiem; Mitissimos principum ammos, hoc est Reipublicae fontes, vitiant; Consilia instillant, non quae honesto, sed quae ventri suo ac compendio serviant: simile quiddam exercentes in rebus mortallure, quale Atae tribuit Homericam natratio. Et tamen haec carcinomata suum invenerunt seculum; invenerunt non solum qui fareant, sed etiam qui autoritate eos arment publica; hoc est, qui gladiron furiosi in manus porrigant. Quod si ita fatis ac divinae providentiae visum est, nos in posteriora haec tam turbulenta tempora (tot ante seculis ab Apostolis praevisa) incidere, in quibus violentiae et autoritati adversus innocentiam tanrum liceat, ferimus aequanimiter, et cedimus temporibus, Iudices. Sin aliquis adhuc locus prudentum consilii et bonorum votis relictus sit, id a vobis (nobilissimi Heroes) supplicabundi pro Christo expetimus atque obtestamur, malitiosam horum intemperiam vestra compescat autoritas: quo vel ab errore in viam respicere, vel ut

moderatius saltem rem agant, ita ut theologis dig-num est. Si haeresin putent quiequid aduersetur suis placitis, nihil ergo placeat, nisi quod rectum sit: nihilque exigant a populo, ultra salutis necessitatem rursus nec populus detrectet, quod citra impietatem praestare poterit. Ira fiet, ut dura civili temperamento utraque pars nonnihil concedit alteri, pax fortassis aliqua utrinque coeat, mea quidem ratione foelicus, quam violentis istis clamoribus, rabiosis insectationibus, fasciculis, carceribus, fumis et incendiis; quae multo gravius malum exasperant, cui mederi magis conveniebat. Scio gravem ortam in Ecclesia Christi tempestatem: sed quae paulo momento sedari initio potuisset, si viset impotens rabies quorundam abfuisset. Quin necdura adeo oranera exiit spem medelae recuperandae, modo relegatis affectibus prudens et temperata moderatio succedere possit in gubernacula. Sed ante omnia, si medelam cuplinus, a fonte ipso ordiendum erat, unde primum profluxit morbi occasio. Frustra tentat medicus vulneri obducere cicatricero, nisi prius repurgata sanie, quae ulceris radices obsidet. Provenit autem magna hujus tempestaris pars non aliunde quam ex corruptis judiciis, caecis affectibus, ambitione, fastu et philautia quorundam huc spectantium, magis ut ipsi autoritate dominantur, quam ut populus subjiciatur Jesu Christo. His principio rite perpurgatis fontibus facilius deinceps ad causas alias subnascentes progrediemur, quae mihi videntur in hominum inventis, et in multitudine traditionum atque articulorum sitae. quae quoniam fovendis dissidiis non mediocrem subministrant occasionem, proxima fuerit incendii extinguendi ratio, si materiam ipsam camino nimium conflagranti subtrahamus. tum si qua in his videbuntur controversa, in quibus non satis consentiant factionum partes, modesta velitatione res inter doctos transigatur. Ita fiet, ut mutua placabilitas aut exitum inveniat offensionum, aut ternpus tandem remedium afferat. Semper interim scholae suam retineant libertatem. Fustibus cogere tyrannorum est. Doceri amant conscientiae, vultque docere religio. Docendi porro efficacissimus magister est amor. Hic ubi abest, nunquam ibi quisquam vel docere dextre, vel quicquam percipi non sinistre poterit. In primis ab omni autoritate submoveantur seditiosa capita, et contentionis faces, nihil quaerentes aliud quam discordiae seminaria. Postremo, si alia ratione consentire nequeamus in illis quae sunt leviora, satis sit tamen in praecipuis fidel capitibus non dissentire. Leviora autem dico, quaecumque extra Scripturam inducuntur, quantumvis alioqui a magnis autoribus profecta. Quid pugnantius elementorum natura: et tamen quam amabili

faedere eadem in humano conjunguntur corpore? Ita quid obstat, quo minus in levioribus istis interdum dissentire liceat, incolumi interim atque irrupta Christianas amicitiae tessera? Magnus est gradus ad concordiam, ex animo voluisse concordiam. Nunc perinde rein agunt quidam, ac si nihil, vellent minus quam concordiam coalescere. quaeso quid erat necesse Bonorum tot articulorum rhapsodiis et evanidis nugis praeter necessitatem onerare Ecclesiae Dei, iis maxime temporibus tam exulceratis: quibus sciebat nihil aliud se profuturum, nisi ut Camerinam, jam plus satis perturbatam, majori patrias tumultu exagitaret? At quanto se dignius fecisset, si traditionum potius ejusmodi jactura patera redimeret Ecclesiarum; quum ex illa nihil accidere posset detrimenti, sine hac consistere Christi Ecclesia omnino nequeat. Haec atque alia, quae publicas concordias intersunt et tranquillitatis, quum in genere ad omnes bonos viros pertinent, quicumque rempublicam velint esse salvam, tum in primis per illos agenda erant, quibus ex professo creditum est ecclesiae procurandae negotium. Nunc quum in istis nulla spes ecclesiae in melius restituendae eluceat, imo quum non aliis magis autoribus debeamus hoc quicquid est incendii in republica acceptum; unum superest secundum Christum in terris perfugium, ut ad mitissima subsellia Clementiae vestrae, summi maximique Proceres, refugiamus, qui in republica hac (si modo respublica dicenda sit) quantum pro pietate velitis vestra, tantum pro autoritate efficere potestis. Quarum alteram a natura vestra, alteram a fortuna, utramque pariter a Domino accepistis, in hoc, non ut privatim vobis ipsis, sed rebus in commune publicis consuleretis. Ac de pietate quidem vestra initio orationis nihil me addubitare dixi, de qua nec adhuc addubito. De autoritate nunc extrema orationis parte quaedam vicissim, sed leviter, attingam; quo non solbin quid fieri a vobis oporteat, sed etiam quo pacto, quod velitis, efficiendum sit, intelligatis.

Sic enim in hac causa existimo, rebus sic undique profiigatis, in tam offusa patriae ac religionis caligine, aut nullam humani praesidii scintillam usquam apparere, aut eam in vestra solum ope inclusam contineri. Atque ut alia spes nulla est, quae hominum possit esse, praeterquam in vobis solis, Iudices; ita rursus unica duntaxat efficiendi ratio est, si quid omnino efficiendum Christi religionisque causa censeatis. Quae nisi adhibeatur, non solum vestra nihil praesidia, sed nec salus ipsa hanc servare rempublicam poterit. Non id nunc ago, nae eo specto, quo me dueret fortassis humana

ratio, aut pervulgata mundi consilia, ut ilico armis, copiis, aut fortitudine bellica, quantum valeatis adversus improbitatem experiamini. Etsi id quidem optimo jure vis istorum et effrenis ferocia promereatur, ut sireill quoque vi parique talione a nohilitate vestra retundatur; vobis tamen (Patres, Proceres) pro sapientia vestra cogi-tandum, non tam quid possitis, quam quid expediat: non quid hotum furor et projecta insania postulet, sed quid vos deceat, quidque causa sit ipsa dignum. Interim hoc loco, patrise et religionis negotium, quoniam natura dissimiles sunt, judicii causa secernimus. Quarum utraque quum opem vestram vehe-menter prassentem efflagitet, nos alteram studio, prudentiae, et fidel vestrae relinquimus, juxta parati vobiscum, vel si ilia pereat, perire, vel si per vos conservetur, vobiscum sinul et cum illa emergere. In altera, quoniam coepi-mus operam implorare vestram, consilium etiam quonam pacto cam aptissime porrigatis ostendimus: non ut armis (ut dixi), retro, viribus, potentia Reginam vestram velitis, etsi maxime possitis, lacessere; sed precibus magis, votisque simul junctis, et consiliis sollicitetis. Nec quisquam enim dubitot, utcunque voluntatem alienam a re Evangellea prae se ferat, quin vestrae tamen obtesta-tioni aures praebeat obsequaces: primum quae eo sexu procreata sit, ut faemina quum sit, non silex, fiaeti ac molliri queat: tum ils majoribus, talique nobilitate producta, ut natura pariter et voluntate amans sit nobilitatis. Cui deinde printer haec adminicula acaedit insuper, quod nuper audio in Anglia nonnihl demure interquiescere persecutionis acerbitatem. In qua mansuetudine si pergat ita, ut coepisse fertur, Regina, haud multum desperandum video, quin cum paterni regni successione, nomen quoque suis dighum majoribus relinquat posteris. Jam haec heroica in Regina indoles, quum nunquam tam aspera fuisset, ut arbitror, in Christi plebem, nisi quorundam sinistris consiliis magis quam sua voluntate abducta; quumque eadem nunc, sua sponte, etiam utcunque serenitate non abhorrere videatur; quid tum futurum existimemus, si ad hanc naturas propensionem vestre porro praces, suasiones, consiliaque se adjunxerint? Sed ad eam rem pernecessarium fuerit illud in primis, quod unum omnium maxime ad vestram simul et patriae salutem attinet, ut vos qui coryphaei sitis Britannicae nobilitatis, cum vitro seria resipiscentia, concordia simul mutuo charitatis et virtutis nexu conjungat. Emendatis primbin aderit Dei, secundans consilia vestra, favor. Concordes porro Maria regina amplectetur lubentius: denique ita consiliis eadem impensius acquiescet. Parum adhuc dico: addo quod a me hoc quidera tempore necessario, pro

vobis etiam utiliter, dictum posthac comperietis — Supplex etiam ultro aderit, ad omnem voluntatem vestram parata, si vos stabili consensu inter vos cum virtute concordetis, eadem velle eademque ratione in republica conspexerit. Contra, si discordia diffunditur, facile vos singulos contempserit: vixque jam unusquisque vestrum, recisus veluti potentia vestrae nervis, virtute, plus quam quisque de ima multitudine gregarius valebit. Facile ex printeris longo intervallo rebus, quid nunc consimilibus temporibus sit expectandum, judicari, potest: si prudentes modo, etiamsi non vates simus. Nam, ut ultra a Casilvellani temporibus rem repetamus, quae res jam olim reipublicae hujusce libertatem Romanis prodidit imperatoribus, nisi distracta inter se ducum et nobilium Britannorum potestas? Quae res alia Pictos, Gallos, Seythas, et Scotos induxit? Praetereamus illa majorum nostrorum tempora, et ruinas tum regni hujus, quae quoniam bene sopitae sunt, praestat nunc non refricare. Succedunt post haec furiosae Danorum semel atque iterum irruptiones: nec multo post Normannici victoris tempestas secuta est. Semper haec fuit Insulae hujus fortuna quaedam propria et conditio, ut quamdiu conjunctis simul viribus ipsa sibi cohaerens eum virtute et concordia viveret, nihil ea firmiter adversus omnem hostilem impetum: contra, ubi interna discordia dissiliret, nihil eadem unquam impotentius ad levissimas etiam calamitates reprimendas, sive quae ab externis hostibus imminerent, sive quae ad internam religionis discordiam pertinerent.

Ego, quum perlectis Annalibus vestris fortunam hujus perpendo Reipublicae, gravem profecto necessitatem fuisse video, cur a majoribus nostris, sapientissimis viris, singularis potestatis forma haec, quae nunc est, constituta, atque ex Heptarchia in Monarchiam commutata sit. Quae nulla est, fateor, constitutio ad Rempublicam gerendam accommodatior aut expeditior, maxime si talis contingat Princeps, qui se intra virtutis ac modestiae leges contineat, possitque sese non minus quam alios regere. Verum rursus quum animadverto, quam graves saepe turbines excitare in Republica possit monarcha, si immoderatus sit, quatoque praecipue subinde fertur in tyrannidem, immuto iterum voluntatem, ut nihil existimem perniciosius bonorum capitibus, quam illud quod apud Poetam est, εἰς κóϊρανός ἔστω. Quaeso enim, in tali imperio quantum ad civium salutem interest, apertusne hostis grassetur foris, an tails intus foveatur Princeps, cui quum nihil daest ad laedendum praeter occasionem, ea tum

accedit ad pravam voluntatem autoritas, ut nihil libeat tam turpe, quod non impune liceat? Nisi quod illic fortiter dimicando cum periculo decernere miseri, hic vaeorditer jugulum praebere miseriores, coguntur cives. Atque hae quidem difficultates et discrimina, non dubium, quin multo ante a prudentissimis viris et scriptoribus perspecta fuerint, qui in constituenda Republica monarchiam laudaverunt. Eamque ob causam sapientissime ab iisdem priscis philosophis acutissimisque homothetis factum arbitror, qui rem politicam in tria partiti genera (ἄρχοντικὸν, συμβουλευτικὸν, βάνανσον) publicam hanc et senatoriam nobilitatem semper cum monarchia conjunxerunt, quae partim autoritate legitima, partim sapientia et consiliis Principis, si plus nimio difflueret, impotentes cupiditates temperarent. Atque ob hoc ipsum maxime adjunctum videtur cum monarchia medium, et interjectum illud inter plebem et principem genus, quod Nobilitatem regni, seu Consilium dicimus, quippe ne quid vel alteri patti quod iniquum sit, vel alteri mrsus quod sit tumultuosum, liceat. Quo demum temperamento fiet, ut quae duo maxima in omni Republica incommoda, et solae fere pestes sunt, utrinque excludantur, tyrannis et seditio. Scio equidem et fateor, meum non esse viris summatibus et consiliariis, multo minus Principibus, quid faciendum sit dictare; insaniam enim, si in mentem id unquam veniat. Caeterum, quoniam in religionis nunc rebus versamur, in quibus usus, meditatio, aetas et experientia mediocris aliquid fortasse vobiscum me docuerunt, audacius, si non hortandi, at supplicandi, necessario impositum hoc tempore officium assumo.

Inter quos omnes tuam in primis Celsitudinem Augustissimam compello, Maria Regina, ut tandem aliquando post longas tempestates acerbissimorum temporum, aliquam serenitatem patrum indulgeat lux Clementiae tum. quae-cunque illa causa fuit, quae nobilissimum animum tuum sic in tuorum exasperavit caedem, certe non id babes ex natura tua, non generis tui, non ex professione illius, quem pro nobis occidit Pharisaeorum persecutio. Crede, crede mihi, Maria Regina, non hic potestatis gladius tibi Deo adversus istos donatus est, quos tantopere persequeris, sed alios: sicarios, homicidas, adulteros, latrones, perjuros, blasphemos, idolatros, lenones, rebelles. Hi sunt pestes illin et strumae Reipublicae, qui religionem Dei violant, qui regni tui infestant statum denique qui tibi vere non favent, nisi tu Deo tuo omnino non faveas. Ob hos existima malefactores datum esse ac institutum a Deo potestatis tuae

exercendae gladium, non hos qui nihil commeruere. Quanquam de causa illorum, quo-niam dictum est satis, nunc apud tuam Celsitudinem non disputo; quos utcunque Majestas tua habet pro haereticis, tamen quia fieri possit, ut aliter videatur Majestati divinae, praestiterat tam sublimes controversias illius relinquere ju-dicio. Interim tibi quando obsequentissimi sunt ex animo subditi, certe san-guini et vitae parcendum erat, satis per se superque multis insidiis et casibus subjects, etiam si nos mutuo non devoremus. Intelligit enim quod res est sublimis tug prudentia, quum multa hominibus largiri opulenta tua possit foelicitas, vitam facile multis eripere, nemini ereptam restituere poteris. Unde merito laudata est divina illa Theodosii junioris vox, qui ab amicis incitatus, ut obtraetantium et inimicorum quosdam mortis vindicaret supplicio — Imo, inquit, utinam vel mortuos mihi in lucem revocare liceat. Atque ille aperte, etiam Imperator, condonavit noxiis. Nec minus laudis et pietatis plena Alexandri verba extiterunt, qui matri Olympiadi per novem menses sollicitanti ad quendam occidendum, humanissime respondens, Aliam quamcunque postulate mercedem jussit, hominis vitam hullo pensari posse beneficio.

Quanquam si exemplis utendum, quo nobis oculi potius flectendi, quam ad Deum, verurn omnis virtutis archetypum? Qui cum passim multis Scripturge verbis, pluribus vero exemplis nos a saevitia ad clementiam revocat, tum illud unum e libro Reg. ii. attentiore paulim consideratione tua quaeso advertat sublimitas: ubi ob Davidis peccatum ultio divina in Israellem vehementius con-flagrusset, ac jam oceisis millibus aliquot angelus adhuc desaevire voluisset, quid Ille? num jussit progredi, nullumque misericordiae sibi locum reservavit Divina pietas? Non opinor. Nequaquam in perpetuum irascitur Ille, nec in internurn comminabitur. Quid ergo? In Scriptura quid audimus? Misertus est, inquit, Dominus super afflictionem, et ait angelo percutienti populum, Sufficit, nunc contine manurn tuam. Libet enim Scripturge verba ipsa adscribere, quo non solum clarius ipsa in oculos incurrant, sed perpetual in animo tuo circumferantur. Atque utinam nunc Dominus misertus similiter Ecclesiae suae, idem vicissim tibi, Maria Regina, quod tum angelo percussori, dicat, Sufficit, reprime nunc manurn tuam. Nec dubium, quin file tacitis susurris tibi intus in animo insibilet, Satis est. Sed vereor ne quidam sint istic Spenserii, pessimo-rum consiliorum architecti, qui longe diversa cantione circumsonantes aures tuas, nequaquam illud salutiferum Dei melos (“ Sufficit”) occinunt, sed

Babylonium potius illud e Psalmo seditiosa buccina increpitant — “ Exinanito, exinanito usque ad fundamentum in ea,” etc.: a quibus ego nocentissimis viperis Longissime tibi, Maria Regina, fugiendum censeo. Quin et vos deinde, praestantissimi Heroes, qui proximo autoritatis loco succeditis, appello: adeste consiliis jam nunc vestris. In hoc omnes incumbite junctissimis animis, pro fide, autoritate et diligentia vestra, ne quid dormitantibus vobis detrimenti capiat Respublica; ne quid publicis rebus male sit, dum vestris consultum sit bene. Si vos Divina beneficentia tot tantisque prudentia dotibus imbuit, ut possitis — si Respublica in eum vos locum posuit, ut debeatis — in commune quae sint optima consulere; agnoscite igitur officium vestrum, velitisque quod agnoscitis ut Christo suum jus, ut Principi sua dignitas, ut populo sua incolumitas sarta tectaue retineatur. Quod si humana nulla sapientia futurum arbitremini, ut tanta haec religionis dissidia, quibus sic omnes regni hujus partes corripiuntur in concordiam coeant; attamen illustre vobis documentum regendae Reipub. aperuit Serenissimus rex Edouardus, qui duas simul diversissimas factiones summa cum moderatione regere et continere potuit. Et qui minus idem a vobis pari temperamento praestari possit? Quid erat necesse hunc Ecclesiastiae contentionis funem utrinque intendi tam acriter, ut jam neutri parti liceat per alteram eadem in Respublica vivere? Qui si eo spectetis, hucque omnes conatus viresque vestras convertendas statuitis, ut diversam doctrinam hanc, quam haeticam dicitis, funditus e medio sublatam aboleatis, credite, credite hoc mihi, Judices, latius ea propagata est, ac profundius insidet, quam ut ulla humana potentia, omnibus pariter collatis copiis, dissipari queat. Sedet quippe ea non in labris, non oculis, aut corporibus hominum externis; sed intus in conscientiis, in abditissimis animi sedibus, quam longissime a conspectu vestro reclusa reconditur; eruptura demum sua aliquando occasione, idque tanto vehementius, quanto nunc ferocius temporum violentia reprimatur. Postremum aut cum illa Divina simul Scripturae fundamenta convellere, aut cum hac illam retinere necesse erit. Quod quum ita sit, quanto magis erat, aliquam inveniri moderationis viam, qua vel si res incerta sit libram subeat cognitionem, vel si certa, ut ea pars vincat, non quae major, sed quae melior; non quam hominum praejudicia, sed quam voluntas Dei Scripturaeque dictamen comprobet. Porro si vobis tantum non insit doctrinae, ut de tam arduis Scripturae controversiis constituatis, proximum est, eos adhiberi in consilium, quorum iudicio et spectatae doctrinae fidatis

tuto. Nunc quae id est, quod quum dura sint in vobis factiones, quarum utriusque perpenditis studia, consilia, affectus quo tendant, iis qui pro homine Pontifice depugnant, quam qui pro Christo Filio Dei moriuntur, malitis credere? At quanto erat hoc loco et autoritate vestra dignius, vos, qui ceterarum rerum gloria anteitis, iisdem quoque ornamentis literarum adungere adminicula, sine quibus manca et elumbis est prudentia vestra, quantumvis alioqui eximia. Quam ad rem si non usus vitae vestrae, si non consilia mea, si non clarissimi et disertissimi viri G. Turneri salutaris illa, quam pro officio et fide nuper vobis propinavit, medicina, inficiet — exempla saltem Germanica hujus caeterarumque gentium permoveant. In quibus nullus fere accedit ad Rempublicam magistratus, literarum non minus praesidiis, quam muneris dignitate conspicuus. Aut sine haec quidera tot tantaque philtra animos vestros ad doctrinae studia accendant, quin aliena manu quam oculis propriis regi malitis, saltem divini verbi volumina in manus sumite, quae in hoc vos negotio abunde instruant. Ac sine id quidera per otia, lusus, aleas, choreas, venationes, aucupia, impetrari [non] poterit: attamen vel civilis vestra haec, qua polletis, prudentia, vel communis sensus, ex successu rerum argumentum capiat, quid de tota hac doctrinae ratione judicandura sit. Nam cum inde ab initio Christi semper doctrina vim hujus mundi sustinuit, tum his maxime temporibus eadem ipsa, invidioso nunc Lutheri nomine a plerisque insimulata, quoties per Pontifices, Caesares, Cardinales, Tetrarchas, tribunos passim, omnibus conjunctis copiis et consiliis, ex quo primam e squallore in laem se proferre coepit, impetita est, si quid humana vis adversus eam valisset? Caereram ut mirabilis foelicitate sua hactenus contra omnes procellas humanas inconcussa victrixque emerit; ira nae dubitandum, quin hanc quoque vim vestram non dissimili eventu tandem aliquando exeutiet; locque majori triumpho, quo validius nunc oppressa h vobis, occumbere videatur. Solet quippe brachram Domini sic in hoc mundo ludere: qui ut rebus plerumque profiigatissimis affulget maxime, ita saepe humana molimina in uberiores suae victoriam laudem convertit.

Quapropter agite summi maximique Proceres, si frustra niti humanam opem adversus consilia Dei intelligatis, si successus ipse satis vos commoneat, hoc quicquid est, absque Numine non agi, quod geritur; si tires vestri hi quos persequimini nihil in vos unquam, nihil in Rempublicam, addo, minus in Deum commerere; si nullis inimici sint, nisi iis quos

Christus ipse habeat adversarios: quin si gratiam potius eosdem inire apud vos, quam supplicia subire, par erat pro innocentia; si denique haereticos ipsos non rei veritas, sed Episcoporum (non omnium sed) paucorum impotens ambitio, effrenis saevitia, corruptaque judicia efficiant — vos oro pro virtute et nobilitate vestra, si abetrent, ut instituantur fatitc; sin minus, parcat innocentira misericordia vestra. Satis jam tumultu-atum, satis fustum est Christiani sanguinis: satis ultioni, affectibus, privatisque emolumentis vestris darren est: denique satis vigilantia dormitavit, nimiumque diu vestra jacuerunt pectora. Nunc tempus est, si qua in animis vestris vigeat fratrum charitas, si quis patriae communis vos sensus tangat, ut posthabitis rebus vestris, Reipub. negotium, si unquam alias, agatis strenue: nisi non solam cum religione pattiare, sed vos etiam una cum patria, velitis corfucute concidere. Quanquam nihil equidem minus suspicor, quam Reipublicum studium vobis deesse, aut curam: quorum neminem esse scio, qui non votis omnibus Rempublicam esse salvam cuplat. Sed aliud in vobis deesse video. Quid enim distractis adeo, et dissilientibus animis, fieri a vobis Republica dignum poterit, dum multi vestrum proditoriis insidiis in alios grassantur, multi metu mussitant, quisque diffidit alteri, nemo verurn dicit, sibi unusquisque timer, plerique aperte adulantur; postremo, dum quisque sibi privatim vivit, quae publici sunt officii perpauci cogitant, pauciores curant, paucissimi aut nulli praestant. Itaque fit, ut Respublica publicis veluti patronis deserta, vos fere etiam deserere nuuc ipsa, nulla re alia magis quam vestra ipsorum negligentia et supinitate, cogatur. quae si ils duntaxat, quos deseritis, periculosa esset, minus erat vobis laborandum: nune — eadem nullis unquam fuit, nescio quo pacto, quam vobis ipsis infoelicior. Reputate enim cum animis vestris: longa non est memoria, quanta his annis quadraginta ordini vestro et nobilitati clades accepta sit, quot Illustrissimorum Ducum capita desiderata, quot nobilissimae inter vos familiae e sublimi dejectae gradu, et solo nunc adaequatae obsoluerunt. Possent ex Annalibus multa hic proferri, sed ea cogitationi vestrae malim relinquere. Illud inter alia quale nuper spectaculum praebuit, quum, spectantibus vobis et conniventibus, clarissimus et mansuetissimus Regis avunculus, idemque Protector Regni, Dux Somersetensis tam nulla causa, et praeter Principis voluntatem, ad lictorem abduceretur? Nec tam ignari fuistis, quin Regem ipsum eodem tempore sumtoo versari in discrimine intelligeretis: ubi si evigilasset, ut par erat, autoritas vestra, nunquam in hunc paroxysmum haec esset Respublica devoluta. Sed haec quae tempore

praeterierunt, nos quoque oratione praetereamus. Nunc verb, si unquam alias, majorera in modum vestra evigilet prudentia opus est, cum propria non parum, tum maxime subditorum causa. Sique patrim communis vos non conjungit charitas, at idem conjungat Redemptor Christus; sal-tern idem hostis, et periculum jungat commune. Quid enim? An nullos esse existimatis, qui non illos solum propter religionem, sed vos etiam propter fortunas istas et sedes vestras, extinctos cupiant? Quamobrem ut finem nunc supplicandi faciam, quod supra et tories dixi, idem repeto. Si tam vilem hahearls civium vestrorum sanguinem, si nihil vos moveant tot hominum gemitus, querelae, lachrymae, bonorum miseriae; at vestra simul cum illis conjuncta fortuna flectat. Sin vero ulla subit animos vestros Reipublicae charitas, si quod patrim studium maneat, si quid preces nostrae, si quid bonorum supplices manus, si quid denique Reipublicae, si quid Ecclesiae Christianae, quam advolutam genibus vestris putetis, fiebilis querela valeat — Rhadamantheam vestram appello pietatem, ut pluris sit apud vos salutis publicae conservatio, quam privatus quorundam affectus; nec quid possit pro imperio autoritas, sed quid aequitas potius civibus debeat vestra, consideretis. Nihil enim in omni officiorum genere aequius fieri arbitror, quam ut quorum vos patres patria conscribit, eos in filiorum loco ascitos tueamini: quique suam in vos omnem reverentiam ac dignitatis auctoramenta transferunt, iidem a vobis salutis ac tranquillitatis vicissim accipiant incolumitatem. Aut sine haec tot charitatis argumenta communisque patriae respectus vos adeo attingat, at quid vobis ipsis dignum, quid generosa ac heroica sanguinis vestri nobilitas tacito quodam sensu vobis suggerat, attendite. Nam quum inter humanos omnes affectus nihil sit tam hominis proprium quam clementia, qua Divinae naturae omnes imaginem referimus: tum a vobis, Illustrissimi Heroes, qui sublimiori in his terris gradu ad Illurn proplus acceditis, multo magis idem sane ab omnibus expectari convenit, maxime etiam sentiri hoc tempore necessarium.

An edition of the foregoing Appeal of Foxe to the Nobility of England, was printed, in small 8vo, “per Joan. Oporinum, Basileae, Anno Salutis humanae MDLVII. mense Martio.” There is a copy of it in the British Museum.

NOTE. — Through an oversight, the following Nos. in the foregoing Appendix have not been referred to in the corresponding pages of the “Life.” — Nos. II. III. IV. VI. VII. IX. XI. XII. XVI. XVII.

# COMMENTARI

## RERVM IN ECCLESIA GE.

**FLARUM MAXIMARUMOS; PER TOTAM EUROPAM,  
PERFECUTIO NUM A VUICLEUI TEMPORIBUS AD HANC ULOS  
AETATE DEFERIPTIO.**

## LIBER PRIMAS.

*Autore Ioanne Foxo Anglo.*

Hiis IN CALCE ACCESSE runt Aphorifmi Ioannis vuicleni, cum cola  
lectaneus quibufdam, Reginaldi Pecoki Epic feopi ciceftrenfis.

**Item, Οπισγογραφία quaedam ad Oxonienfes,**

## ARGENTORATI

**EXCUDEBAR VUENDELINUS RIBELIUS ANNO M, D, LIIII.**

# ACTES

## AND

# MONUMENTS

**OF THESE LATTER AND PERILOUS DAYS TOUCHING  
MATTERS OF THE CHURCH,**

*wherein are comprehended and described the great persecutions & horrible troubles, that haue bene wrought and practised by the Romishe Prelates, speciallye in this Realme of England and Scotlande, from the yeare of our Lorde a thousande, unto the tyme nowe present.*

**GATHERED AND COLLECTED ACCORDING TO THE**

*true copies and wrytinges certifiestorie as, a el of the parties themselues that sutfered as also out of the Bishops Registers. which wet the doers therof;*

**BY**

**JOHN FOXE.**

**IMPRINTED AT LONDON BY IOHN DAY,**

*dwellyng ouer Aldersgate.*

**CUM PRIUILEGIO REGLE MAJESTATIS.**

## THE PREFACES,

AD

### DOMINUM JESUM CHRISTUM

SERVATOREM CLEMENTISSIMUM, EUCHARISTICON

## JOHANNIS FOXI.

CONFECTO nunc opere, quod tuis primum auspiciis ac voluntate aggressus, summe et adorande Jesu, idemque Servator clementissime, inchoavi, quodque demum beneficio ac favore exegi atque absolvi, printer omnem aertam opinio-hem et vires meas: superest itaque pro officio meo ut animula haec, ceu pro votiva tabula, gratias, si non quantas debeat (utinam enim id possit) at quantas queat maxima, munificentissimm tuae persolvat Majestati; quae tam miserurn homuncionem, vel sypbar potius hominis, in laboribus tot tantisque istis, qui vol asellum quemvis ἀχθοφόρον possent conficere, tumultuantem, benigno successu ac solario tam clementer suffulserit. Quanquam autem de operis dlfficultate nihil hic causari attinet, quae vix aestimari a multis poterit; tua tamen non ignorat omnipotens Majestas, hujus qualaeunque sit negotii con-fectio, quibus quamque non ferendis curls, vigiliis, molestiis constitit; quibus nuUo modo pares futuri essemus, nisi laventis gratim tum humeri affulsisset, ac sese quodammodo admiscuisset operi, Quidni enim fatear ac tester ingenue quod re ipsa experti sumus? Persensimus enim, peneque oculis ipsis conspeximus, singularem excelsae dextrae tuae ἐνεργείαν, non modo in successu negotii provehondo, sod in vita etiam spirituque: inter labores conservando. Tui igitur muneris est, clementissime Jesu, quod opus tuis susceptum auspiciis huc usque prorectum sit. Nos vicissim, quod nostri sit officii, gratias clementiae tuae cum nostro privatim, tum publico quodammodo ecclesiae tuae nomine, agimus. Vol hinc enim cornlinus quanti causam martyrum tuorum aestimes, quando eorum illustrando nomini tanta faveas

propensione; quanquam vero si nulla hic extaret eorum recordatio, non possent non omnibus modis esse illis-trissimi, quorum sint nomina vitae tum libro inscripta: et tamen voluit hoc modo tua declarare Majestas, nobisque innotescere hominibus, quam honorificum sit pro tui nominis gloria fortiter dimicantes occumbere, quorum tu vitam a cinere ac rogo sic vindicas, sic causam tueris, sic dignitatem illustras, ut eandem cum gloriae foenote abs te recipiant clariorem, quam si ipsi nunquam alioqui perdidissent. Habet siquidem peculiare hoc sibi millitum ratio, longe a mundo hoc diversum, quod in castris tuis militantes sive vivant, sive moriantur, multo clarescant a funere foeliciter, quam si vixissent maxime.

Sic Cranmerum videmus, Ridleyum, Latimerum Johannem Hooperum Bradfordum caeterosque ejusdem decurim pugiles, quanto majore occubuisse cum gloria in acie tua depugnantes, quam si, relicta statione in qua erant collocati, saluti ipsi suae causam tuam postposuissent, Quae enim gens, quae natio, quae temporum vetustas, quae hominum posteritas, eorum non cantabit laudes, non virtutem agnoscet, non magnitudinem admirabitur? Quis Wiclevum unquam, aut Cobhamum, natum fuisse existimasset, nisi tua in causa tam egissent strenue? Quanto honori illud Hussio Bohemensi, nostroque Tindalo fuit, quod vitam in evangelii tui causa perditam, magis abs te recipere, quam ipsi retinere maluerint? Spectemus e diversa parte adversarios tuos, quorum tam multas esse constat caedes, injurias, crudelitates adversus tuos, multaque item occulte et scelestae ab iisdem perpetrata, quae nunquam sperabant fore palam: et tamen quid unquam in angulis et tenebris ab illis est designatum tam occulte adversus ecclesiarum, quod non in apertum produxit tua productaque providentia? Atque ita produxit, ut unde ipsi laudis sibi conceperunt animo opinionem, inde summum sibi-ipsis dedecus pepererint et contumeliam, quam nec vita effugere, nec morte unquam finire poterint. Quis Guisos, Boneros, Storios, Gardineros, tanquam execranda hominum nomina nunc non novit? non exhorret? quis eorum facinora obliverebit dies, aut sepeliet memoria? Et quid hos in tanta multitudine hostium tuorum recenseo? Cui unquam prospere cessit tuo rebel-lare numini, aut hostium se ecclesiae tuae profiteri? Papae nomeum quam erat aliquando in his tetrabre aelebre et gloriosum? Nunc quid putidius, quid probrosius? Cardinalitium fastigium coeperunt primo admirari homines, multaque prosequi reverentia sic monachorum et nonnarum collegia suum quondam habebant plausum

apud plebem simplicem et credulam. At postquam sprete veritate tua coeperunt grassari contra te, tuorumque homicidise fieri, eo tandem sunt prolapsi (exceptis paucis quos tua exemit gratia) ut reliqua faex nihil aliud jam esse praeter vocabula quaedam ad ignominiam relicta videatur.

Haec nimirum, sanctissime Domine ac Deus noster! justissimi iudicii tui sunt praeludia, ex quo haud difficile aestimare sit, quidnam in altero illo expaetaturi sint, quos in hoc ipso seculo, hoc est, in suo ipsorum regno, tanta accumulata infamia et dedecore. Sed omissis his, ad sanctos tuos redeamus martyres, quorum nomine merito a nobis perenne velut sacrificium laudis et gratiarum tuse debetur, simul et habetur, bonitati. Primum, quod in ecclesiae tuae causa dimicantibus tam fortem et alacrem spiritum omnibusque tormentis maiorem adversus parricidas papistas subministrasti. Deinde quod et nobis in istorum desudantibus historia propitius adeo clementiae tuse favor affuerit. Debetur et hoc privatim meo quoque nomine singulari tuse pietati, quod vitam toties alioqui nutantem in hac tanta, quantam tu solus novisti, laboris immensitate conservatam tuo voveris beneficio. Verum illud imprimis omnes debemus pariter effusissimo tuo in nos amori, quod beatorum martyrum tuorum, quos mundi hujus ad flammam et cineres adegerit perversitas, causam et innocentiam, velut e cinere recollectam, in lucem denuo notitiamque ecclesiae tuae revocare ac patefacere dignatus sit. Etsi enim dubium non est, quin in supremo illo iudicio tuo, quum virtutes coelorum movebuntur, omnis eorum adamussum excutietur causa ante tribunal tuum, est tamen aliquid hic quoque in ecclesia tua causam ipsorum, facta, vitseque virtutes caeteras non ignorari. Tunc autem ad illos uberior gloria, ad nos interea major redundabit fructus, quando ex ipsorum recte factis, integritate, innocentia, fide, ac patientia constare poterit, non quid ipsi solum fecerint, sed quid et nobis eorum sit exemplo faciendum.

Sed hic rursus, dulcissime Jesu! opus est benigno favoris tui praesidio. Nos enim qui filii martyrum tuorum sumus, quosque maxime majores nostros imitari conveniebat, nunc nihil fere parentum tenemus, praeter vitse solam hanc, quam suo partem sanguine reliquerunt, libertatem: qua etiam ipsa nimium abuti-tour intemperanter, ut jam periculum sit, ne non filii modo martyrum, sed ne fratres quidem ipsorum haberi mereamur. Quantum enim intersit discriminis, quamque prorsus disconveniat ordine toto nostra consuetudo ab illorum vestigiis et disciplina, pudet profecto referre. Sed

quid ego tibi referam, cujus nihil non perspicit Majestas ac intuetur, quanto illis studio ac curse fuit amore tui caetera quaeque adeoque seipsos ad vitae etiam contemptum abdicare, mundum cum omnibus desideriis flocci facere, voluptates tanquam nugas spernere? Nec sinebant pericula undique imminencia opibus congerendis, multoque minus honoribus cumulandis vacare. Contra vero, nostra nunc vita, studium, omnisque adeo contentio, quid nisi mundum spirat, quid aliud quam perpetuum quoddam fluxarum rerum, opum, ac honorum aucupium videtur et ambitus? Ac illi quam praeclare secum actum putassent, si vel vivere modo licuisset. Ideoque multi fuere eorum, qui Mariae reginae facultates et possessiones omnes adusque extremum assem obtulerunt, dummodo solam ipsis remitteret conscientiam. Et quae nos tanta haec habendi intemperies exagitat, quibus nec unus nec mediocris victus possit esse satis? Sine modo, sine fine, opibus, sacerdotiis, censuique dilatando inhiamus. Quanto ambitu amicos fatigamus et inimicos, non ut vivamus solum, verum ut sublimes vivamus et honorati? De fide, de mansuetudine eorum, tolerantia, simplicitate, ac patentia incredibili, quid dici satis potest? Quanta constantia qua animi alacritate perpassi sunt quicquid infligebatur, vindictam oranera Deo remittentes, eui et causam commendabant? Nulla vis eos adversariorum dejicere, nec minae frangere, non ludibria movere, non pericula, non tormenta ulla consternere, nec delinire blanditiae potuerunt.

Componamus nunc nostram cum his mollitiem. Sed pudor prohibet. Nam quae tam levis nos tentationis aura afflare possit, quae non illico praecipites ac transversos rapiat in avaritiam, in fastum, voluptates, turpitudinem, vindictam, et in quid non malorum? Quae tam levis objiei poterit injuriola, pro qua non coelum terrae miscemus, mariaque turbamus ab imo? Ex quo in promptu est colligere, quantum ab eo absumus, ut mortem simus unquam tua causa subituri, si quando res martyrrium flagitet, quum nec affectus quidem istos tuo am-putare jussu velimus. Quapropter ut martyrum quidera illorum causa gratias agoimus nomini tuo sancto; ita nostra vicissim causa depraeamur, ut qui largitus sis ipsis vincendi facultatem, nobis itidem pia eorundem exempla imitandi felicitatem aspires, sicque ecclesiae tuae affulgeat tua gratia; nec ubi sedueti hujus mundi illecebris, socordiores ipsi in retinenda evangelii tui victoria, quam illi in comparanda strenui, videamur. Postremo, quoniam historiam hanc tuo nutu ac voluntate aggressi, in ea re operam studiumque posuimus,

quo facta gestaue sanetorum tuorum, sanctissime Jesu! ad nominis tui gloriam et in commodum ecelesiae publicum emergerent, adde nunc labori fructum, simulque historiae rutelam in te raeipias magnopere petimus; cui et opus ipsum totumque me ipsum, quem tot modis tuae misericordiae debeo, toto corpore et anima totisque viribus commendo, dedico, consecroque: cui omne cadat genu, omnisque vox et lingus confessionis gloriam per omnes ecclesias tribuat personetque! Amen.

**TO THE**

**RIGHT VIRTUOUS, MOST EXCELLENT, AND  
NOBLE PRINCESS,**

**QUEEN ELIZABETH,**

Our dread Lady, by the Grace of God, Queen of England, France, and Ireland, Defender of Christ's Faith and Gospel, and principal Governor both of the Realm, and also over the said Church of England and Ireland, under Christ the Supreme Head of the same, etc., JOHN FOXE, her humble Subject, wisheth daily increase of God's Holy Spirit and Grace, with long Reign, perfect Health, and joyful Peace, to govern his Flock committed to her Charge; to the Example of all good Princes, the Comfort of his Church, and Glory of his blessed Name.

CHRIST, the Prince of all princes, who hath placed you in your throne of majesty, under him to govern the church and realm of England, give your royal highness long to sit, and many years to reign over us, in all flourishing felicity, to his gracious pleasure, and long lasting joy of all your subjects. Amen!

When I first presented these Acts and Monuments unto your majesty (most dear sovereign, queen ELIZABETH our peaceable Salome! ), which your majesty's rare clemency received in such gentle part, I well hoped that these my travails in this kind of writing had been well at an end, whereby I might have returned my studies again to other purposes after mine own desire, more fit than to write histories, especially in the English tongue. But certain evil-disposed persons, of intemperate tongues, adversaries to good proceedings, would not suffer me so to rest, fuming and fretting, and raising up such miserable exclamations at the first appearing of the book, as was wonderful to hear. A man would have thought Christ to have been new-born again, and that Herod, with all the city of Jerusalem, had been in an uproar. Such blustering and striving was then against that poor book through all quarters of England, even to the gates of Louvain, so that no English Papist:, almost in all the realm,

thought himself a perfect catholic, unless he had cast out some word or other to give that book a blow.

Whereupon, considering with myself what should move them thus to rage, first I began with more circumspect diligence to overlook again that I had done. In searching whereof I found the fault, both what it was, and where it lay; which was indeed not so much in the book itself (to say the truth) as in another certain privy mystery and working of some; of whom John of Aventine shall tell us in his own words, and show us who they be:

“Quibus,” says he, “audiendi quae fecerint pudor est, nullus faciendi quae audire erubescunt. Illic, ubi opus, nihil verentur; hic, ubi nihil opus est, ibi verentur,” etc. Who, being ashamed belike to hear their worthy stratagems like to come to light, sought by what means they might [work] the stopping of the same. And because they could not work it *per brachium seculare*, “by public authority,” (the Lord of heaven long preserve your noble majesty! ) they renewed again an old wonted practice of theirs; doing in like sort herein, as they did sometimes with the Holy Bible in the days of your renowned father of famous memory, king Henry the Eighth who, when they neither by manifest reason could gainsay the matter contained in the book, nor yet abide the coming out thereof, then sought they, by a subtle devised train, to deprave the translation, notes, and prologues thereof, bearing the king in hand and all the people, that “there were in it a thousand lies,” and I cannot tell how many more. Not that there were in it such lies in very deed, but that the coming of that book should not bewray their lying falsehood, therefore they thought best to begin first to make exceptions themselves against it; playing in their stage like as Phormio did in the old comedy, who, being in all the fault himself, began first to quarrel with Demipho, when Demipho rather had good right to lay Phormio by the heels.

With like facing brags these catholic Phormiones think now to dash out all good books, and, amongst others also, these Monuments of Martyrs: which godly martyrs as they could not abide being alive, so neither can they now suffer their memories to live after their death, lest the acts of them, being known, might bring perhaps their wicked acts and cruel murders to detestation; and therefore spurn they so vehemently against this book of histories, with all kind of contumelies and uproars, railing and wondering upon it. Much like as I have heard of a company of thieves,

who in robbing a certain true man by the highway side, when they had found a piece of gold or two about him more than he would be known of, they cried out of the falsehood of the world, marvelling and complaining what little truth was to be found in men. Even so these men deal also with me; for when they themselves altogether delight in untruths, and have replenished the whole church of Christ with reigned fables, lying miracles, false visions, and miserable errors, contained in their missals, portuses, <sup>ft572</sup> breviaries, and summaries, and almost no true tale in all their saints' lives and festivals, as now also no great truths in our Louvanian books, etc.; yet notwithstanding, as though they were a people of much truth, and that the world did not perceive them, they pretend a face and zeal of great verity; and as though there were no histories else in all the world corrupted, but only this History of Acts and Monuments, with tragical voices they exclaim and wonder upon it, sparing no cost of hyperbolical phrases to make it appear as full of lies as lines, etc. Much after the like sort of impudency as sophisters used sometimes in their sophisms to do (and sometimes is used also in rhetoric), that when an argument cometh against them which they cannot well resolve indeed, they have a rule to shift off the matter with stout words and tragical admiration, whereby to dash the opponent out of countenance, bearing the hearers in hand the same to be the weakest and slenderest argument that ever was heard, not worthy to be answered, but utterly to be hissed out of the schools.

With like sophistication these also fare with me, who, when they neither can abide to hear their own doings declared, nor yet deny the same which they hear to be true, for three or four escapes in the book committed (and yet some of them in the book amended), they, neither reading the whole, nor rightly understanding that they read, inveigh and malign so perversely the setting out thereof, as though neither any word in all that story were true, nor any other story false in all the world besides. And yet in accusing these my accusers I do not so excuse myself, nor defend my book, as though nothing in it were to be sponged or amended. Therefore I have taken these pains, and reiterated my labors in travailing out this story again; doing herein as Penelope did with her web, untwisting that she had done before: — or, as builders do sometimes, which build and take down again, either to transpose the fashion, or to make the foundation larger; so, in recognizing this history, I have employed a little more labor, partly to

enlarge the argument which I took in hand, partly also to assay, whether by any painstaking I might pacify the stomachs, or satisfy the judgments of these importune quarrellers: — which nevertheless I fear I shall not do, when I have done all I can. For well I know, that all the heads of this hissing hydra will never be cut off, though I were as strong as Hercules; and if Apelles, the skilful painter, when he had bestowed all his cunning upon a piece of work, which no good artificer would or could greatly reprove, yet was not without some controlling sutor, which took upon him *ultra crepidam*, much more may I look for the like in these controlling days.

Nevertheless, committing the success thereof unto the Lord, I have adventured again upon this story of the church, and have spent not only my pains, but also almost my health therein, to bring it to this. Which now being finished, like as before I did, so again I exhibit and present the same unto your princely majesty; blessing my Lord my God with all my heart; first, for this liberty of peace and time, which, through your peaceable government, he hath lent unto us for the gathering both of this and other like books, tractations, and monuments, requisite to the behoof of his church, which hitherto, by iniquity of time, could not be contrived in any king's reign since the conquest, before these halcyon days of yours. Secondly, as we are all bound, with public voices, to magnify our God for this happy preservation of your royal estate, so, privately for my own part, I also acknowledge myself bound to my God and to my Savior, who so graciously in such weak health hath let me time, both to finish this work, and also to offer the second dedication thereof to your majesty; desiring the same to accept in good worth the donation thereof, if not for the worthiness of the thing given, yet as a testification of the bounden service and good will of one, which, by this he here presenteth, declareth what he would, if he had better to give.

And though the story, being written in the popular tongue, serveth not so greatly for your own peculiar reading, nor for such as be learned, yet I shall desire both you and them to consider in it the necessity of the ignorant flock of Christ committed to your government in this realm of England; who, as they have been long led in ignorance, and wrapped in blindness, for lack especially of God's word, and partly also for wanting the light of history, I thought pity but that such should be helped, their ignorance

relieved, and simplicity instructed. I considered they were the flock of Christ, and your subjects, belonging to your account and charge, bought with the same price, and having as dear souls to the Lord as others; and, though they be but simple and unlearned, yet not unapt to be taught if they were applied.

Furthermore, what inconvenience groweth of ignorance, where knowledge lacketh, both I considered, and experience daily teacheth. And therefore, hearing of the virtuous inclination of your majesty, what a provident zeal, full of solicitude, you have, minding (speedily I trust) to furnish all quarters and countries of this your realm with the voice of Christ's gospel and faithful preaching of his word, I thought it also not unprofitable to adjoin, unto these your godly proceedings and to the office of the ministry, the knowledge also of Ecclesiastical History, which, in my mind, ought not to be separate from the same: that like as by the one, the people may learn the rules and precepts of God's doctrine, so by the other, they may have examples of God's mighty working in works to his church, to the confirmation of their faith, and the edification of christian life. For as we see what light and profit cometh to the church, by histories in old times set forth, of the Judges, Kings, Maccabees, and the Acts of the Apostles after Christ's time; so likewise may it redound to no small use in the church, to know the acts of Christ's martyrs now, since the time of the apostles, besides other manifold examples and experiments of God's great mercies and judgments in preserving his church, in overthrowing tyrants, in confounding pride, in altering states and kingdoms, in conserving religion against errors and dissensions, in relieving the godly, in bridling the wicked, loosing and tying up again of Satan the disturber of common-weals, in punishing transgressions, as well against the first table as the second; — wherein is to be seen idolatry punished, blasphemy plagued, contempt of God's holy name and religion revenged, murder, with murder, rewarded, adulterers and wedlock-breakers destroyed, perjuries, extortions, covetous oppression, and fraudulent counsels come to nought, with other excellent works of the Lord: the observing and noting whereof in histories minister to the readers thereof wholesome admonitions of life, with experience and wisdom both to know God in his histories, works, and to work the thing that is godly; especially to seek unto the Son of God for their salvation, and in his faith only to find that they seek for, and in no other means. The

continuance and constancy of which faith the Lord of his grace and goodness grant to your noble majesty, and to his whole beloved church, and all the members of the same to everlasting life. Amen.

## AD DOCTUM LECTOREM,

## JOHANNES FOXUS.

COGITANTI mihi, versantique mecum in animo, quampericulosae res aleae sit, emittere nunc aliquid in publicum, quod in manus oculosque multorum subeat, his praesertim tam exulceratis moribus temporibusque, ubi tot hominum dissidiis, tot studils partium, tot morosis capitibus, tam rigidis censuris, et criticorum sannis fervent fere omnia, ut difficillimum sit quicquam tam circumspect scribere, quod non in aliquam calumniandi materiam rapiatur; perbeati profecto felicesque videntur ii, quibus eum vitae cursum tenere liceat, ut in otio viventes cum dignitate, sic alienis frui queant laboribus, velut in theatto otiosi sedentes spectatores, ut nullum interim ipsis vel ex actione taedium, vel ex labore periculum metuendmn sit. Me vero, nescio quo pacto, longe diversa quidem hactenus exercuit vitro ratio; quippe cui nec fortunto illam felicitatem, in cujus complexibus tam multos suaviter foveri video, nec otii amoenitatem experiri, vix etiam per omnem vitam degustare, in continuo laborum ac negotiorum fervore ac contentione contigerit. Quanquam de fortuna parum queror, quam semper contempsi; quin neque de laboribus multum dictums, si modo labores ii tantum vel prodesse vel placere caeteris possent hominibus, quantum me privatim atterunt incommodantque. Nunc ad meae infelicitatis cumulum accedit insuper, qubd in eo argumenti genere laborandum fuit, quod, praeter lugubrem rerum ipsarum materiam, praeter linguae inamoenitatem, praeter tractandi difficultatem, quae vix nitorem recipiat orationis, eo porro auctorem ipsum redigit angustiae, ut neque falsa narrare sine injuriae historiae, nec verum dicere sine magna sua invidia odioque multorum liceat. Nam cum in eo historiae argumento mihi versandum fuit, quod non ad superiorum modo temporum res gestas alteque repetitas pertineat, sed hanc ipsam aetatem nostram, nostraeque gentis nunc homines etiamnum praesentes vivosque, sic attingat, sic perfricet, sic designet, quemadmodum in hoc materim genere necessario faciendum fuit: quaeso, quid hic mihi aliud expectandum sit, nisi postquam frustra me defatigando valetudinem attriverim, oculos perdiderim, senium acciverim, corpus exhauserim,

demum ut post haec omnia multorum me hominum odiis, sibilis, invidiae ac calumniae exponam? In tot istis asperitatibus cum nihil me tutum praestare poterit, non Caesar, non monarchre, non rex, non regina, non ulla hujus mundi praesidia, praeter solam Divini numinis potentem dextram; principio igitur, atque ante omnia huc ceu ad tutissimum asylum me recepi, huic me librumque commendavi et commendo. Tum vero insuper in eodem Domino tuum ilium candorem, docte pieque lector! eamque tuam humanitatem appellare volui, qua ex humanioribus literis studiisque to scio praeditum, quo nostris his sudoribus tuae approbationis accedat calculus; aut si approbationem non mereamur, saltem ne favoris desit benignitas: cui si approbatam iri hanc historiae nostrae farraginem senserimus, caeterorum judicia obtrectatorum levius feremus.

Nam alioqui non defuturos sat scio qui variis modis nobis facessent molestiam. Habebit hic momus suos morsus, sycophanta suos sibilos, nec deerit calumniatori sua lingua et aculeus, quem infigat. Hic fidem detrahet historiae; the artificium in tractando, alter diligentiam, vel in excutiendis rebus iudicium desiderabit. Illi forsani operis displicebit moles, vel minus disposita servataque temporum ratio. Et si nihil horum fuerit, attamen in tanta religionis pugna, in tanta iudiciorum, capitum, sensuum varietate, ubi suae quisque favet ac blanditur factioni, quid tam affabre, aut circumspecte enarrari potest, quod placeat universis? Quin et jam nunc mussitari etiam audio a nonnullis qui longa sese teneri dicant expectatione, quoad haec tandem “Legenda nostra,” ut appellant, “Aurea” evulganda sit: qui si nostram primum in eo tarditatem reprehensam velint, nae ego suaves istos homines vicissim rogatos velim, ut ipsi prius in edendis suis se praebeant expeditiores, quam alienam incessant lentitudinem.

Deinde, si tardius exeat ipsorum opinione volumen, meminerint, proverbiali praecepto, Lentam esse festinationem oportere; et bos dicitur lassus fortius pedem figere. Egimus in hac quidem re pro virili nostrae; egimus spero et pro officio, si non satis pro temporis modo expedite, at egimus certe pro valetudine; addam porro, egimus supra valetudinem. Quin et illud ipsorum venia adjicere liceat, egisse nos maturiis quam ipsis forsani expediet qui in hunc nugantur modum: certe maturatius egimus quam tanti momenti et magnitudinis negotio conveniebat, quod accuratiorem in digerendis rebus moram curamque postulabat; cum a nobis vix integros datos esse menses octodecim praeparandae materiae, comportandis componendisque rebus,

conferendis exemplaribus, lectitandis codicibus, rescribendis his quae scripto mandata erant, castigandis formulis, concinnandae historiae, et in ordinem redigendae, etc., noverint ii qui testes adfuerunt, et temporis conscii, et laboris socii. Quod si autem “Legendae suae Aureae” titulum huic eo accommodant, quod illius exemplo hanc similiter fabulosam putent historiam, hincque odioso vocabulo ejus praejudicent veritati, quid his respondeam aliud quam quod ingenue suam ipsi prodant calumniam, quam ne editione quidem libri differre queant, prius de rebus dijudicantes quam hoverint. Atque interim quidem illud bene habet, quod ipsos tandem aliquando *legendwaesuae aurea* pudeat tam fabulosae. Et tamen fabulis illis non puduit mundum tam diu ludificare, periculum etiam intentantes his, si qui *legendae illi*, hoc est, mendacissimis illorum nugis, auderent detrudere. Quare nihil magis esse possit impium, quam sacrosanctam ecclesiae fidem fabulamentis hujusmodi confictisque praeter omnem veri fidem deliriis commaculare; tamen ineptissimi isti nugatores, ex suo ingenio caeteros quosque scriptores metientes, nec ipsi verum adferre satagunt, nec afferentibus aliis fidem habendam putant, cuncta videlicet suis aureis somniis similia existimantes? Quin apage cum “Legenda tua Aurea,” <sup>ft573</sup> nugator impudens; quem ego librum, cum onnes eum scimus, nec ipse ignoras, prodigiosis mendaciorum portentis et vanissimis undique commentis scatere, ne cum Homeri quidem fabulis conferre velim; tantum abest ut cum vere seriis gravibusque ecclesiae historiis quicquam commune habeat. Quid? An quia papistis illis tuis et impuris monachis sic libuit in ridiculis miraculorum suorum portentis ineptire, tu protinus nullam gravem historiae auctoritatem putas in ecclesiae admittendam? Quin eadem lege et de Eusebii ecclesiastica, et Tripartita Sozomeni et Socratis [et Theodoriti], caeterorumque historiis judicemus. Sunt praeter haec et alia quaedam de sanctis et divis conscripta miracula, quae proplus ad *legendam* hanc accedunt, et tamen nequaquam eo loco apud nos habentur, ut “Legendae illi Papisticae” annumerentur, etiam quae suspectissimae sunt fidei. Quanquam de scriptoribus caeteris mea nihil interest censuram ferre. Quod ad hanc vero nostram *περὶ τῶν μαρτυρικῶν* attinet, testatum id velim universis, datam esse a nobis operam sedulo ne quid usquam inesset operi fabulosum, aut ejusmodi quod vel a nobis fictum, vel quod “Legendae illi Aureae” (magis dicam plumbeae) non undique foret dissimillimum. Id quod res ipsa et nativa historiae facies testari poterit, cujus tota textura ex ipsis episcoporum archivis atque registris, partimque ex propriis martyrum

ipsorum literis hausta ac conflata videri poterit, in qua historia etsi neque id exigam ut singula hic pro oraculis habeantur; at dedimus tamen pro virili operam, ut si non plene assequeremur, accederemus tamen quam proxime ad veterem illam historiae legem, ut duas res, praecipuas historiae pestes, vitaremur, timorem videlicet et assentationem; quarum altera saepe minus dicit, altera semper plus addit, quam par est, narrationi. Sed hujus rei fidem ex ipso magis opere, quam ex mea commendatione astrui honestius est. Habet enim veritas ipsa simplicem suam et nativam faciem, quam non erit difficile non mucosis naribus lectori ex ipso vel orationis habitu, aut rerum aspectu, sive aliis circumstantiarum notis deprehendere. Sed vereor ne hic quoque, quemadmodum caeteris in rebus, locum haheat veteris proverbii experientia; Faciunt quippe mendaces ut ne veri etiam dicenti fides habeatur. Cum hactenus in martyrologicis sanctorum legendis vitisque describendis mendacia ac nugacissimee somniorum fictiones pro veris legantur narrationibus, fit ut caeterae ejusdem argumenti materiae eandem pariter suspicionem subeant, ut vix jam quicquam legi dicive in ecclesia cum fide queat. Verum huic malo cum mederi nequeamus, satis erit, quod nostrarum erat virium id nos praestitisse. Quod superest, divinae curandum providentiae relinquamus. Atque de certitudine veritateque historiae haec hactenus: quae utinam nae tam vera quidem certaue esset, quam isti videri volunt, at falsa potius, consimilisque huic, quam dicant, “Aureae ipsorum Legendae,” aut Vitis Patrum, aut Festivali, aut Dormisecure, caeterisque papisticis istis τοῖς τῶν λήρων λήροις foret. Nunc vero martyrum horum non a nobis ficta, sed inflicta a vobis, supplicia atroxque caedes veriolem hanc comprobant historiam pluresque suae veritatis testes habent, quam vellemus ipsi qui historiam scripsimus. Venio jam ad alteram criminationis partem, quae de Calendario fortassis objicietur. <sup>Fi574</sup> Audio enim et hic mihi obstrepere non tacitas modo sententias, sed apertas papistarum quorundam voces, quibus inique a me factum videbitur, quod antiquatis atque ex Calendario explosis veteris ecclesiae divinis, martyribus, confessoribus, virginibusque, novos eorum loco martyres ac confessores infulciam. Primum, nulli ego veterum divorum hoc facto praesaejudicatum velim. Neque vero ideo inter divos a me referuntur isti, quod inseruntur in Calendarium. Hanc ego apotheosin mihi nunquam sumpsit, quam sibi tam confidenter sumpsit Gregorius Nonus. Porro, neque eo spectat hoc Calendarium, ut novam aliquam festorum dierum legem praescribam ecclesiae; tum multo minus cultum sancti alicujus instituo. Festorum

dierum jam plus satis erat in mundo. Utinam Dominicum solum Sabbatum digne, atque ut par est, transigeremus. Habeant per me suum papistae Calendarium. Habeat et ecclesia suos sanctos, tum recentes tum veteranos, modo probatos, modo interim iidem ne colantur, modo quam sint vetusti tam vere etiam sancti sint.

Verum enimvero cum non dubitavit sua etiam aetate Hieronymus multos existimare eorum gehennae ignibus cruciari, quos multi passim pro sanctis haberent in ecclesia; quid hic tum diceret Hieronymus, si modo superstes papisticam hanc sanctorum colluviem et Calendaria, tot papas, tot episcopis, et abbatibus oblita cerneret?

Quamquam a me quidem non Calendarium hoc institutum est, nisi ut *pro indice* duntaxat, suum cujusque martyris mensem et annum designante, ad privatum lectoris serviret usum. Et tamen si in templis etiam fas sit singulorum mensium dies propriis sanctorum nomenclaturis consignare, qui minus liceat id mihi in veris istis facere martyribus, quod ipsi in suis pseudomartyribus, tanta sibi licentia, ne dicam impudentia, permiserunt? Si non poena, sed causa martyrem faciat, cur non unum Cranmerum sexcentis Becketis Cantuariensibus non conferam, sed praetulerim? Quid in Nicolao Ridleo videtur cum quovis divo Nicolao non conferendum? Qua in re Latimerus, Hoperus, Marsheus, Simpsonus, caeterique christiani martyrii candidati, inferiores summis maximisque illis papistici Calendarii divis, imo multis etiam nominibus non praeponendi videantur? Interim nullius ego boni sanctique viri (modo qui vere sanctus sit) causam laedo, nec memoriam extinguo, nec gloriam minuo. Et si cui hoc displiceat Calendarium, meminerit, non in templis collocari, sed domesticae tantum lectioni praeparari.

Sed missis hisce adversariorum calumniis, ad te, docte candideque lector! (quoniam haec ad te instituta est epistola) tempus est ut recurat oratio, cujus in his rebus iudicium ut pluris aestimo, ita egeo magis hic quoque patrocinio. Scio enim, in vasti hic congerie reperies nonnulla ad quae merito corruges frontem. Neque vero fieri facile potuit, praesertim in tanta operis praecipitatione, ut cuncta ad amussim atque ad unguem perfecte adeo elimarentur, quin alicubi vel ex lassitudine dormitaret scriptor, vel per incuriam excideret auctori aliquid, vel ex festinatione eveniret, quod canis solet in proverbiiis nimirum prae studio properanti, Caecos nimirum

producenti catulos. In quibus quidem excutiendis rebus magis nobis venia tua quam censura imploranda est. Quamobrem paucis haec apud te, docte simul et humanissime lector! ante operis ingressum, libuit **προοιμιάζειν** ut si quid. inter evolendum occurrerit, non omnibus perfectum numeris, non ad Cleanthis lucernam, elucubratum, non ad exquisitum theologorum acumen expressum, aut minus alioqui acutissimis tuis dignum naribus, cogites haec non tuis auribus data esse, sod meis; hoc est, crassioris turbæ hominibus, a quibus facilius leguntur libri quam judicantur. Aut si ne id quidem gravissimee tuae sententiae fecerit satis, liceat illa mihi uti lege, qui semper permissum est opere in magno, “scriptori obrepere somnum.” Quod si vero tuam hac in re facilitatem impetravero, minus laborabo quid caeteri obstrepant, Graeci memor proverbii, cujus et ipsos commeminisse velim, **μωμησεταί τις μάλλον ἢ μιμήσεται.** <sup>i575</sup>

**TO THE PERSECUTORS OF GOD’S TRUTH, COMMONLY CALLED PAPISTS, <sup>FT576</sup> ANOTHER PREFACE OF THE AUTHOR.**

If any other had had the doing and handling of this so tragical an history, and had seen the mad rage of this, your furious cruelty, in spilling the blood of such an innumerable sort of Christ’s holy saints and servants, as, in the volumes of this history, may appear by you, O ye *papists* (give me leave by that name to call you), I know what he would have done therein: what vehemency of writing — what sharpness of speech and words — what roughness of style, in terming and calling you — he would have used; what exclamations he would have made against you; how little he would have spared you. So I, likewise, if I had been disposed to follow the order and example of their doing, — what I might have done herein, let your own conjectures give you to understand, by that which you have deserved. And if you think you have not deserved so to be entreated, as I have said, and worse than I have done, then see and behold, I beseech you, here in this story, the pitiful slaughter of your butchery! Behold your own handy work! consider the number, almost out of number, of so many silly and simple lambs of Christ, whose blood you have sought and sucked; whose lives you have vexed; whose bodies you have slain, racked, and tormented; some also you have cast on dunghills, to be devoured of fowls and dogs; without mercy, without measure, without all sense of humanity! See, I say, and behold, here present before your eyes, the heaps of slain bodies,

of so many men and women, both old, young, children, infants, new born, married, unmarried, wives, widows, maids, blind men, lame men, whole men; of all sorts, of all ages, of all degrees; lords, knights, gentlemen, lawyers, merchants, archbishops, bishops, priests, ministers, deacons, laymen, artificers, yea, whole households and whole kindreds together; father, mother and daughter; grandmother, mother, aunt, and child, etc.; whose wounds, yet bleeding before the face of God, cry vengeance! For, whom have you spared? what country could escape your hands? See, therefore, I say, — read, and behold your acts and facts; and, when you have seen, then judge what you have deserved. And if ye find that I have tempered myself with much more moderation for mine own part (but that I have in some places inserted certain of other men's works, than either the cause of the martyrs or your iniquity hath required), then accept my good will in the Lord, which here I thought to signify unto you in the beginning of this preface, not to flatter or seek for your acceptation (which I care not greatly for), but only as tendering the conversion of your souls, if perhaps I may do you any good. Wherefore, as one that wishes well unto you in the Lord, I exhort you, that with patience you would read and peruse the history of these your own acts and doings, being no more ashamed now to read them, than you were then to do them; to the intent that, when you shall now the better revise what your doings have been, the more you may blush and detest the same.

Peter, preaching to the Jews and pharisees, after they had crucified Christ, cried to them: “*Delictorum poenitentiam agite,*” and turned three thousand at one sermon. So the said Peter sayeth and writeth still to you, and we, with Peter, exhort you: “Repent your mischiefs; be confounded in your doings; and come, at length, to some confession of your miserable iniquity.” First, you see now, your doings, so wicked, cannot be hid; your cruelty is come to light; your murders be evident; your pretty practices; your subtle sleights, your secret conspiracies, your filthy lives are seen, and stink before the face both of God and man. Yea, what have you ever done so in secret and in corners, but the Lord hath found it out, and brought it to light? You hold, maintain, and defend, that ministers ought and may live sole, without matrimony: what filthiness and murdering of infants followed thereupon! Your ear-confessions can say something, but God knoweth more; and yet the world knoweth so much that I need not

here to stand upon any particular examples of cardinals, doctors, and others, taken in manifest whoredom at London, at Oxford, at Cambridge, at Chester, and other places more.

But to pass over this stinking Camarine <sup>f577</sup> of your unmaidenly lives, I return again to your murders and slaughters, which you may here in this volume not only see, but also number them if you please. God so hath displayed and detected them, that now all the world may read them. As I have said, God, I assure you, hath detected them, who hath so marvellously wrought such help and success in setting forth the same, that I dare assure you, it is not without the will of Him, that these your murders should be opened, and come to light. And what if they were not opened, nor made to the world notorious, but secret only, between God and your conscience? Yet what cause have you to repent and to be confounded, now the world also seeth them, hateth, and abhorreth you for the same! What will you say? what will you, or can you, allege? How will you answer to the high Judge to come? or whither will you fly from his judgment, when he shall come? Think you, blood will not require blood again? Did you ever see any murder, which came not out, and was at length repaid? Let the example of the French Guise work in your English hearts, and mark you well his end. If Christ in his gospel, which cannot lie, doth threaten a millstone to such as do but hurt the least of his believers, in what a dangerous case stand you, which have smoked and fired so many his worthy preachers, and learned ministers! And what if the Lord should render to you double again, for that which ye have done to them! Where should you then become? And hath not he promised in his word so to do? And think you, that that Judge doth sleep, or that his coming day will not come? And how will you then be able to stand in his sight when he shall appear? With what face shall ye look upon the Lord, whose servants ye have slam? Or with what hearts will you be able to behold the bright faces of them, upon whom you have set so proudly here, condemning them to consuming fire? In that day, when you shall be charged with the blood of so many martyrs, what will ye, or can you say? How think ye to excuse yourselves? Or what can you for yourselves allege? Will ye deny to have murdered them? This book will testify and denounce against you; which if you cannot deny now to be true, then look how you will answer to it in that counting day.

Peradventure you will excuse yourselves, and say, that you did but the law; and if the law did pass upon them, you could not do with all. But here I will ask, what law do you mean? The law of God, or the law of man? If ye mean the law of God, where do you find in all the law of God, to put them to death, which, holding the articles of the creed, never blasphemed his name, but glorified it, both in life, and in their death? If you answer, by the law of man, I know the law (“*ex officio*” or rather *ex homicidio*) which you mean and follow. But who brought that law in first, in the time of king Henry IVth, but you? <sup>F578</sup> Who revived the same again in queen Mary’s days, but you? Further, who kept them in prison before the law, till, by the law, you had made a rope to hang them withal? And think you by charging the law, to discharge yourselves? But you will use here some translation of the fact perchance; alleging that you burnt them not, but only committed them to the secular power, by whom, you will say, they were burnt, and not by you. It will be hard to play the sophister before the Lord. For so it may be said to you again, that the fire burned them, and not the secular power. But I pray you, who put them in? But they were heretics, you will say, and Lutherans, and therefore we burnt them, thinking thereby to do God good service, etc. Of such service-doers Christ spake before, saying, that such should come, who, putting his servants to death, should think to do good service to God. And forsomuch as, under the pretense of heresy, you put them to death; concerning that matter, there is, and hath been, enough said to you by learning, if either learned books, or learned sermons could move you. But, to this, none answereth you better than the martyrs themselves, which in this book do tell you, that in the same which you call heresy, they serve the living God. And how do you then serve the living God, in putting them to death, whom they in the death do serve so heartily and so heavenly, as in this book here doth well appear? And because you charge them so much with heresy, this would I know, by what learning do you define your heresy, by the scripture, or by your canon law? I know what you will answer: but whatsoever you say, your own acts and deeds will well prove the contrary. For what scripture can save him, whom your law condemneth? What heresy was there, in speaking against transubstantiation, before Innocent III. did so enact it in his canon, A.D. 1215? What man was ever counted for an heretic, which, worshipping Christ in heaven, did not worship him in the priest’s hands, before Honorius III., in his canon, did

cause the sacrament to be elevated and adored upon the altar? “Faith only justifying,” in St. Paul’s time, and in the beginning church, was no heresy, before of late days the Romish canons have made it heresy!

Likewise, if it be heresy not to acknowledge the pope as supreme head of the church, then St. Paul was an heretic, and a stark Lutheran, which, having the scriptures, yet never attributed that to the pope, nor to Peter himself, to be supreme head of the church. So were all the other fathers of the primitive church heretics also, which never knew any such supremacy in the pope, before Boniface I. called himself “universal bishop” six hundred years after Christ. After like sort and manner, if receiving in both kinds, and having the scripture in a popular tongue be a matter worthy of burning, then were all the apostles and martyrs of the first church worthy to be burned, and the Corinthians ill instructed of St. Paul, having both “panem” and “calicem Domini!” Either condemn St. Paul and them, with these, or else let these be quit with the other. The same I may infer of purgatory, the setting up of images, going on pilgrimage, and such like, etc. And, but that I am wearied to see your miserable folly, I might here argue with you. For if your heresy (as you call it) be a sin with you so heinous, that it deserveth burning, then would I know, how can that be a sin now, which was a virtue once? In the time of the old law, it was a virtue amongst the Jews to have no image in the temple. Also, Hezekiah, Josiah, with divers other good kings more, were commended for abolishing the same; and have we not the same commandment still? and how cometh it now to be a vice, which was a virtue then? Likewise in the new law, both Paul and Barnabas would have torn their garments for doing that, for the not doing whereof you burn your brethren now. You see, therefore, how your heresy standeth; not by God’s word, for which you burn God’s people, but only by your own laws and canons, made by men. Wherefore if these your laws and canons (without the which the church once did stand and flourish) be now of such force, that the breach thereof must needs be *death*, better it were, either they were never made, or that now they were abolished; seeing both the church may well be without them, and that God’s people in no case can well live with them, but be burned for them.

And now, as I have hitherto collected and recited almost all your excuses, and reasons that you can bring and allege for yourselves, (and yet you see they will not serve you,) so I exhort you to turn to that, which only may

and will serve; that is, to the blood of “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.” Wash your bloody hands with the tears of plentiful repentance; and though you cannot call back again the lives of those whom you have slain, yet call yourselves back again from the way of iniquity, and from the path of destruction which you were going to! Consider how long now you have spurned and kicked against the Lord and his truth, and yet, you see, nothing hath prevailed. What have you, but “kicked against the pricks?” If killing and slaying could help your cause, you see what an infinite sort you have put to death; the number of whom, although it doth exceed man’s searching, yet Paulus Vergerius, in his book against the Pope’s Catalogue, taking a view thereof, doth account them to the number of an hundred thousand persons, slain in Christendom of you (whom he there calleth “papists”) in the cause of Christ’s gospel within this forty or an hundred years;<sup>f579</sup> besides them in QueenMary’s time here in England, and besides them within these two years slain in France by the [duke of] Guise, which, as you know, cometh to no small sum. And yet for all this horrible slaughter, and your so many fought fields against the poor saints, what is your cause the better? What have you thereby got, or won, but shame, hatred, contempt, infamy, execration, and to be abhorred of all good men; as may appear, not only by your habit and garment, the form and wearing whereof it shameth and abhorreth men now, as you see, to be brought unto; but also, the title and name of your profession. For though ye profess *popery* inwardly in your hearts, yet which of you all now is not ashamed to be called a *papist*, and would be angry with me if I should write to you under the name of *papists*? You see, therefore, how little you have won.

Let us compare now your winnings and losses together. And as you have gained but a little, so let us see what great things you have lost; which, first, have split your own cause, the quiet of your conscience, — which I dare say shaketh within you. Ye have lost the favor both of God and man, the safety of your souls, and almost the kingdom of the Lord, except you take the better heed. What think you, then, by these your proceedings, to win any more hereafter, which have lost so much already? Do not the very ashes of the martyrs which you have slain rise up still against you in greater armies? Seeing therefore the Lord doth and must prevail, be counselled and exhorted in the Lord; leave off your resisting, and yield to

the truth which your own boiling consciences, I am sure, doth inwardly witness and testify, if, for your own wilful standing up, on your credit and reputation, as ye think, ye would come to the confession of the same. And what reputation is this of credit, to be found constant in error against the truth; in Antichrist against Christ; in your destruction against saving of your souls? Briefly, and to be short, if my counsel may be heard, better it were for you in time to give over while it is thankworthy, than at length to be drawn, by compulsion of time, will ye, nill ye, to give over your cause, losing both thanks and your cause also. For see you not daily more and more the contrary part (the Lord's arm going with them) to grow so strong against you, that not only there is no hope, but no possibility for your obstinate error to stand against so manifest truth? First, learning, and all best wits, for the most part repugn against you. Most nations and kingdoms have forsaken you, as Germany, Poland, Bohemia, Denmark, Suabia, Dalmatia, Croatia, Epirus, and a great part of Greece; England, Ireland, Scotland, and France, God be glorified, well favorably cometh on, you see, and other more be like to follow: so that if things come handsomely forward, as they began and are like to do, the pope is like to pay home again shortly his feathers that he hath so long time borrowed. Moreover, universities and schools, in all quarters, to be set up against you; and youth so trained in the same, that you shall never be able to match them. <sup>F580</sup>

To conclude, in countries, kingdoms, cities, towns, and churches reformed, your errors and superstitious vanities be so blotted out, within the space of these forty years, in the hearts of men, that their children and youth, being so long nouseled in the sound doctrine of Christ, like as they never heard of your ridiculous trumpery, so will they never be brought to the same. <sup>F581</sup> And if nothing else will deface you, yet printing only will subvert your doings, do what ye can, which the Lord only hath set up for your desolation. Wherefore, forsake your cause, and your false hopes, and save yourselves. And take me not your enemy in telling you the truth, but rather your friend, in giving you good counsel — if you will follow good counsel given. Return therefore and reform yourselves; repent your murders, cease your persecutions, strive not against the Lord; but rather bewail your iniquities, which, though they be great, and greater than you are aware, yet they are not so great, but Christ is greater, if ye repent

betimes. Ye see here I trust good counsel given; God grant it may as well fructify in you, as on my part it hath proceeded of an open and tender heart; wishing you well to do, as I pray God ye may, so that you and we may agree and consent together in one religion and truth, in Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom be praise for ever. Amen.

## **TO THE TRUE AND FAITHFUL CONGREGATION OF CHRIST'S UNIVERSAL CHURCH,**

With all and singular the Members thereof, wheresoever congregated or dispersed through the Realm of England; a Protestation or Petition of the Author, wishing to the same Abundance of all Peace and Tranquillity, with the speedy Coming of Christ the Spouse, to make an End of all Mortal Misery.

SOLOMON, the peaceable prince of Israel, as we read in the first book of Kings, after he had finished the building of the Lord's temple, (which he had seven years in hand,) made his petition to the Lord for all that should pray in the said temple, or turn their face toward it; and his request was granted, the Lord answering him, as we read in the said book; "I have heard," saith he, "thy prayer, and have sanctified this place," (1 Kings 8:30.) etc. Albeit the infinite majesty of God is not to be compassed in any material walls, yet it so pleased his goodness to respect this prayer of the king, that not only he promised to hear them which there are prayed, but also replenished the same with his own glory. For so we read again in the book aforesaid, "Non poterant ministrare propter nebulam, quia replevit gloria Domini domum Domini." (1 Kings 8:10.)

Upon the like trust in God's gracious goodness, if I, sinful wretch, not comparing with the building of that temple, but following the zeal of the builder, might either be so bold to ask, or so happy to speed, after my seven years' travail about this Ecclesiastical History, I would most humbly crave of Almighty God to bestow his blessing upon the same; that as the prayers of them which prayed in the outward temple were heard, so all true disposed minds which shall resort to the reading of this present history, containing the Acts of God's holy Martyrs, and Monuments of his Church, may, by example of their life, faith, and doctrine, receive some such spiritual fruit to their souls, through the operation of his grace; that it

may be to the advancement of his glory, and profit of his church, through Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

But, as it happened in that temple of Solomon, that all which came thither came not to pray, but many to prate, some to gaze and see news, other to talk and walk, some to buy and sell, some to carp and find fault, and, finally, some also at the last to destroy and pull down, as they did indeed; — for what is in this world so strong, but it will be impugned? what so perfect, but it will be abused? so true, that will not be contraried? or so circumspectly done, wherein wrangling Theon <sup>f582</sup> will not set in his tooth? — even so neither do I look for any other in this present history, but that, amongst many well-disposed readers, some wasp's nest or other will be stirred up to buz about mine ears. So dangerous a thing it is now a days to write or do any good, but either by flattering a man must offend the godly, or by true speaking procure hatred of the wicked. Of such stinging wasps and buzzing drones I had sufficient trial in my former edition before; <sup>f583</sup> who if they had found in my book any just cause to carp, or, upon any true zeal of truth, had proceeded against the untruths of my story, and had brought just proofs for the same, I could right well have abided it: for God forbid but that faults, wheresoever they be, should be detected and accused. And therefore accusers in a commonwealth, after my mind, do serve to no small stead.

But then such accusers must beware they play not the dog, of whom Cicero in his Oration <sup>f584</sup> speaketh, which, being sent into the Capitol to fray away thieves by night, left the thieves, and fell to bark at true men walking in the day. Where true faults be, there to bay and bark is not amiss; but to carp where no cause is; to spy in other straws; and leap over their own blocks; to swallow camels, and to strain at gnats; to oppress truth with lies, and to set up lies for truth; to blaspheme the dear martyrs of Christ, and to canonize for saints those whom Scripture would scarce allow for good subjects; — that is intolerable. Such barking curs, if they were well served, would be made a while to stoop; but with these brawling spirits I intend not at this time much to wrestle.

Wherefore to leave them a while, till further leisure serve me to attend upon them, thus much I thought, in the mean season, by way of Protestation or Petition, to write unto you both in, general and particular,

the true members and faithful congregation of Christ's church, wheresoever either congregated together, or dispersed through the whole realm of England; that, forasmuch as all the seeking of these adversaries is to do what they can, by discrediting of this history with slanders and sinister surmises, to withdraw the readers from it, this, therefore, shall be, in few words, to premonish and desire of all and singular of you (all well-minded lovers and partakers of Christ's gospel), not to suffer yourselves to be deceived with the big brags and hyperbolical speeches of those slandering tongues, whatsoever they have or shall hereafter exclaim against the same, but indifferently staying your judgment till truth be tried, you will first peruse and then refuse; measuring the untruths of this history, not by the scoring up of their hundreds and thousands of lies which they give out, but wisely weighing the purpose of their doings according as you find; and so to judge of the matter.

To read my books I allure neither one nor other. Every man as he seeth cause, so let him like as he listeth. If any shall think his labor too much in reading this story, his choice is free either to read this, or any other which he more mindeth. But if the fruit thereof shall recompence the reader's travail, then would I wish no man solight eared, as to be carried away for any sinister clamor of adversaries, who many times deprave good doings, not for the faults they find, but therefore find faults because they would deprave. As for me and my history, as my will was to profit all and displease none, so if skill in any part wanted to will, yet hath my purpose been simple; and certes the cause no less urgent also, which moved me to take this enterprise in hand.

For, first, to see the simple flock of Christ, especially the unlearned sort, so miserably abused, and all for ignorance of history, not knowing the course of times and true descent of the church, it pitied me that this part of diligence had so long been unsupplied in this my-country church of England. Again, considering the multitude of chronicles and story-writers, both in England and out of England, of whom the most part have been either monks, or clients to the see of Rome, it grieved me to behold how partially they handled their stories. Whose painful travail albeit I cannot but commend, in committing divers things to writing, not unfruitful to be known nor unpleasant to be read; yet it lamented me to see in their Monuments the principal points which chiefly concerned the state of

Christ's church, and were most necessary of all christian people to be known, either altogether pretermitted, or if any mention thereof were inserted, yet were all things drawn to the honor specially of the church of Rome, or else to the favor of their own sect of religion. Whereby the vulgar sort, hearing and reading in their writings no other church mentioned or magnified but only that church which here flourished in this world in riches and jollity, were drawn also to the same persuasion, to think no other church to have stood in all the earth but only the church of Rome.

In the number of this sort of writers, besides our monks of England (for every monastery almost had his chronicler) I might also recite both Italian and other-country authors, as Platina, Sabellicus, Naucerus, Martin, Antoninus, Vincentius, Onuphrius, Laziarde, George Lily, Polydore Virgil, with many more, who, taking upon them to intermeddle with matters of the church, although in part they express some truth in matters concerning the bishops and see of Rome, yet, in suppressing another part, they play with us, as Ananias and Sapphira did with their money, or as Apelles did in Pliny, <sup>f585</sup> who, painting the one half of Venus coming out of the sea, left the other half imperfect: so these writers, while they show us one half of the bishop of Rome, the other half of him they leave imperfect, and utterly untold. For as they paint him out, on the one part, glistening in wealth and glory, in shewing what succession the popes had from the chair of Saint Peter, when they first began, and how long they sat, what churches and what famous buildings they erected, how far their possessions reached, what laws they made, what councils they called, what honor they received of kings and emperors, what princes and countries they brought under their authority, with other like stratagems of great pomp and royalty; so, on the other side, what vices these popes brought with them to their seat, what abominations they practiced, what superstition they maintained, what idolatry they procured, what wicked doctrine they defended contrary to the express word of God, into what heresies they fell, into what division of sects they cut the unity of christian religion, how some practiced by simony, some by necromancy and sorcery, some by poisoning, some indenting with the devil to come by their papacy, what hypocrisy was in their lives, what corruption in their doctrine, what wars they raised, what bloodshed they caused, what treachery they traversed against their lords and emperors, imprisoning some, betraying some to the Templars and

Saracens, and in bringing others under their feet, also in beheading some; as they did with Frederic and Conradine, the heirs and offspring of the house of Frederic Barbarossa, in the year 1268; <sup>f586</sup> furthermore, how mightily Almighty God hath stood against them, how their wars never prospered against the Turk, how the judgments of the godly-learned from time to time have ever repugned against their errors, etc. — of these and a thousand other more not one word hath been touched, but all kept as under benedicite, in auricular confession.

When I considered this partial dealing and corrupt handling of histories, I thought with myself nothing more lacking in the church than a full and a complete, story; which, being faithfully collected out of all our monastical writers and written monuments, should contain neither every vain-written fable (for that would be too much), nor yet leave out any thing necessary, for that would be too little; but, with a moderate discretion, taking the best of every one, should both ease the labor of the reader from turning over such a number of writers, and also should open the plain truth of times lying long hid in obscure darkness of antiquity: whereby all studious readers, beholding as in a glass the stay, course, and alteration of religion, decay of doctrine, and the controversies of the church, might discern the better between antiquity and novelty. For if the things which be first, after the rule of Tertullian, are to be preferred before those that be later, then is the reading of histories much necessary in the church, to know what went before, and what followed after; and therefore not without cause “*historia*,” in old authors, is called the Witness of Times, the Light of Verity, the Life of Memory, Teacher of Life, and Shower of Antiquity, etc., without the knowledge whereof man’s life is blind, and soon may fall into any kind of error; as by manifest experience we have to see in these desolate later times of the church, when the bishops of Rome, under color of antiquity, have turned truth into heresy, and brought such new-found devices of strange doctrine and religion, as, in the former age of the church, were never heard of before, and all through ignorance of times and for lack of true history.

For, to say the truth, if times had been well searched, or if they which wrote histories had, without partiality, gone upright between God and Baal, halting on neither side, it might well have been found, the most part of all this catholic corruption intruded into the church by the bishops of Rome, as transubstantiation, elevation and adoration of the sacrament,

auricular confession, forced vows of priests not to marry, veneration of images, private and satisfactory masses, the order of Gregory's mass now used, the usurped authority and "summa potestas" of the see of Rome, with all the rout of their ceremonies and weeds of superstition overgrowing now the church; all these, I say, to be new-nothings lately coined in the mint of Rome, without any stamp of antiquity, as by reading of this present history shall sufficiently, I trust, appear. Which history therefore I have here taken in hand, that as other story-writers heretofore have employed their travail to magnify the church of Rome, so in this history might appear to all christian readers the image of both churches, as well of the one as of the other; especially of the poor oppressed and persecuted church of Christ. Which persecuted church, though it hath been of long season trodden under foot by enemies, neglected in the world, not regarded in histories, and almost scarce visible or known to worldly eyes, yet hath it been the true church only of God, wherein he hath mightily wrought hitherto, in preserving the same in all extreme distresses, continually stirring up from time to time faithful ministers, by whom always have been kept some sparks of his true doctrine and religion.

Now forasmuch as the true chureli of God goeth not, lightly, <sup>f587</sup> alone, but is accompanied with some other church or chapel of the devil to deface and malign the same, necessary it is therefore the difference between them to be seen, and the descent of the right church to be described from the apostles' time: which, hitherto, in most part of histories hath been lacking, partly for fear, that men durst not, partly for ignorance, that men could not, discern rightly between the one and the other. Who, beholding the church of Rome to be so visible and glorious in the eyes of all the world, so shining in outward beauty, to bear such a port, to carry such a train and multitude, and to stand in such high authority, supposed the same to be the only right catholic mother. The other, because it was not so visibly known in the world, they thought therefore it could not be the true church of Christ. Wherein they were far deceived: for although the right church of God be not so invisible in the world that none can see it, yet neither is it so visible again that every worldly eye may perceive it. For like as is the nature of truth, so is the proper condition of the true church, that commonly none seeth it, but such only as be the members and partakers thereof. And, therefore, they which require that God's holy church should be evident and

visible to the whole world, seem to define the great synagogue of the world, rather than the true spiritual church of God.

In Christ's time who would have thought but that the congregations and councils of the Pharisees had been the right church? and yet had Christ another church in earth besides that; which, albeit it was not so manifest in the sight of the world, yet was it the only true church in the sight of God. Of this church meant Christ, speaking of the temple which he would raise again the third day; and yet after that the Lord was risen, he showed not himself to the world, but only to his elect, which were but few. The same church, after that, increased and multiplied mightily among the Jews; yet had not the Jews eyes to see God's church, but did persecute it, till at length all their whole nation was destroyed.

After the Jews, then came the heathen emperors of Rome, who having the whole power of the world in their hands, did what the world could do, to extinguish the name and church of Christ. Whose violence continued the space of three hundred years. All which while the true church of Christ was not greatly in sight of the world, but rather was abhorred everywhere, and yet notwithstanding the same small silly flock, so despised in the world, the Lord highly regarded, and mightily preserved. For although many then of the christians did suffer death, yet was their death neither loss to them, nor detriment to the church; but the more they suffered, the more of their blood increased.

In the time of these emperors God raised up then in this realm of Britain divers worthy preachers and witnesses, as Elvanus, Meduinus, Meltivianus, Amphibalus, Albanus, Aaron, Julius, and other more: in whose time the doctrine of faith, without men's traditions, was sincerely preached. After their death and martyrdom it pleased the Lord to provide a general quietness to his church, whereby the number of his flock began more to increase.

In this age then followed here in the said land of Britain Fastidius, Ninianus, Patricius, Bacchiarius, Dubricius, Congellus, Kentigernus, Helmotus, David, Daniel, Sampson, Elvodugus, Asaphus, Gildas, Henlanus, Elbodus, Dinothus, Samuel, Nivius, and a great sort more, which governed the church of Britain by christian doctrine a long season; albeit the civil governors for the time were then dissolute and careless (as Gildas

very sharply doth lay to their charge), and so at length were subdued by the Saxons.

All this while, about the space of four hundred years, religion remained in Britain uncorrupt, and the word of Christ truly preached, till, about the coming of Augustine and of his companions from Rome, many of the same Britain-preachers were slain by the Saxons. After that began the christian faith to enter and spring among the Saxons, after a certain Romish sort, yet notwithstanding somewhat more tolerable than were the times which after followed, through the diligent industry of some godly teachers which then lived amongst them; as Aidan, Finian, Colman archbishop of York, Bede, John of Beverly, Alcuin, Noetus, <sup>f588</sup> Hucharius, Serlo, Achardus, Ealtedus, Alexander, Neckham, Negellus, Fenallus, AElfricus, Sygeferthus, and such other; who, though they erred in some few things, yet neither are sogrossly nor so greatly to be complained of in respect of the abuses that followed. For as yet, all this while, the error of transubstantiation and elevation, with auricular confession, was not crept in for a public doctrine in Christ's church, as, by their own Saxon sermon made by. AElfric, and set out in the volumes <sup>f589</sup> of this present history, may appear. During the which mean time, although the bishops of Rome were had here in some reverence with the clergy, yet had they nothing as yet to do in making laws touching matters of the church of England: but that only appertained to the kings and governors of the land, as is in this story to be seen.

And thus the church of Rome, albeit it began then to decline apace from God, yet, during all this while, it remained hitherto in some reasonable order, till at length, after that, the said bishops began to shoot up in the world through the liberality of good princes, and especially of Matilda, a noble duchess of Italy, who at her death made the pope heir of all her lands, and endued his see with great revenues. <sup>F590</sup> Then riches begat ambition, ambition destroyed religion, so that all came to ruin. Out of this corruption sprang forth here in England, as did in other places more, another Romish kind of monkery, worse than the other before, being much more drowned in superstition and ceremonies, which was about the year of our Lord, 980. Of this swarm was Egbert, Agilbert, Egwin, Boniface, Wilfrid, Agatho, James, Romain, Cedda, Dunstan, Oswald, Athelwold; Athelwin, duke of East-Angles; Lanfranc, Anselm, and such others. <sup>F591</sup>

And yet in this time also, through God's providence, the church lacked not some of better knowledge and judgment, to weigh with the darkness of those days. For although king Edgar, with Edward his base son, being seduced by Dunstan, Oswald, and other monkish clerks, was then a great author and fautor of much superstition, erecting as many monasteries as were Sundays in the year, yet, notwithstanding, this continued not long. For, eftsoons after the death of Edgar, came king Ethelred and Queen Alfrida his mother, with Alferus duke of Merceland, and other peers and nobles of the realm, who displaced the monks again, and restored the married priests to their old possessions and livings.<sup>F592</sup> Moreover, after that, followed also the Danes, which overthrew those monkish foundations, as fast as king Edgar had set them up before.

And thus hitherto stood the condition of the true church of Christ, albeit not without some repugnance and difficulty, yet in some mean state of the truth and verity, till the time of pope Hildebrand, called Gregory VII. which was near about the year 1080, and of pope Innocent III. in the year 1215: by whom all together was turned upside down, all order broken, discipline dissolved, true doctrine defaced, christian faith extinguished; instead whereof, was set up preaching of men's decrees, dreams and idle traditions. And whereas, before, truth was free to be disputed amongst learned men, now, liberty was turned into law, argument into authority. Whatsoever the bishop of Rome denounced, that stood for an oracle of all men to be received without opposition or contradiction; whatsoever was contrary, ipso facto it was heresy, to be punished with faggot and flaming fire. Then began the sincere faith of this English church, which held out so long, to quail. Then was the clear sunshine of God's word overshadowed with mists and darkness, appearing like sackcloth to the people, who neither could understand what they read, nor yet were permitted to read what they could understand. In these miserable days, as the true visible church began now to shrink and keep in for fear, so up started a new sort of players, to furnish the stage, as school-doctors, canonists, and four orders of friars; besides other monastical sects and fraternities of infinite variety; which, ever since, have kept such a stir in the church, that none for them almost durst rout, neither Caesar, king, nor subject. What they defined, stood; what they approved, was catholic; what they condemned, was heresy; whomsoever they accused, none almost could save. And thus

have these, hitherto, continued, or reigned rather, in the church, the space now of full four hundred years and odd. During which space the true church of Christ, although it durst not openly appear in the face of the world, was oppressed by tyranny; yet neither was it so invisible or unknown, but, by the providence of the Lord, some remnant always remained from time to time, which not only showed secret good affection to sincere doctrine, but also stood in open defense of truth against the disordered church of Rome.

In which catalogue, first, to pretermitt Bertram and Berengarius, who were before pope Innocent III. a learned multitude of sufficient witnesses here might be produced; whose names neither are obscure nor doctrine unknown; as Joachim, abbot of Calabria, and Almeric, a learned bishop, who was judged an heretic for holding against images in the time of the said Innocent. Besides the martyrs of Alsace, of whom we read an hundred to be burned by the said Innocent <sup>f593</sup> in one day, as writeth Ulric Mutius. <sup>f594</sup> Add likewise to these the Waldenses or Albigenses, which, to a great number, segregated themselves from the church of Rome. To this number also belonged Reymund, earl of Thoulouse, Marsilius Patavinus, Gulielmus de Sancto Amore, <sup>f595</sup> Simon Tornacensis, Arnoldus de Nova Villa, Johannes Semeca, besides divers other preachers <sup>f596</sup> in Suabia standing against the pope, A.D. 1240; <sup>f597</sup> Laurentius Anglicus, a master of Paris, A.D. 1260; Petrus Johannes, a mlnorite, <sup>f598</sup> who was burned after His death, A.D. 1290; Robertus Gallus, a dominic friar, A.D. 1292; Robert Grosthead, bishop of Lincoln, who was called “Malleus Romanorum,” <sup>f599</sup> A.D.1250; Lord Peter of Cugnieres, A.D. 1329. To these we may add, moreover, Gulielmus Ockam, Bonagratia Bergomensis, Luitpoldus, Andreas Laudensis, Ulric Hangenor, treasurer to the emperor, Johannes de Ganduno, <sup>f600</sup> A.D. 1330, mentioned in the Extravagants; Andreas de Castro, Buridanus, Euda, <sup>f601</sup> duke of Burgundy, who counselled the French king not to receive the new-found constitutions and Extravagants of the pope into his realm; Dantes Aligerius, an Italian, who wrote against the pope, monks, and friars, and against the donation of Constantine, A.D. 1330; Taulerus, a German preacher; <sup>f602</sup> Conradus Hager, imprisoned for preaching against the mass, A.D. 1339; the author of the book called “Poenitentiarius Asini,” compiled about the year 1343; Michael Cesenas, a grey friar; Petrus de Corbaria, with Johannes de Poliaco, mentioned in the

Extravagants, and condemned by the pope; Johannes de Castilione, with Franciscus de Arcatara, who were burned about the year of our Lord, 1322; <sup>f603</sup> Johannes Rochtaylada, otherwise called Haybalus, with another friar martyred about the year 1346; Franciscus Petrarcha, who called Rome the whore of Babylon, etc. A.D. 1350; <sup>f604</sup> Gregorius Ariminensis, A.D. 1350; Joannes de Rupe Scissa, <sup>f605</sup> imprisoned for certain prophesies against the pope, A.D. 1340; Gerhardus Ridder, who also wrote against monks and friars a book called “Lacrymae Ecclesiae,” A.D. 1350; Godfridus de Fontanis, Guilelmus de Landuno, Joannes Monachus Cardinalis, Armachanus, Nicolaus Orem, preacher, A.D. 1364; Militzius, a Bohemian, who then preached that antichrist was come, and was excommunicated for the same, A.D. 1366; Jacobus Misnensis, Matthias Parisiensis, a Bohemian born, and a writer against the pope, A.D. 1370; Joannes Montziger, rector of the university of Ulm, A.D. 1384; Nilus, archbishop of Thessalonica, Henricus de Iota, Henricus de Hassia, etc. <sup>f606</sup>

I do but recite the principal writers and preachers in those days. How many thousands there were which never bowed their knees to Baal, that is known to God alone. Of whom we find in the writings of one Bruschius <sup>f607</sup> that six-and-thirty citizens of Mentz were burned, A.D. 1390: who, following the doctrine of the Waldenses, affirmed the pope to be the great Antichrist. Also Massaeus recordeth of one hundred and forty, who, in the province of Narbonne, were put to the fire, for not receiving the decretals of Rome; besides them that suffered at Paris, to the number of four-and-twenty at one time, A.D. 1210: and the next year after there were four hundred burnt under the name of heretics; besides also a certain good eremite, an Englishman, of whom mention is made in John Bacon, <sup>f608</sup> who was committed for disputing in Paul’s church against certain sacraments of the church of Rome, A.D. 1306. <sup>F609</sup>

To descend now somewhat lower in drawing out the descent of the church. What a multitude here cometh of faithful witnesses in the time of John Wickliff, as Ocliff <sup>f610</sup> Wickliff (A.D. 1379); William Thorp, White, Purvey, Pateshul, Pain, Gower, Chaucer, Gascoin, William Swinderby, Walter Brute, Roger Dexter, William Sautry, about the year 1401; John Badby, A.D. 1410; Nicholas Taller, Richard Wagstaff, Michael Scrivener, William Smith, John Henry, William Parchmenar, Roger Goldsmith, with an anchoress called Matilda, in the city of Leicester; lord Cobham; sir Roger

Acton, knight; John Beverley, preacher; John Huss, Jerome of Prague, a schoolmaster, with a number of faithful Bohemians and Thaborites not to be told; with whom I might also adjoin Laurentius Valla. and Joannes Picus, the learned earl of Mirandula. But what do I stand upon recital of names, which almost are infinite?

Wherefore, if any be so far beguiled in his opinion [as] to think the doctrine of the church of Rome, as it now standeth, to be of such antiquity, and that the same was never impugned before the time of Luther and Zuinglius now of late, let them read these histories: or if he think the said history not to be of sufficient credit to alter his persuasion, let him peruse the acts and statutes of parliaments, passed in this realm, of ancient time, and therein consider and confer the course of times; where he may find and read, in the year of our Lord 1382, <sup>f611</sup> of a great number (who there be called evil persons) going about from town to town in frieze gowns, preaching unto the people, etc. Which preachers, although the words of the statute do term there to be dissembling persons, reaching divers sermons containing heresies and notorious errors, to the emblemishment of christian faith, and of holy church, etc. as the words do there pretend; yet notwithstanding, every true christian reader may conceive of those preachers to teach no other doctrine, than now they hear their own preachers in pulpits preach against the bishop of Rome, and the corrupt heresies of his church.

Furthermore, he shall find likewise in the statutes, <sup>f612</sup> in the year of our Lord 1401, another like company of good preachers and faithful defenders of true doctrine against blind heresy and error. Whom, albeit the words of the statute there, through corruption of that time, do falsely term to be false and perverse preachers, under dissembled holiness, teaching in those days openly and privily new doctrines and heretical opinions, contrary to the faith and determination of holy church, etc., yet notwithstanding whosoever readeth histories, and conferreth the order and descent of times, shall understand these to be no false teachers, but faithful witnesses of the truth; not teaching any new doctrine contrary to the determination of holy church, but rather shall find that church to be unholy which they preached against; teaching rather itself heretical opinions, contrary both to antiquity and verity of Christ's true catholic church.

Of the like number also, or greater, of like faithful favorers and followers of God's holy word, we find in the year 1422, specified in a letter sent from Henry Chichesly, archbishop of Canterbury, to pope Martin V., <sup>f613</sup> in the fifth year of his popedom, where mention is made of so many here in England, infected (as he said) with the heresies of Wickliff and Huss, that without force of an army, they could not be suppressed, etc. Whereupon the pope sent two cardinals to the archbishop, to cause a tenth to be gathered of all spiritual and religious men, and the money to be laid in the chamber apostolic; and if that were not sufficient, the residue to be made up of chalices, candlesticks, and other implements of the church, etc.

What shall need then any more witnesses to prove this matter, when you see, so many years ago, whole armies and multitudes thus standing against the pope? who, though they be termed here for heretics and schismatics, yet in that which they call heresy served they the living Lord within the ark of his true spiritual and visible church.

And where is then the frivolous brag of the papists, who make so much of their painted sheath; and would needs bear us down, that this government of the church of Rome, which now is, hath been of such an old standing, time out of mind, even from the primitive antiquity; and that there never was any other church demonstrable here in earth for men to follow, besides the said only catholic mother church of Rome? when as we have sufficiently proved before, by the continual descent of the church till this present time, the said church, after the doctrine which is now reformed, is no new-begun matter, but even the old continued church by the providence and promise of Christ still standing; which, albeit it hath been of late years repressed by the tyranny of Roman bishops more than before, yet notwithstanding it was never so oppressed, but God hath ever maintained in it the truth of his gospel, against heresies and errors of the church of Rome, as, in this history, more at full is to be seen.

Let us now proceed further as we began, deducing this descent of the church unto the year 1501. In which year the Lord began to show in the parts of Germany wonderful tokens, and bloody marks of his passion; as the bloody cross, his nails, spear, and crown of thorns, which fell from heaven upon the garments and caps of men, and rocks of women; as you may further read in this history. <sup>F614</sup> By the which tokens Almighty God,

no doubt, pre-signified what grievous afflictions and bloody persecutions should then begin to ensue upon his church for his gospel's sake, according as in this history is described; wherein is to be seen what christian blood hath been spilt, what persecutions raised, what tyranny exercised, what torments devised, what treachery used, against the poor flock and church of Christ; in such sort as since Christ's time greater hath not been seen.

And now by revolution of years we are come from that time of 1501, to the year now present 1570. <sup>F615</sup> In which the full seventy years of the Babylonish captivity draweth now well to an end, if we count from the first appearing of these bloody marks above-mentioned. Or if we reckon from the beginning of Ludler and his persecution, <sup>f616</sup> then lacketh yet sixteen years. Now what the Lord will do with this wicked world, or what rest he will give to his church after these long sorrows, he is our Father in heaven, his will be done in earth as seemeth best to his divine Majesty.

In the mean time let us, for our parts, with all patient obedience wait upon his Grace's leisure, and glorify his holy name, and edify one another with all humility. And if there cannot be an end of our disputing and contending one against another, yet let there be a moderation in our affections. And forasmuch as it is the good will of our God, that Satan thus should be let loose amongst us for a short time; yet let us strive in the mean while, what we can, to amend the malice of the time, with mutual humanity. they that be in error, let them not disdain to learn. they which have greater talents of knowledge committed [to them], [let them] instruct in simplicity them that be simple. No man liveth in that commonwealth where nothing is amiss; but yet because God hath so placed us Englishmen here in one commonwealth, also in one church, as in one ship together, let us not mangle or divide the ship, which, being divided, perisheth; but every man serve with diligence and discretion in his order, wherein he is called — they that sit at the helm keep well the point of the needle, to know how the ship goeth, and whither it should; whatsoever weather betideth, the needle, well touched with the stone of God's word, will never fail: such as labor at the oars start for no tempest, but do what they can to keep from the rocks: likewise they which be in inferior rooms, take heed they move no sedition nor disturbance against the rowers and mariners. No storm so dangerous to a ship on the sea, as is discord and disorder in a weal public. What countries and nations, what kingdoms and empires, what cities, towns, and

houses, discord hath dissolved, in stories is manifest; I need not spend time in rehearsing examples.

The God of peace, who hath power both of land and sea, reach forth his merciful hand to help them up that sink, to keep up them that stand, to still these winds and surging seas of discord and contention among us; that we, professing one Christ, may, in one unity of doctrine, gather ourselves into one ark or the true church together; where we, continuing steadfast in faith, may at the last luckily be conducted to the joyful port of our desired landing-place by his heavenly grace. To whom, both in heaven and earth, be all power and glory, with his Father and the Holy Spirit, for ever.  
Amen.

## THE UTILITY OF THIS STORY. F617

SEEING the world is replenished with such an infinite multitude of books of all kind of matters, I may seem, perhaps, to take a matter in hand superfluous and needless, at this present time to set out such volumes, especially of histories; considering now-a-days the world is so greatly pestered, not only with superfluous plenty thereof, but of all other treatises, so that books now seem rather to lack readers, than readers to lack books. In which multitude of books, I doubt not but many do both perceive, and inwardly bewail, this insatiable boldness of many now-a-days both in writing and printing; which, to say the truth, for my part I do as much lament as any man else beside; and would therefore no man should think that unadvisedly or with rashness I have attempted this enterprise, for assuredly I have been not only doubtful, but also both bashful and fearful within myself for setting the same abroad. And why? First, I perceived how learned this age of ours is in reading of books, neither could I tell what the secret judgments of readers would conceive, to see so weak a thing to set upon such a weighty enterprise; not sufficiently furnished with such ornaments able to satisfy the perfection of so great a story, or sufficient to serve the utility of the studious and the delight of the learned. Which ability the more I perceived to be wanting in me, the less I durst be bold to become a writer.

But again, on the other side, when I weighed with myself what memorable acts and famous doings this latter age of the church hath ministered unto us by the patient sufferings of the worthy martyrs, I thought it not to be neglected, that so precious monuments of so many matters, meet to be recorded and registered in books, should lie buried by my default, under darkness of oblivion. Methought somewhat was to be said of them for their well-deserving, and something, again, of our parts, for benefits by them received. But, above all other things, nothing did so much stir me forward hereunto, as the diligent consideration and special regard of the common utility which every man plentifully may receive by the reading of these our “Monuments” or Martyrology; which history as I have taken in hand chiefly for the use of the English church, so have I framed it in that tongue which the simple people could best understand.

Now, if men commonly delight so much in other chronicles which entreat only upon matters of policy, and rejoice to behold therein the variable events of worldly affairs, the stratagems of valiant captains, the roar of foughten fields, the sacking of cities, the hurlyburlies of realms and people; and if men think it such a gay thing in a commonwealth to commit to history such old antiquities of things profane, and bestow all their ornaments of wit and eloquence in garnishing the same, how much more then is it meet for Christians to conserve in remembrance the lives, acts, and doings, not of bloody warriors, but of mild and constant martyrs of Christ; which serve not so much to delight the ear, as to garnish the life, to frame it with examples of great profit, and to encourage men to all kind of christian godliness! As first, by reading thereof we may learn a lively testimony of God's mighty working in the life of man, contrary to the opinion of Atheists, and all the whole nest of Epicures. For like as one said of Harpalus <sup>f618</sup> in times past, that his doings gave a lively testimony against God, because he, being so wicked a man, escaped so long unpunished; so, contrariwise, in these men, we have an assured and plain witness of God, both in whose lives and deaths appeared such manifest declarations of God's divine working; whiles in such sharpness of torments we behold in them strength so constant above man's reach, such readiness to answer, such patience in imprisonment, such godliness in forgiving, such cheerfulness and courage in suffering; besides the manifold sense and feeling of the Holy Ghost, which they in their lives so plentifully tasted in their afflictions, as in reading of their letters evidently we may understand. Over and besides this, the mild deaths of the saints do not a little avail to the stablishing of a good conscience, to learn the contempt of the world, and to come to the fear of God. Moreover, they confirm faith, increase godliness, abate pride in prosperity, and in adversity do open an hope of heavenly comfort. For what man, reading the misery of these godly persons may not therein, as in a glass, behold his own case, whether he be godly or godless? For if God give adversity unto good men, what may either the better sort promise themselves, or the evil not fear? And whereas by reading of profane stories we are made perhaps more skillful in warlike affairs; so by reading of this we are made better in our livings, and besides are better prepared unto like conflicts (if by God's permission they shall happen hereafter), more wise by their doctrine, and more stedfast by their example.

To be short, they declare to the world what true christian fortitude is, and what is the right way to conquer; which standeth not in the power of man, but in hope of the resurrection to come, and is now, I trust, at hand. In consideration whereof, methinks I have good cause to wish, that, like as other men, even so also kings and princes, who commonly delight in heroical stories, would diligently peruse such monuments of martyrs, and lay them always in sight, not only to read, but to follow, and would paint them upon their walls, cups, rings, and gates. For doubtless such as these are more worthy of honor than an hundred Alexanders, Hectors, Scipios, and warlike Julies. And though the world judgeth preposterously of things, yet with God, the true Judge, certes such are most reputed in deed, not that kill one another with a weapon, but they who, being rather killed in God's cause, do retain an invincible constancy against the threats of tyrants, and violence of tormentors. Such as these are the true conquerors of the world, by whom we learn true manhood, so many as fight under Christ, and not under the world. With this valiantness did that most mild Lamb, and invincible Lion of the tribe of Judah first of all go before us. Of whose unspeakable fortitude we hear this propheticall admiration: "Who is this," saith he, "which walketh so in the multitude of his strength? (Isaiah 63:1.) forsooth, the high Son of the high God, once conquered of the world, and yet conquering the world after the same manner he was conquered.

The like dance did all his other martyrs follow, to whom the ancient antiquity of the church did attribute so great honor, as never king or emperor could purchase in this world with all their images, pillars, high spires, triumphs, temples, and all their solemn feasts. In probation whereof we see with what admiration, and almost superstition, not only the memory but also the relics of those good martyrs, were received and kept amongst the ancient christians. We have also for witness the learned hymns and songs of Prudentius and Nazianzen, wherewith Pindarus did never so much set out his triumphs of Olympia and Nemea. I need not here rehearse the learned orations of eloquent Cyprian, Chrysostome, Ambrose, and Jerome, who never showed their eloquence more, than when they fell into the commendations of the godly martyrs.

Whereby it is manifest, what estimation in times past was attributed to martyrs; with what gratulation, rejoicing, mirth, and common joy, the afflictions of those godly, dying in Christ's quarrel, were sometime

received and solemnized; and that not without good reasonable cause. For the church did well consider how much she was beholden to their benefits, by whose death she understood her treasures to increase. Now then if martyrs are to be compared with martyrs, I see no cause why the martyrs of our time deserve any less commendation than the others in the primitive church; which assuredly are inferior unto them in no point of praise, whether we view the number of them that suffered, or greatness of their torments, or their constancy in dying, or also consider the fruit that they brought, to the amendment of posterity, and increase of the gospel. They did water with their blood the truth that was newly springing up; so these, by their deaths, restored it again, being sore decayed and fallen down. They, standing in the forward of the battle, did receive the first encounter and violence of their enemies, and taught us, by that means, to overcome such tyranny; these, with like courage again, like old beaten soldiers, did win the field in the rearward of the battle. They, like famous husbandmen of the world, did sow the fields of the church, that first lay unmanured and waste; these, with fatness of their blood, did cause it to batten and fructify. Would to God the fruit might be speedily gathered into the barn, which only remaineth behind to come!

Again, if we ascribe such reputation to godly preachers (and worthily), who diligently preach the gospel of Christ, when they live notwithstanding, by the benefit of time, without all fear of persecution; how much more reasonable cause have we to praise and extol such men as stoutly spend their lives for the defense of the same!

All these premises duly of our parts considered and marked, seeing we have found so famous martyrs in this our age, let us not fail then in publishing and setting forth their doings; lest, in that point, we seem more unkind to them, than the writers of the primitive church were unto theirs. And though we repute not their ashes, chains, and swerds [swords] in the stead of relics, yet let us yield thus much unto their commemoration, to glorify the Lord in his saints, and imitate their death (as much as we may) with like constancy, or their lives at the least with like innocency. They offered their bodies willingly to the rough handling of the tormentors; and is it so great a matter then for our part to mortify our flesh, with all the members thereof? They neglected not only the riches and glory of the world for the love of Christ, but also their lives; and shall we then keep so

great a stir one against another for the transitory trifles of this world? They continued in patient suffering, when they had most wrong done unto them, and when their very hearts' blood gushed out of their bodies; and yet will not we forgive our poor brother, be the injury, never so small, but are ready for every trifling offense to seek his destruction, and cut his throat. They, wishing well to all men, did of their own accord forgive their persecutors; and therefore ought we, who are now the posterity and children, of martyrs, not to degenerate from their former steps, but, being admonished by these examples, if we cannot express their charity toward all men, yet at least to imitate the same to our power and strength. Let us give no cause of offense to any, and if any be given to us, let us overcome it with patience, forgiving, and not revenging, the same. And let us not only keep our hands from shedding of blood, but our tongues also from hurting the fame of others. Besides, let us not shrink, if case so require, from martyrdom, or loss of life, according to their example, and to yield up the same in the defense of the Lord's flock. Which thing if men would do, much less contention and business would be in the world than now is. And thus much touching the utility and fruit to be taken of this history.

## TO ALL THE PROFESSED FRIENDS AND FOLLOWERS OF THE POPE'S PROCEEDINGS.

### FOUR QUESTIONS PROPOUNDED.

To you all and singular who profess the doctrine and religion of the pope your holy father, and of your mother-church of Rome, pretending the name of Catholics, commonly termed Papists, wheresoever abiding in the realm of England, these four questions or problems hereunder following I would move; desiring you all either to muse upon them, or to answer them at your leisure.

### THE FIRST QUESTION.

First, forsomuch as mount Sion (which God calleth by the prophet Isaiah the “the hill of his holiness”), beareth in the Scripture an undoubted type of the spiritual church of Christ; and forsomuch as the said Isaiah, (Isaiah 11:9, and 65:25.) prophesying of the said mount Sion, saith in these words, “Non nocent neque affligent in omni monte sancto meo, dicit Dominus,” etc.; that is, “They shall not kill nor hurt in all my holy hill, saith the Lord,” etc. And again, in the same chapters, thus we read, “Habitabit lupus cum agno, et pardus cum haedo accubabit, vitulus et leo et ovis una commorabuntur, et puellus parvulus ducet eos,” etc.; that is, “The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid; the calf, the lion, and the sheep shall feed together, and a young child shall rule them. The cow also and the bear shall abide together with their young ones, and the lion shall eat chaff and fodder like the ox,” etc.

Upon these premises now followeth my question: How the church of Rome can be answerable to this hill of Sion, seeing in the said church of Rome is, and hath been, now so many years, such killing and slaying, such cruelty and tyranny shewed, such burning and spilling of christian blood, such malice and mischief wrought, as, in reading these histories, may to all the world appear?

To this if they answer, and expound these words of the prophet, as pertaining to the church triumphant; thereunto I reply again, that by the

words in the same place and in the same sentence expressed, that sense cannot stand; forasmuch as the prophet in the very same piece, where he prophesieth of this peaceable dwelling in God's holy mountain, without hurting or killing, meaneth plainly of the earth, and showeth also the cause of that godly peace; "Because," saith he, "the earth is replenished with knowledge and science of the Lord," etc. And furthermore the prophet, speaking of the same day when this shall be, addeth, saying, "In that day the Root of Jesse shall stand for a sign to the people, for the Gentiles to be converted, and to seek unto him," etc.; which day in no wise can be applied to the church in heaven triumphant, but only here militant in earth.

Touching which place of Isaiah, further here is to be noted by the way, that, by this peaceable mount Sion (which comprehendeth both the states, as well ecclesiastical as temporal), is not restrained the public penalty of good laws needful to be executed upon public malefactors, but here is restrained the fierceness, revenge, cruelty, and violence of men's affections. To which affections men being commonly subject by nature, through grace and working of the gospel are altered, reformed, and changed to another disposition; from stoutness to softness, from violence to sufferance, from fierceness to forbearing, from pride to humility, from cruelty to compassion, from wiliness to simplicity, from solemn singularity to humanity and meekness. Which virtues, if they had been in the church of Rome (according to the rule of St. Paul, "Which willeth men that be stronger to bear with the infirmities of the weaker, and that in the spirit of meekness," etc. (Romans 15:1. Galatians 6:1), I should not have needed now at this time to write such a long history as this, of the suffering of so many martyrs.

### **THE SECOND QUESTION.**

My second question is this, To demand of you, catholic professors of the pope's sect, who so deadly malign and persecute the protestants professing the gospel of Christ; what just or reasonable cause have you to allege for this your extreme hatred ye bear unto them, that neither you yourselves can abide to live with them, nor yet will suffer the others to live amongst you? If they were Jews, Turks, or infidels, or, in their doctrine, were any idolatrous impiety, or detestable iniquity in their lives; if they went about any deadly destruction, or privy conspiracies to oppress your

lives, or by fraudulent dealing to circumvent you; then had you some cause to complain, and also to revenge. Now seeing in their doctrine ye have neither blasphemy, idolatry, superstition, nor misbelief to object unto them — seeing they are baptized in the same belief, and believe the same articles of the creed as ye do; having the same God, the same Christ and Savior, the same baptism, and are ready to confer with you in all kind of christian doctrine, neither do refuse to be tried by any place of the Scripture — how then riseth this mortal malice of you against them? If you think them to be heretics, then bring forth, if ye can, any one sentence which they arrogantly hold, contrary to the mind of holy Scripture, expounded by the censure of most ancient doctors. Or what is there in all the Scripture to be required, but they acknowledge and confess the same? See and try the order of their lives and doings; what great fault find you? they serve God, they walk under his fear, they obey his law, as men may do; and though they be transgressors towards him, as other men are, yet toward *you* what have they done, what have they committed or deserved, why you should be so bitter against them?

What offended the poor inhabitants of Merindol and Cabriers, when the bishop of Aix, the cardinal of Tours, and other bishops of France, wresting from Francis, the French king, a commission, sent Minerius with his captain John de Gray, to destroy their country, A.D. 1530; who, driving the poor people there into a barn full of straw, set the barn on fire, and burned up men, women, and children? And, likewise, in a church exercised the like cruelty upon them, where were murdered the same time to the number of a thousand young and old, women, children, and young infants, besides seven whole towns, with the most part of the dwellers therein, being murdered and burnt in the said country of Provence.

Also, before that, what offended the citizens of Tholouse and Avignon, when pope Gregory IX set Louis IX. the French king to war against them, and against Raymund their earl, without cause; where also the said king died the siege?

Or, to speak of later years, what hurt or harm did the poor protestants in the the town of Vassy; <sup>f619</sup> who, being peaceably at a sermon, were miserably slain and cut, men, women, and children, by the duke of Guise and his armed soldiers? Besides other infinite examples almost not to be

numbered of like cruelty, in Calabria, Apulia, Bohemia, France, and now of late in Flanders, and in other countries more.

But to let other countries pass, let us tum now to the peaceable government in this realm of England, under this our so mild and gracious Queen now presently reigning. Under whom you see how gently you are suffered, what mercy is shewed unto you, how quietly ye live. What lack you that you would have, having almost the best rooms and offices in all the realm, not only without any loss of life, but also without any fear of death? And though a few of your arch-clerks be in custody, yet in that custody so shrewdly are they hurt, that many a good protestant in the realm would be glad with all their hearts to change rooms and diet with them, if they might. And albeit some other for their pleasure have slipt over the seas; if their courage to see countries abroad did so allure them, who could let them? Yet this is certain, no dread there was of death that drave them. For what papist have you seen in all this land to lose either life or limb for papistry, <sup>f620</sup> during all these twelve years hitherto since this queen's reign? And yet, all this notwithstanding, having no cause to complain, so many causes to give God thanks, ye are not yet content, ye fret and fume, ye grudge and mutter, and are not pleased with peace, nor satisfied with safety, but hope for a day, and fain would have a change. And to prevent your desired day, ye have conspired, and risen up in open rebellion against your prince, whom the Lord hath set up to be your governor.

And as you have since that now of late disturbed the quiet and peaceable state of Scotland, in murdering most traitorously the gentle and godly regent of Scotland (who, in sparing the queen's life there, when he had her in his hands, hath now therefore lost his own), so, with like fury, as by your rebellion appeareth, would you disturb the golden quiet and tranquillity of this realm of England, if ye might have your wills. Which the merciful grace of the Almighty, for Christ his Son's sake our Lord, forefend and utterly disappoint. Amen!

Wherefore, these premises considered, my question is to ask of you and know, what just or reasonable cause ye have of these your unreasonable doings, of this your so mortal and deadly hatred, fury, and malice, you bear against these your even-christened; of these your tumults, conjurations,

gaping, and hoping, rebellions, mutterings, and murders, wherewith you trouble and disquiet the whole world? Of all which mischiefs, if the true cause were well known, the truth would be found doubtless to be none other but only the private cause of the bishop of Rome, that he is not received, and the dignity of his church exalted.

Touching which cause how unreasonable and unjust it is, more shall be said (the Lord willing) in reply, according as I shall see their answer, if it shall so please them, or any of them, to answer this question. In the mean time, this, for a brief note shall suffice: that it standeth not with the Scripture, but contrary to the Scripture, that the bishop of Rome should so revenge his own private cause. If this title and plantation be good, and of God, why doth he not refer it unto God? And no doubt, but if it be so, God will maintain it, though the whole world said No. If it be otherwise, it will fall and be rooted out, though all the world said Yea. Yea, the greatest argument to prove this plantation of the pope's supremacy not to be of God, is, that the pope, fighting in his own private cause, by outward and worldly force, seeketh his own glory. Christ our Savior, being here refused himself, yet neither revenged his own cause, nor sought his own glory, but only the glory and will of his Father, thus speaking of himself, "Si ego glorifico meipsum, gloria mea nihil est, Pater meus est qui glorificat me," etc.; that is, "If I glorify myself, my glory is nothing; my Father is he that glorifieth me, (John 8:54.) etc. Even so I say with Scripture, that if the pope's proceedings were planted of God, he would not so wrestle for his glory as he doth; but forsomuch as he seeketh by such cruelty and bloodshed to exalt himself, we may well argue his proceedings not to be of God, and that he should be brought low. (Luke 18:14.)

### THE THIRD QUESTION.

My third question I take of the thirteenth chapter of the book of Revelation. Which book, as it containeth a propheticall history of the church, so likewise it requireth by histories to be opened. In this chapter mention is made, first, of a certain beast coming out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, with ten diadems of blasphemy: unto the which beast the dragon, the devil, gave his strength, and great power to fight against his saints, and to overcome them, and to make forty-two months; <sup>f621</sup> of the which beast one of his heads was wounded at length to death.

After this, immediately in the same chapter, mention followeth of another beast rising out of the land, having two horns like a lamb, and spake like a dragon, and did all the power of the former beast before his face, and caused all dwellers of the earth to worship the beast, whose head was wounded and lived. Who also had power to give spirit and life to the said former beast, to make the image of the beast to speak, and to cause all men, from the highest to the lowest, to take the mark of the beast in their hands and foreheads; and whosoever worshipped not the image of the beast should be killed.

Upon this description of these two beasts riseth my question; wherein I desire all papists, from the highest to the lowest, either to answer, or to consider with themselves, what the spirit of the prophecy meaneth by the said two beasts. Neither is the mystery of this prophecy so obscure, but, being historical, by histories it may be explained and easily expounded. Writing, therefore, to the papists, as men expert in histories, my question is this: That seeing the prophecy of these two beasts must needs prefigure some people or dominion in the world, of some high estate and power, they will now declare unto us, *what* people or domination this should be; which, if they will do plainly and truly, according to the marks and properties of the said two beasts here set forth, they must needs be driven, of force inevitable, to grant and confess the same to agree only to the city and empire of Rome, and to no other; which, by these reasons following, of necessity must needs be concluded.

**First**, the beast which came out of the sea, having the strength, the seat and power, of the great dragon (the devil, called the prince of this world) committed to him, who also had power given over all tribes, nations, languages, people, and countries in the earth, must needs be an empire or monarchy of great force, passing all other monarchies in the world besides: and this must needs argue the empire of Rome and none other.

**Secondly**, In that the beast had seven heads and ten horns, with ten diadems full of blasphemy upon them; those seven heads being expounded in the said book (Revelation 17.) for seven hills, notoriously importeth the city of Rome, wherein were seven hills contained. The like also may be thought of the ten horns, being there expounded for ten kings (signifying, belike, the ten provinces or kingdoms of the world, subdued to the Roman

empire), with ten crowns of blasphemy upon their heads; all which conveniently agree to the city of Rome.

**Thirdly**, Where the said beast had power to make forty-two months, <sup>f622</sup> and to fight against the saints, and to overcome them, etc.; thereby most manifestly is declared the empire of Rome, with the heathen persecuting emperors, who had power given the space of so many months (that is, from Tiberius to Licinius, two hundred and ninety-four years) to persecute Christ's church, as, in the table of the primitive church hereafter following, is discoursed more at large.

**Fourthly**, Where the prophet speaketh of one of the heads of the beast to be wounded to death, and the wound afterward to be cured again; by that ye have to understand the decay and subversion of the city of Rome, and of Italy, which, being one of the heads of the Roman monarchy, was subdued by the Goths, Vandals, and Lombards, and the city of Rome thrice sacked and taken, between the reign of Honorius emperor of Rome, and the time of Justinian emperor of Constantinople; and so remained this head of Rome wounded a long time under the dominion of the Lombards, till at length this wound was cured again, as the sequel of this prophecy declareth. For so it followeth in the the aforesaid chapter of the Revelation: "And after this I saw," saith he, "another beast rising out of the land, having two horns like the lamb, and rising out spake like the dragon. Who practiced all the power of the first beast before his face, and caused all the inhabitants of the earth to worship the first beast, tending whose head was wounded and cured again, etc. And to him it was given to give life to the image of the beast, and to make it speak: and also to make all them that will not worship the image of the beast, to be slain, and caused all, from the most to the least, both rich and poor, free-men and bond-men, to take the mark of the beast in their right hand and in their foreheads, so that none should buy and sell unless he had the beast's mark about him," etc.

The description of this second beast being well viewed, it cannot be avoided, but needs must be applied to the bishop of Rome, and to none other, as by the history and order of times is evident to be proved. For who else representeth the horns of "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world," but only he? Who speaketh with the voice of the dragon so proudly as he? The voice of the dragon spake once to Christ,

“That all the glory of the world was his, to give to whom he would, and that he would give it,” etc. And doth not this false-horned lamb, speaking in the same voice of the dragon, say by the mouth of pope Gregory VII., “That all the kingdoms of the earth were his, and that he had power in earth to loose, and take away empires, kingdoms, dukedoms, and what else soever mortal men may have, and to give them where he would,” <sup>f623</sup> etc.?

Furthermore, at what time the declining state of Rome began to decay, and Italy was brought under subjection of the Lombards, then the pope stirred up Pepin and Charlemagne, to take his part against the Lombards, and to restore monarchy again the old glory of that monarchy to his former state. And, therefore, who cured the wounded head of this beast again but only he? Who gave life and speech to the image of the beast, but he? who, after that, by the help of the French kings, he had subdued those Lombards, with other aliens, and had gotten the possession of Rome into his own hands, so repaired and advanced the fame and name of Rome, that since that time all persons, from the highest to the lowest, both rich and poor, have been glad to send and seek to Rome, yea, kings, emperors, queens, and dukes, have been glad to kiss that bishop’s feet, and to lead his horse by the bridle. So that the majesty of Rome, in the old heathen emperors’ days, was never more terrible nor glorious, nor ever had more power to persecute and overcome God’s saints, than these lamb-like bishops of Rome have had, and have exercised, these five hundred years in Christendom. And, therefore, who else in all the world hath so much power to do the works of the first beast before his face, as he? or who but he alone, who forceth both high and low, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive the seal, and to become loyal to the city and see of Rome? so that whosoever hath not the mark whereby to be known to hold of the church of Rome, shall have no place to buy and sell, nor to occupy in all Christendom.

Now if any papist whatsoever, in answering to this my question, can apply this prophetic mystery of these two beasts otherwise than thus, I would heartily desire him to take so much pains to satisfy this doubt at his good pleasure and leisure. In the mean season, let this stand for a *Corollarium*: that the bishop of Rome, by this description, must be that second beast prophesied to come in the latter time of the church under a

false pretended lamb, to restore again the old persecutions of Rome, and to disturb the whole church of Christ, as this day too truly is come to pass.

### THE FOURTH QUESTION.

As touching my fourth question, although I could urge you with another like propheticall place of Scripture, no less evident against the bishop of Rome, taken out of the second epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians, where mention is made of the son of perdition, “sitting in the temple of God, as God, and advancing himself above all that is called God, etc.” — Which place ye can by no reasonable evasion avoid — yet notwithstanding to let this pass, I turn my question to ask this of you: Whether the religion of Christ be mere spiritual, or else corporal? If ye affirm it to be corporal, as was the old religion of the Jews, consisting in outward rites, sacrifices, and ceremonies of the law; then shew, if ye can, what any one outward action or observation is required in christian religion by the Scripture, as necessary in a christian man for remission of sins and salvation, save only the two sacramental ceremonies of outward baptism, and of the Lord’s supper? Howbeit, neither these also as they are corporal; that is to say, neither the outward action of the one, nor of the other, conferreth remission of sins, nor salvation, but only are visible shews of invisible and spiritual benefits. And furthermore, if our God whom we serve be spiritual; how can his religion and service be corporal, as we are taught by the mouth of our Savior, saying, “God is a Spirit, and therefore they that worship him must worship in spirit and verity, etc.”

Now if ye grant (as ye must needs) this our christian religion to be spiritual, and not a corporal religion, then shew, if ye can, any one point, of all these things, which ye strive for so much with us, to be spiritual, but altogether corporal, and extern matters and ceremonial observations, nothing conducing to any spiritual purpose: as your outward succession of bishops, garments, vestures, gestures, colors, choice of meats, difference of days, times, and places, hearing, seeing, saying, touching, tasting, numbering of beads, gilding and worshipping images, building monasteries, rising at midnight, silence in cloisters, abstaining from flesh and white meat, fasting in Lent, keeping ember-days, hearing mass and divine service, seeing and adoring the body in form of bread, receiving holy-water and holy-bread, creeping to the cross, carrying palms, taking ashes, bearing candles,

pilgrimage-going, censing, kneeling, knocking, altars, super-altars, candlesticks, pardons. In orders, crossing, anointing, shaving, forswearing marriage. In baptism, crossing, salting, spatling, exorcising, washing of hands. At Easter, ear-confession, penance-doing, satisfaction; and in receiving, with beards new shaven, to imagine a body where they see no body; and though he were there present to be seen, yet the outward seeing and touching of him, of itself, without faith, conduceth no more than it did to the Jews. At Rogation-days, to carry banners, to follow the cross, to walk about the fields. After Pentecost, to go about with Corpus Christi play. At Hollomas to watch in the church, to say a dirge, and commemorations, and to ring for All-Souls, to pay tythes truly, to give to the high altar. And if a man will be a priest, to say mass and matins, to serve the saint of that day, and to lift well over his head, etc. In sickness to be annealed, to take his rites; after his death to have funerals, and chits said for him, and to be rung for at his funeral, month mind, and year mind, etc. Add moreover to these the outward sacrifice of the mass, with opus operatum sine bono motu utentis. etc.

All which things above recited, as they contain the whole summary and effect of all the pope's catholic religion; so are they all corporal exercises, consisting in the extern operation of man. Which if they can make a perfect right catholic christian, then it may be said, that men may be made perfect Christians by flesh and blood, without any inward working of faith, or of the Holy Ghost. For what is in all these, but that which flesh and blood of his [own] strength is able to accomplish, though no inward strength or motion of the Holy Ghost did work?

But now the order of our religion, and way of salvation, consisteth not in such corporal or outward things as these, but in other more high and more spiritual gifts, which far exceed the capacity of flesh and blood; of the which gifts, the chiefest and only main cause that sayeth man, and remitteth sins, is his faith in Christ. Which faith I thus define; for a man to believe, by the blood-shedding of Jesus the Son of God his sins to be forgiven, God's wrath to be pacified, and himself to be justified perfectly from all accusations that can be laid unto him. And though the papists make a light matter of this, to believe Christ; and when they hear us say, That faith only justifieth, they object to us again, and make it a small matter to be saved, if faith only justifieth us; yet notwithstanding, this

faith, if it be well examined, is such a thing that flesh and blood is not able to attain thereto, unless God's holy Spirit from above do draw him.

Moreover, besides this faith, many other things are incident also to the doctrine of our salvation. Albeit as no causes thereof, but either as sacraments and seals of faith, or as declarations thereof, or else as fruits and effects following the same: so baptism, and the supper of the Lord, are as testimonies and proofs, that by our faith only in Christ we are justified; that as our bodies are washed by water, and our life nourished by bread and wine, so, by the blood of Christ our sins are purged, and the hunger of our souls relieved by the death of his body.

Upon the same faith riseth also outward profession by mouth, as a declaration thereof. Other things also, as fruits and effects, do follow after faith; as peace of conscience, joy in the holy Ghost, invocation, patience, charity, mercy, judgment, and sanctification. For God, for our faith in Christ his Son, therefore giveth into our hearts his holy Spirit of comfort, of peace, and sanctification, whereby man's heart is moved to a godly disposition to fear God, to seek him, to call upon him, to trust unto him, to stick to him in all adversities and persecutions, to love him; and, for his sake also, to love our brethren; to have mercy and compassion upon them, to visit them if they be in prison, to break bread to them if they be hungry, and, if they be burdened, to ease them; to clothe them if they be naked, and to harbor them if they be houseless; with such other spiritual exercises of piety and sanctification as these, which therefore I call spiritual, because they proceed of the holy Spirit and law of God, which is spiritual.

And thus have ye a catholic Christian defined, first after the rules of Rome, and also after the rule of the gospel. Now confer these antitheses together, and see whether of these is the true Christian, the ceremonial man after the church of Rome, or the spiritual man with his faith and other spiritual fruits of piety following after the same. And if ye say that ye mix them both together, spiritual things with your corporal ceremonies, to that I answer again, that as touching the end of remission of sins and salvation, they ought in no case to be joined together, because the main cause of all our salvation and remission is only spiritual, and consisteth in faith, and in no other.

And therefore upon the same cause I come to my question again, as I began to ask whether the religion of Christ be a mere spiritual religion; and whether in the religion of Rome, as it is now, is any thing but only mere corporal things required, to make a catholic man. And thus I leave you to your answer.

In turning over the first leaves of this book, <sup>f624</sup> thou shalt find, gentle reader, the arguments of Pighius and Hosius, wherein thug they argue: that forsomuch as Christ must needs have a catholic church ever continuing here in earth, which all men may see, and whereunto all men ought to resort; and seeing no other church hath endured continually from the apostles, visible here in earth, but only the church of Rome; they conclude, therefore, the church of Rome only to be the right catholic church of Christ.

In answering whereunto, this is to be said; that forsomuch as the *medius terminus* of this argument, both in the *major* and *minor*, consisteth only in the words “visible and unknown,” if they mean by this word “visible,” in the *major*, that Christ’s church must be seen here to all the world, that all men may resort to it, it is false. Likewise, if they mean by the same word “visible” in the *minor*, that no other church hath been seen and known to any, but only the church of Rome, they are likewise deceived. For the true church of Christ neither is so visible, that all the world can see it, but only they which have spiritual eyes, and be members thereof; nor yet so invisible again, but such as be God’s elect, and members thereof, do see it, and have seen it, though the worldly eyes of the most multitude cannot do so; whereof read more in the Protestation, above prefixed, to the church of England.

## FOUR CONSIDERATIONS GIVEN OUT TO CHRISTIAN PROTESTANTS,

### PROFESSORS OF THE GOSPEL; WITH A BRIEF EXHORTATION INDUCING TO REFORMATION OF LIFE.

#### THE FIRST CONSIDERATION.

As, in the pages before, “Four Questions” were moved to the catholic papists, to answer them at their leisure; so have I here, to the christian gospellers, four considerations for them to muse upon with speed convenient.

The first consideration is this: that every good man well weigh with himself the long tranquillity, the great plenty, the peaceable liberty, which the Lord of his mercy hath bestowed upon this land during all the reign hitherto of this our sovereign and most happy Queen Elizabeth, in such sort as the like example of God’s abundant mercies is not to be seen in any nation about us; so, as we may well sing with the psalm in the church, “Non fecit taliter omni nationi, et opes glories suae non manifestavit eis;” first, in having the true light of God’s gospel so shining among us, so publicly received, so freely preached, with such liberty of conscience without danger professed; having, withal, a prince so virtuous, a Queen so gracious, given unto us, of our own native country, bred and born amongst us, so quietly governing us, so long lent unto us, in such peace defending us against such as would else devour us; briefly, what could we have more at God’s hand, if we would wish? Or what else could we wish in this world that we have not, if this one thing lacked not — grace to use that well which we have?

#### THE SECOND CONSIDERATION.

As these things first are to be considered concerning ourselves, so, secondly; let us consider likewise the state and times of other our countrymen and blessed martyrs aforepast; what storms of persecutions they sustained, what little rest they had, with what enemies they were

matched, with what crosses pressed, under what princes, under what prelates, they lived, or rather died, in the days of king Henry the fourth, king Henry the fifth, king Henry the seventh, king Henry the eighth, Queen Mary, etc.; under Bonner bishop of London, Gardiner bishop of Winchester, Cholmley, Story, bishop Arundel, Stokesley, Courtney, Warham; at what time children were caused to set fire to their fathers, the father adjured to accuse the son, the wife to accuse the husband, the husband the wife, brother the sister, sister the brother; examples whereof are plenty in this book to be seen.

### **THE THIRD CONSIDERATION.**

Thirdly, let us call to mind, considering thus with ourselves, these good men and worthy martyrs in those dangerous days, tasting as they did the heavy hand of God's sharp correction, beginning commonly, with his own house first; if they were alive now in these halcyon-days, under the protection of such a peaceable prince, O what thanks would they give to God? How happy would they count themselves, having but half of that we have, with freedom only of conscience and safety of life! Or, if in case we ourselves had been in those times of theirs, so troubled and distressed as they were, spoiled of goods, hated of the world, cited in consistories, pinched in prisons, sequestered from house, wife, and children, looking for nothing but death; what would we say? what would we think? what would we do? Much otherwise doubtless than we do now. God grant we may do better; for worse I think we cannot if we would. John Wickliff, William Swinderby, Thorpe, Sawtry, with a number of godly men more, being then clad in friese-gowns, going barefoot, to preach where they could; if they were now alive, how glad would they be of these days, what pains would they take, yea, what pains would they not take in preaching the gospel, not for lucre, nor for money, nor passing for promotions or dignities of the church! Sir John Oldcastle, Lord Cobham, Sir Roger Acton, with divers worshipful gentlemen a great number, if they, being in our state, might enjoy with us their houses and lands, with the good favor of their prince (as then they could not), how gladly would they have contented themselves, though they never raised their rents and fines to the undoing of their poor tenants! Likewise in the time of John Huss and Jerome of Prague, the nobility and gentlemen of Bohemia, if they might have had half

this tranquillity which we have, to enjoy the liberty of God's word and true use of the sacraments without molestation of Romish prelates, what would they have cared how simply they walked in their attire, without any such monstrous pomp in pranking up themselves, as we Englishmen in these reformed days walk now, more like players on a stage, than God's children in his church.

### THE FOURTH CONSIDERATION.

Wherefore, well-beloved, these things being so, let us call ourselves to mind, considering the times that have been, the times that be, and the times that may come, how we stand, and by whom we stand. If it be the favor of God only that doth support us in the midst of so many enemies, let us beware that in no wise we provoke his indignation. If it be his truth and gospel that we profess, let us walk in the light of his truth, and keep ourselves within the compass of his gospel. What the gospel requireth, and what it abhorreth, who knoweth not? and yet who followeth what he knoweth? If St. Paul willeth every one to depart from iniquity, which nameth the Lord Jesus; and if the Lord Jesus himself testifieth plainly his kingdom not to be of this world, how will then the nature of that kingdom so spiritual, and our conditions so worldly, match well together? To rip up all our deformities in particular I mind not here, neither need I, the same being so evident to all men's eyes, that who cannot see our excessive outrage in pompous apparel, our carnal desires and unchaste demeanors, without fear of God, our careless security, without conscience, as though there were no judgement to come, our studies so upon this world, as though there were no other heaven? What pride and idleness of life, double dissembling in word and deed, without simplicity, avarice unsatiable, little regard to hear God's word, less to read it, least of all to follow it, every man aspiring to worldly wealth and promotion, little or no mercy to the poor, racking of rents and fines, bribing and taking unmeasurable. What should I speak of the contentions and unbrotherly divisions amongst us, most lamentable to see, but more lamentable, if all were seen which may or is like to follow upon the same? Such were the times once of the church before the horrible persecution of Dioclesian; for so we read, such hatred and disdain, through much peace and prosperity of the church, to creep in amongst the churchmen.

Wherefore let us be exhorted, dearly beloved, to reclaim ourselves while time doth serve. If we find the Lord so gracious in sparing us as he doth, let not that make us worse, but better. It is a lewd child that will not learn without beating. A well-minding man will be good; not forced by coaction, but of voluntary office induced. As adversity, if it come, ought not to dismay us; so prosperity, now present, ought not to puff us up in security, considering what commonly is wont to follow; as Plato well writeth, “ae atque effrentae libertatis servitatem plerumque asseclam esse,” Of immoderate liberty and too much security, followeth most commonly extreme servitude. And as we walk like chddren of disobedience, God hath his rods to scourge us; if we will needs be rebels, he hath his Pharaohs and Nabuchadnezzars to plague us. Or if we will be so inordinate and (with reverence be it spoken, without offence to God or man) so doggish and curlish one to another, the Lord lacketh not his dog-strikers to whip us. And would God our lives were such, that the destruction and ruin, here of late seen among us, may portend nothing against us, as I trust there is no cause for us to fear; but rather to fear the Lord, and walk in his obedience, and amend that which is amiss amongst us. Amen.

The grace of our Lord Jesus bless thee, gentle reader, that long thou mayest read, and much thou mayest profit. Amen.

Pax praedicantibus, gracia audientibus, gloria Jesu Christo. Amen.

THE KALENDER											
Januarye hath 31 dayes. The Moone 30.				Days of their death	Year of the Lord	February hath 28 dayes. The Moone 29.				Days of their death	Year of the Lord
3	A	1	Circumcision				d	1	William Thorpe, Priest, Confessor		1407
	b	2	John Wicklief, Preacher, martyr		1387	11	e	2	Purification og our Ladye.		
11	c	3	John Aston, Confes.		1382	19	f	3	John Claydon, martyr		1413
	d	4	William Sawtre, Priest, martyr		1401	8	g	4	Richard Turnine, martyr		1413
19	e	5	Swinderby a Priest martyr				A	5	Zisca, a Confessor		1416
8	f	6	Epiphany			16	b	6	Syr. John Ould Castell. Lord Cobham, Martyr.		1418
	g	7	Syr Roger Acton, Knyght, martyr		1401	5	c	7	Richarde Houeden, martyr		1430
16	A	8	John Brown, Gentleman, martyr		1413		d	8	Thomas Bageley, Priest, martyr.		1431
5	b	9	John Beverly, Preacher, martyr		1413	18	e	9	Paule Craws, martyr		1431
	c	10	Richard Silbecke, martyr	14	1413	2	f	10	Thomas Rhedon, martyr		1436
13	d	11	John Castellane, Doctour, martyr	12	1521		g	11	Raynolde Pecocke, Bis. Confessor		1457
2	e	12	Thomas Whytell, minister, martyr	27	1525	10	A	12	Sir Roger Onley, Knight, martyr		1441
	f	13	Bartlet Grene,	27	1556		b	13	Elenor		

			Gentleman, martyr						Cobham, Gentlewoman , Confessor		
10	g	14	John Tudson, martyr	27	1556	18	c	14	Mother of the Lady Yong, martyr		1490
	A	15	Thom. Went, martyr	27	1556	7	d	15	Thomas Notrice, martyr		1507
18	b	16	Thomas Browne, martyr	27	1556		e	16	Thomas of Eckles, martyr		1510
7	c	17	Isabel Foster, martyr	27	1556	15	f	17	Thomas Bungaye, martyr		1511
	d	18	Joane Wame, alias Lashford, martyr	27	1556	4	g	18	D. Martyn Luther, Confessor	18	1546
15	e	19	John Lomas, martyr	31	1556		A	19	Pope of Fay, martyr		1512
4	f	20	Anne Albright, alias Thampnes, martyr	31	1556	12	b	20	Peake, martyr		1512
	g	21	Joane Catmer, martyr	31	1556	1	c	21	George Carpenter, Martiir	8	1527
12	A	22	Agnes Snothe, martyr	31	1556		d	22	John Rogers, Preacher, Martyr	4	1555
1	b	23	Joane Sole, martyr	31	1556	9	e	23	Lawence Saunders, Preacher, martyr	8	1555
	c	24	William Waterer, martyr	15	1556		f	24	I Hooper, Bys., Martyr Mathy. Apo.	9	1555
9	d	25	Conuer. of Paule. Steuen Kemp, martyr	15	1557	17	g	25	Rowland Taylor, Doctour, martyr	9	1555
	e	26	William Hay, martyr	15	1557	16	A	26	Robert Farrar, Bys. Martyr	22	1555
17	f	27	Thomas Hudson, martyr	15	1557		b	27	Agnes Potten, martyr	19	1556
6	g	28	William Lowicke, martyr	15	1557	14	c	28	Tronchfield's wife, martyr	19	1557

	A	29	Will. Prowing, martyr	15	1557					
14	b	30	Nicholas Final, Math., Bradbridge, martyrs	16	1557					
3	c	31	John Philpot, Thomas Steuens, martyrs		1557					

## THE KALENDER

Marche hath 31 days. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord	April hath 30 dayes. The Moone 29.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord		
3	d	1	William Tailoure, martir	2	1422		g	1	Rob Hatches, Archer, Hawkins, Martyrs	4	1519
	e	2	John Weselianus, a Doctoure, martir		1479	11	A	2	Thomas Bounde, martyr	4	1519
11	f	3	Doctor Weselus, alias Basilius, Confessor		1490		b	3	Wrigsham, martyr	4	1519
	g	4	Henry Sudphen, martyr		1524	19	c	4	Lansdale, martyr	4	1519
19	A	5	John Houghley, martyr		1526	8	d	5	Mistress Smith, Widow, martyr	4	1519
8	b	6	Petrus Flestedius, martyr		1528	16	e	6	James Baynham, Gentlemen, martyr	30	1532
	c	7	Adolphus Clabachus, martyr		1528	5	f	7	Jo. Awcocke, Confessor	2	1555
16	d	8	Patricke Hammelton, martyr		1528		g	8	George Marshe, Preacher, martyr	24	1555
5	e	9	Tho. Hitten,		1530	13	A	9	Wiliam	24	1555

			martyr						Flower, Minister, martyr		
	f	10	Tho. Bilney, Martyr		1531	2	b	10	Robert Drakes, Minister, martyr	24	1556
13	g	11	Daby Foster, martyr		1531		c	11	Thomas Tymmes, martyr	24	1556
2	A	12	Edward Frese. Confessor		1531	10	d	12	Rich. Spurge, Tho. Spurge, Martyrs	24	1556
	b	13	Valentyne Frese and his wyfe, martyr		1531		e	13	John Cabell, martyr	24	1556
10	c	14	Father Bate, Confessor		1531	18	f	14	George Ambrose, martyr	24	1556
18	d	15	Rawlin White. Martyr		1555	7	g	15	John Harpole, Jone Bech, Martyrs	1	1556
	e	16	Thomas Tomkins, martyr		1555		A	16	John Hullier, Minister, martyr	2	1556
7	f	17	Thomas Higbed, Gentlemen, martyr	15	1555	15	b	17	Christopher Lister, Minister, martyr	28	1556
	g	18	Thomas Cawson, Gentlemen, martyr	25	1555	4	c	18	John Mace, martyr	28	1556
15	A	19	William Hunter, martyr	25	1555		d	19	John Spenser, martyr	28	1556
4	b	20	William Pigot, martyr	25	1555	12	e	20	Simond Joyne, martyr	28	
	c	21	Stephen Knyght, martyr	28	1555	1	f	21	Richarde Nichol, martyr	28	1556
12	d	22	John Lawrence, Minister, martyr	28	1555		g	22	John Hamonde, martyr	28	1556
1	e	23	Thomas Cranmer, Archebyshop: Martyr	29	1555	9	A	23	St. George, Martir		
	f	24	Rob. Spicer, martyr	21	1556		b	24	Thomas Loseby, martyr	12	1556

9	g	25	Annunciation of our Ladye.	24	1556	17	c	25	Marke Evangelist		
	A	26	William Coberley, martyr	24	1556	6	d	26	Henry Ramsey, martyr	12	1557
17	b	27	Maunderell, martyr	24	1556		e	27	Thomas Thyrtle, martyr	12	1557
6	c	28	Richard Crashfield, martyr	15	1557	14	f	28	Margaret Hyde, martyr	12	1557
	d	29	Cuthbert Simpson. Martyr	28	1558	3	g	29	Agnes Stanley, martyr	12	1557
14	e	30	Hugh Fox, martyr	28	1558		A	30	William Nichol, martyr		1558
3	f	31	John Debennish, martyr	28	1558						

## THE KALENDER

May hath 31 dayes. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord	June hath 30 dayes. The Moone 29.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord		
11	b	1	Philip and James, Apostles				e	1	Hierom of Prague, Anne Askewe, Jo. Lassells, gentlemen, Martyrs	1	1416
	c	2	John Hus, Martyr		1415	19	f	2	Jo. Adas, Nico. Bellma, Tho. Hawks, Martyrs		1546
19	d	3	Hieronimus Savanarola, Martyr	23	1499	8	g	3	Tho. Wattes, John Simpson, John Ardeley, Martyrs	10	1555
8	e	4	Dominick, martyr	23	1499	16	A	4	Nic. Chamberlayn, Tho. Hosmod, Martyrs	15	1555
	f	5	Siluester, martyr	23	1499	5	b	5	W. Bramforde,	15	1555

									Martyr		
16	g	6	Fryer Roy, martyr		1531		c	6	Tho. Hurland, Tho. Oswald, Thom. Reade, Th.Abington, Martyrs	6	1556
5	A	7	Robert Kyng, martyr		1532	13	d	7	T. Wood, Tho. Milles, Martyrs W. Adherall, minister, Confessor	20 23	1556 1556
	b	8	Robert Debnam, martyr		1532	2	e	8	John Clement, Confessor A Merchants Servat, martyr H. Adlington, martyr	25 26 27	1556 1556 1556
13	c	9	Nicholas Mashe, martyr		1532		f	9	Lau. Pemam, Henry Wyte, W. Hallywell, Martyrs	27	1556
2	d	10	John Cardmaker, alias Taylour, Preacher, martyr	31	1555	10	g	10	Th. Bowyer, George Serle, Edmund hurst, Martyrs	27	1556
	e	11	John Wame, martyr	31	1555		A	11	Lion Cawche, Kafe Jackson, Martyrs	27	1556
10	f	12	Margaret Ellis, Confessor	13	1556	18	b	12	Tho. Derifall, martyr	27	1556
	g	13	Hugh Lauerocke, martyr	15	1556	7	c	13	John Roth, Eliza Pepper, Agnes George, Martyrs, Thomas Paret, Hut, Ambrose, Confessors	27 28	1556 1556
18	A	14	John Apprice, martyr	15	1556		d	14	John Moryce, Confessor	29	
7	b	15	Katharin Hut, Wydowe, martyr	16	1556	15	e	15	Rog. Bernard, Adam Foster, Rob. Lawson,	30	1557

									Martyrs		
	c	16	Elizabeth Thackwell, martyr	16	1556	4	f	16	Walter Apelby, Betronill hys wife, Edmund Allen, Katheryn hys wyfe, Martyrs	18	1557
15	d	17	Jone Homes, martyr	16	1556	12	A	18	Jo. Bradbridge, J. Manning, Elizabeth a blynde mayde, Martyrs	18	1557
4	e	18	A blind Boye, and another with hym, martyrs	5	1556	1	b	19	Thomas More, martyr		
	f	19	Thomas Spycer, martyr	21	1556		c	20	Nico. Whight, Nico. Pardue, J. Fishcocke, Barbara Final, Martyrs	19	1557
12	g	20	John Denny, martyr	21	1556	9	d	21	Natiuitye of S. John Bap. Bradbriges widow, martyr		
1	A	21	William Pole, martyr	21	1556		e	22	Benden's wife, Wilson's wife, Martyrs	19	1557
	b	22	John Slesh, Confessor	30	1556		f	23	Ric. Woodman, G. Stephens, W. Maynard, Alexanders Hosmons man, Martyrs	22	1557
9	c	23	Wylliam Norant, martyr	29	1557		A	25	Thomasina Woods wayde, martyr	22	1557
	d	24	Steuw Gratwick, martyr	29	1557	14	b	26	Margeye Morice, martyr		
17	e	25	John Thurstone,		1557	3	c	27	James Morice, son, Denis		

			Confession						Burges, Asdown's wife, Groue's wyfe, Martyrs		
6	f	26	William Seaman, martyr	19	1558		d	28	Henry Ponde, R. Eastlande, Ro. Southam, Mat. Ricarby, martyrs	27	1558
	g	27	Thomas Carman, martyr	19	1558	11	e	29	Peter & Paul & Apostles John Lloyd John Holyday, martyrs	27	1558
14	A	28	Thomas Hudson, martyr	19	1558		f	30	Roger Hollad, martyr	27	1558
3	b	29	Wylliam Haries, martyr	26	1558						
	c	30	Richard Day, martyr	26	1558						
11	d	31	Christian George, martyr	26	1558						

## THE KALENDER

July hath 31 dayes. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord	August hath 31 dayes. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord		
19	g	1	Henry Voz, John Esch, Martyrs	1	1522	8	c	1	Leonard Keyser, martyr	16	1527
8	A	2	John Frith, Andrew Hewet, Martyrs	4	1533	16	d	2	James Abbes, martyr	2	1555
	b	3	Antony Perso, Robert Testwood, Hen. Finnemore, Martyrs	18	1543	5	e	3	John Denley, gentlemen, martyr	8	1555
16	c	4	Tho. Bradford, preacher, John Leate, Martyrs	1	1555		f	4	John Newman, martyr	28	1555
5	d	5	Jone Polley, martyr		1555	18	g	5	Patricke Patyngham,	28	1555

									martyr		
	e	6	Wylliam Myny, minister, martyr	2	1555	2	A	6	William Coker, martyr	23	1555
18	f	7	Richard Hoke, martyr		1555		b	7	William Hopper, martyr	23	1555
2	g	8	John Blande, preacher, Jhon Franke, martyr	12	1555	10	c	8	Henry Laurence, martyr	23	1555
	A	9	Hunfrey Middleton, martyr	12	1555		d	9	Richard Wryght, martyr	23	1555
10	b	10	Nich. Shetterden, martyr	12	1555	18	e	10	Wylliam Stere, martyr	23	1555
	c	11	William Dighel, Diricke Caruer, martyr	12	1555	7	f	11	Richard Wryght, martyr	23	1555
18	d	12	John Launder, martyr	23	1555		g	12	Elizabeth Wame, martyr		
7	e	13	Thomas Iueson, martyr		1555	15	A	13	George Tankerfield, martyr	26	1555
	f	14	Nicholas Haule, martyr		1555	4	b	14	R. Smith, martyr	8	1555
15	g	15	John Aleworth, confessor		1555		c	15	Stephen Horwod, martyr	30	1555
4	A	16	John Careles, Confessor	1	1556	2	d	16	Thomas Fusse, martyr	30	1555
	b	17	John Owyn, Julius Palmer, a Schoolmaster, and Askine, Martyrs	16	1556	1	e	17	William Hail, martyr	31	1555
12	c	18	Ka. Cawches, Paratine Massye, & her	17	1556		f	18	Robert Samuell, Preacher, martyr	31	1555
1	d	19	Child not one hower olde, &	17	1556	9	g	19	Jone West, martyr	1	1556
	e	20	Guyllenmyne Gilbert	17	1556		A	20	Wylliam Bongeor, martyr	2	1557
9	f	21	Tho. Dungate, Tho. Foreman,	18	1556	17	b	21	Robert Purcas, martyr	2	1557

			Anne Tree, Martyrs Simo. Miller, Eliza Coper, Martyrs	13	1556						
	g	22	Mary Magdalene			6	c	22	Thomas Bennold, martyr	2	1557
17	A	23	Richard Yeoman, minister, martyr	10	1558		d	23	Agnes Silversyde, alias Smith, martyr	2	1557
6	b	24	William Pikes, martyr	14	1558	14	e	24	Barthelmew, Apostle		
	c	25	James Apostle			3	f	25	Ellin Ewryny, martyr	2	1557
14	d	26	Stephen Cotton, martyr	14	1558		g	26	Elizabeth Folkes, Mayde, martyr	2	1557
3	e	27	John Slade, martyr	14	1558	11	A	27	Wylliam Munt, martyr	2	1557
	f	28	Stee Wright, Rob. Milles, Martyrs	14	1558		b	28	Alice Munt, martyr	2	1557
11	g	29	Rob Dines, martyr	14	1558		c	29	Rose Allyn, Mayde, martyr	2	1557
	A	30	Tho. Benbrick, gentlemen, martyr	29	1558	8	d	30	John Johnson, George Egles, Martyrs	2	1557
	b	31					e	31	One Fryer, and the sayde George Egles Sister, martyr	2	1557

## THE KALENDER

September hath 30 dayes. The Moone 29.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord	October hath 31 dayes. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord		
16	f	1	Father Abraham, martyr		1428	16	A	1	Bartholet Myllon, martyr		1534
5	g	2	Wylliam Whyght, priest, martyr		1428	5	b	2	John de Burge, a rich merchant,		1534

									martyr		
	A	3	John Waddon, priest, martyr		1428	13	c	3	The Receyuer of Naunts, martyr		1534
13	b	4	William Gardiner, martyr		1552	2	d	4	Henry Poile, martyr		1534
2	c	5	W. Allen, martyr		1555		e	5	Catelle, a Schole- Mistris, martyr		1534
	d	6	Thomas Cob, Thomas Cob Martyrs		1555	10	f	6	Stephen de la Foarge, a Marchat, martyr		1536
10	e	7	William Androwe, Confessor		1555		g	7	Wyllyam Tyndall, martyr		1537
	f	8	T. King, Confessor		1555	18	A	8	William Leyton, martyr		1537
	g	9	Thomas Leis, Confessor	5	1555	7	b	9	Puttedew, martyr		1538
7	A	10	George Catmer  Robert Streater, Ant. Burward	6	1555		c	10	Collins, martyr Cowbrige, martyr		1538 1539
	b	11	George Bradbrige, martyr	6	1555	15	d	11	Peter, a Gemane, martyr		1539
15	c	12	James Cutty, martyr	6	1555	4	e	12	Launcelot, martyr		1539
4	d	13	Thomas Hayward, John Goreway, Martyrs		1555		f	13	John, a Painter, martyr		1539
	e	14	Robert Glober, Cornel. Bugay, Martyrs	20	1555	12	g	14	Giles Gemayne, martyr		
12	f	15	Edwarde Sharpe, martyr	8	1556	1	A	15	Robert Bames, Thomas Garard, William Hierome, Martyrs		1541
1	g	16	Ihon Hart, T. Rabensdale, A. Shomaker,	24	1556		b	16	Wylliam Wolsey, martyr	4	1555

			A. Corier, Martyrs								
	A	17	Tho. Home and another woman, Martyrs	23	1556	9	c	17	Robert Pigot, martyr	4	1555
9	b	18	John Kurde, martyr	20	1557		d	18	Luke Evangelist		
	c	19	Cicily Ormes, martyr Joyce Lewis, martyr	23 10	1557 1557	17	e	19	Nicholas Ridley, Bishop, martyr	16	1555
17	d	20	Rafe Allerton, Richard Rothe, Martyrs	17	1557	6	f	20	Hugh Latimer, Bishop, martyr	16	1555
6	e	21	Matthew Apostle				g	21	John Web, gentlemen, George Roper, Martyrs	31	1555
	f	22	James Ausco and Margerye his wife, Martyrs	17	1557	14	A	22	Gregory Packe, martyr Adam Walles, martyr	31 12	1555 1551
14	g	23	Agnes Bogeor, Mar. Turston, Martyrs	17	1557	3	b	23	Mark Burges, William Hoker, Daur Mylle, Martyrs		1560
3	A	24	John Warren, martyr		1557		c	24	Simson, priest, Beberech, frier, Martyrs		
	b	25	Christian Glober, Tho. Atothe, Martyrs		1557	11	d	25	Keyler, black fyer, Daur Stratto, gentleman, Martyrs		
11	c	26	John Mylles, Nico. Holden, Martyrs		1557	19	e	26	Norman Gorley, Vicar of Dolor		
19	d	27	John Ashdone, martyr		1557		f	27	A Black Chano, with 4 other		
	e	28	Thomas Spurdaunce, martyr		1557	8	g	28	Simon and Jude		
8	f	29	Michaell				A	29	Thre dyed in	18	1556

			Archangell						pyrson at Cicester, Confessors		
	g	30	John Fortune, martyr		1557	16	b	30	Mother Seaman, Confessor		1556
						6	c	31	Mother Bennet, Confessor		1556

## THE KALENDER

November hath 30 days. The Moone 29.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord	December hath 31 days. The Moone 30.			Days of their death	Year of the Lord		
	d	1	The Feaste of all Saynctes				f	1	Wylliam Tracy, Esquire, Confessor		1534
13	e	2	Rycharde Meckings, martyr		1541	13	g	2	Peter Sapience, Andrew Apostle		1545
2	f	3	Richard Spenser, Martyr		1541	2	A	3	George Bucker, alias Adn. Dalip, martyr		
	g	4	Andrew Hewet, martyr		1541	10	b	4	An olde man of Buckingham hire, martyr		1531
10	A	5	John Porter, Confessor		1542		c	5	Two grey Fryers, Martyrs		1581
	b	6	Thomas Barnard, martyr		1542	18	d	6	John Hילו, Confessor		1513
18	c	7	James Morton, martyr		1542	7	e	7	John Coynes, Confessor		1517
7	d	8	George Wyzarde, Gentleman, martyr		1546		f	8	Robert Warde, Confessor		1517
	e	9	John Kirbye, martyr		1546	15	g	9	A Scholer of Abbebile, martyr		1522
15	f	10	Roger Clarke, martyr		1546	4	A	10	A Jew, martyr	4	1528

4	g	11	Richard Bayfield, alias Somersa, martyr	20	1531		b	11	Richard Hun, martyr	20	1515
	A	12	John Clarke, Confessor		1556	12	c	12	John Cewbery, martyr	7	1531
12	b	13	Dunstone Chittenden, Confessor		1556	1	d	13	James Gore, Confessor	13	1555
1	c	14	Wylliam Foster, martyr		1556		e	14	Wylliam Wyseman, Confessor	18	1555
	d	15	Alice Potkins, Confessor		1556	9	f	15	John Philpot, Preacher, martyr	22	1557
9	e	16	John Archer, Confessor		1556		g	16	John Rough, Preacher, martyr	22	1557
	f	17	Hooke, martyr		1556	17	A	17	Margaret Mering, martyr	22	1558
17	g	18	John Hallingdale, martyr	18	1557	6	b	18	Thomas Tyler, Confessor		1558
6	A	19	Wylliam Sparow, martyr	18	1557		c	19	Mathew Withers, Confessor		1558
14	b	20	Richard Gybson, Gentleman, martyr	18	1557	14	d	20	Dale, Confessor		1550
	c	21	Saunder, Gouche, martyr	4	1558	3	e	21	Thomas Apostle		
3	d	22	Elizabeth Druer, martyr	4	1558		f	22	Wylliam Playn		
	e	23	Philip Humfrey, martyr	5	1558	11	g	23	Elizabeth Lawson, Confessor		1550
11	f	24	John Dauye, martyr	5	1558	17	A	24	Nicholas Burton, martyr	22	1562
19	g	25	Henry Dauye, martyr	5	1558		b	25	Nativity of our Lord		
	A	26	John Comeforth, martyr	5	1558	8	c	26	Stephen, martyr		
8	b	27	Christopher Broun, martyr	10	1558		d	27	John Evangelist		

	c	28	John Herste, martyr	10	1558	16	e	28	Childermasse		
10	d	29	Alice Snothe, Kathe. Knight, Martyrs	10	1558	5	f	29	Thomas Rhedonensis, an Erle, martyr Picus Mirandula, Confessor Erasmus Rotterdam, Confessor		1436 1497 1513
5	e	30	Andrew Apostle				g	30	Mar. Bucer, Confessor Pau. Vhagius, Confessor Philip Melancton, Confessor Peter Martir, Confessor		1549 1551 1559 1562
						13	A	31	Kyng Edward the Sixt, Confessor		15553

# ACTS AND MONUMENTS

OF THE

CHRISTIAN MARTYRS

AND

*Matters Ecclesiastical Passed In The Church Of Christ, From The Primitive Beginning, To These Our Days, As Well In Other Countries, As, Namely, <sup>f625</sup> In This Realm Of England, And Also Of Scotland, Discoursed At Large:*

**AND FIRST, THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE CHURCH OF ROME THAT NOW IS, AND THE ANCIENT CHURCH OF ROME THAT THEN WAS.**

CHRIST our Savior, in the Gospel of St. Matthew (Matthew 16:16), hearing the confession of Simon Peter, who, first of all other, openly acknowledged him to be the Son of God, and perceiving the secret hand of his Father therein, answered again and (alluding to his name) called him a rock, upon which rock he would build his church so strong, that the gates of hell should not prevail against it, etc. In which words three things are to be noted: First, that Christ will have a church in this world. Secondly, that the same church should mightily be impugned, not only by the world, but also by the uttermost strength and powers of all hell. And, thirdly, that the same church, notwithstanding the uttermost of the devil and all his malice, should continue. Which prophecy of Christ we see wonderfully to be verified, insomuch that the whole course of the church to this day may seem nothing else but a verifying of the said prophecy. First, that Christ hath set up a church, needeth no declaration. Secondly, what force, what sides and sorts of men, of princes, kings, monarchs, governors, and rulers

of this world, with their subjects, publicly and privately, with all their strength and cunning, have bent themselves against this church. And, thirdly, how the said church, all this notwithstanding, hath yet endured and holden its own. What storms and tempests it hath overpast, wondrous it is to behold: for the more evident declaration whereof, I have addressed this present history, intending, by the favorable aid of Christ our Lord, not so much to delight the ears of my country in reading of news, as most specially to profit the hearts of the godly, in perusing antiquities of ancient times: to the end, first, that the wonderful works of God in his church might appear to his glory; also, that the continuance and proceedings of the church, from time to time, being set forth in these Acts and Monuments, more knowledge and experience may redound thereby, to the profit of the reader and edification of christian faith.

\* For <sup>f626</sup> if these divers times of the church, which have been so horrible and perilous from the beginning, almost, of the gospel (but especially during this latter age of Christ's church, according to the true forewarning of the apostles), had not wanted writers and historians, more than writers might have lacked matter copious to work upon, so many notable things worthy of knowledge, which have happened in this church of England since the reign of Lucius (but namely since Satan broke loose), had not so escaped and passed without memory. Hereof some, yet notwithstanding (praised be the Lord there-for!), have been preserved and remain; but yet the most things lost in silence; and some, again, misshadowed and corrupted, either through obtreaction or flattery of writers; who, not observing "legem historiae," as Tully required, <sup>f627</sup> seemed either not bold enough to tell truth, or not afraid enough to bear with untruth and time. For as there never happened greater perturbations, tumults, and dissensions, among all the monarchies that have been since the first constitution of public regiment, than hath been seen among churchmen; — betwixt popes, one pope with another, betwixt popes and emperors, for giving and taking the imperial crown, and likewise betwixt popes and other nations; — so writers commonly, in taking parts either with one or other, as they inclined their affection, framed their style.

Add also, hereunto, the barbarousness of those days, and, partly, negligence in the learned sort, which were no small causes why we lack now so many things much needful for those times to be known.

Notwithstanding such as yet remain to be collected, especially of the more sincere and less suspected sort of writers, I have here purposed, by the favorable grace of Christ our Lord, in this history to **digest and compile**; <sup>f628</sup> not so much to delight the ears of my country, as to the intent to profit the church of Christ, so that we, in these reformed days, seeing the prodigious deformities and calamities of these times now present, and comparing the same with the times that were before, may therefore pour out more abundant thanks to the Lord for this his so sweet and merciful reformation.\*

For the better accomplishing whereof, so to prosecute the matter, as may best serve to the profit of the reader, I have thought good, first beginning from the time of the primitive church, and so continuing (by the Lord's grace) to these latter years, to run over the whole state and course of the church in general, in such order as digesting the whole tractation of this history into five sundry diversities of times. <sup>F629</sup>

**First**, I will intreat of the suffering time of the church, which continued from the apostles' age about three hundred years.

**Secondly**, of the flourishing time of the church, which lasted other three hundred years.

**Thirdly**, of the declining or backsliding time of the church, which comprehendeth other three hundred years, until the loosing out of Satan, which was about the thousandth year after the nativity of Christ. During which space of time, the church, although in ambition and pride it was much altered from the simple sincerity of the primitive time, yet, in outward profession of doctrine and religion, it was something tolerable, and had some face of a church; notwithstanding some corruption of doctrine, with superstition and hypocrisy, was then also crept in. And yet in comparison of that which followed after, it might seem, as I said, something sufferable.

**Fourthly**, followed the time of Antichrist, and loosing of Satan, or desolation of the church, whose full swinge containeth the space of four hundred years.

In which time both doctrine and sincerity of life were utterly, almost, extinguished; namely, in the chief heads and rulers of this west church,

through the means of the Roman bishops, especially counting from Gregory VII. called Hildebrand, Innocent III., and the friars which with him crept in, till the time of John Wickliff and John Huss, during four hundred years.

**Fifthly** and lastly, after this time of Antichrist reigning in the church of God by violence and tyranny, followeth the reformation and purging of the church of God, wherein Antichrist beginneth to be revealed, and to appear in his color, and his antichristian doctrine to be detected, the number of his church decreasing, and the number of the true church increasing.

The durance of which time hath continued hitherto about the space of two hundred and fourscore years; and how long it shall continue more, the Lord and Governor of all times, he only knoweth. For in these five diversities and alterations of times, I suppose the whole course of the church may well be comprised. The which church, because it is universal, and sparsedly through all countries dilated, therefore in this history, standing upon such a general argument, I shall not be bound to any one certain nation more than another: yet notwithstanding keeping mine argument aforesaid, I have purposed principally to tarry upon such historical acts and records, as most appertain to this my country of England and Scotland.

And forsomuch as the church of Rome, in all these ages above specified, hath challenged to itself the supreme title and ringleading of the whole universal church on earth, by whose direction all other churches have been governed; in writing, therefore, of the church of Christ, I cannot but partly also intermeddle with the acts and proceedings of the same church, forsomuch as the doings and orderings of all other churches from time to time, as well here in England as in other nations, have this long season chiefly depended upon the same. Wherefore, as it is much needful and requisite to have the doings and orderings of the said church to be made manifest to all christian congregations, so have I framed this history, according to the same purpose. First, in a general description briefly to declare, as in a summary table, the misguiding of that church, comparing the former primitive state of the forenamed church of Rome, with these latter times of the same: which done, then after, in a more special

tractation, to prosecute more at large all the particulars thereof, so far forth as shall seem not unprofitable for the public instruction of all other christian churches, to behold and consider the manner and dealing of this one. In the which one church of Rome four things, as most special points, seem to me chiefly to be considered; to wit, Title, Jurisdiction, Life, and Doctrine. Wherein I have here to declare, First, concerning the title or primacy of the church, how it first began, and upon what occasion; Secondly, concerning the jurisdiction and authority thereof, what it was, and how far it did extend; Thirdly, touching the disorder of life and conversation, how inordinate it is; and Fourthly, the form of doctrine, how superstitious and idolatrous of late it hath been. Of the which four, the first was prejudicial to all bishops; the second, derogatory to kings and emperors; the third, detestable to all men; the fourth, injurious against Christ.

For **first**, the title and style of that church was such, that it over-went all other churches, being called “The holy universal mother church, which could not err;” and the bishop thereof, “Holy father the pope,” “Bishop universal,” “Prince of priests,” “Supreme head of the universal church, and vicar of Christ here in earth, which must not be judged; having all knowledge of Scripture, and all laws, contained within the chest of his breast.”

**Secondly**, the jurisdiction of that bishop was such, that, challenging to himself both the swords, that is, both the keys of the spirituality and the scepter of the laity, not only he subdued all bishops under him, but also advanced himself above kings and emperors, causing some of them to lie under his feet, some to hold his stirrup, some to lead his horse by the bridle, some to kiss his feet; placing and displacing emperors, kings, dukes, and earls, whom and when he listed; taking upon him to translate the empire at his pleasure, first, from Greece to France, then from France to Germany, preferring and deposing whom he pleased, confirming them which were elected.

Also, being emperor himself, *sede vacante*, pretending authority or power to invest bishops, to give benefices, to spoil churches, to give authority to bind and loose, to call general councils, to judge over the same, to set up religions, to canonize saints, to take appeals, to bind consciences, to make

laws, to dispense with the law and word of God, to deliver from purgatory, to command angels, etc.

**Thirdly**, what was the life and conversation of the court of Rome, hereafter in the process of this history followeth to be seen and observed.

**Fourthly**, such was his doctrine in like manner, tedious to students, pernicious to men's consciences, injurious to Christ Jesus, and contrary to itself. In laws more divers, in volume more large, in diligence and study more applied, in vantage and preferment more gainful, than ever was the study and learning of the holy Scripture of God.

All which four points well considered and advised in this present history set forth, I trust it may minister to the indifferent christian reader, sufficient instruction to judge what is to be esteemed of this see and church of Rome.

But here by the way it is to be noted, that all these deformities above touched, of vain title, of pretended jurisdiction, of heretical doctrine, of schismatical life, came not into the church of Rome all at one time, nor sprang with the beginning of the same church, but with long working and continuance of time by little and little crept up through occasion, and came not to full perfection, till the time partly of pope Silvester, <sup>f630</sup> partly of pope Gregory VII. A.D. 1080, partly of Innocent III., and, finally, of pope Boniface VIII. A.D. 1300. Of the which four popes, the first brought in the title, A.D. 314, which was never in such ample wise before publicly enacted, and received publicly in the said church of Rome. The second brought in jurisdiction. The third, which was pope Innocent, with his rabble of monks and friars (as Peter the Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, John Duns Scotus), and with such other bishops as succeeded in the same see after him, corrupted and obscured the sincerity of Christ's doctrine, and manners also. And lastly, pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1300, and after him pope Clement V., over and besides the jurisdiction sufficiently advanced before by pope Hildebrand, added moreover the temporal sword to be carried before them; and that no emperor (were he never so well elected) should be sufficient and lawful without the pope's admission, whereby the pope's power was brought now to its full pride and perfection. And thus

came up the corruption of the Romish church in continuance of years, by degrees and not altogether nor at one time, as is declared, and hereafter more particularly (Christ willing) shall be expressed.

Wherefore, whosoever shall have hereafter to do with any adversaries, about the antiquity or authority of the church of Rome, let him here well consider when and how the Title, Jurisdiction, and Corruption of Life and Doctrine, first began in the pope's see. And so shall he see, that the church of Rome, as it is now governed with this manner of title, jurisdiction, life, and institution of doctrine, never descended from the primitive age of the apostles, or from their succession, "Nisi tantum *aequivoce*,<sup>f631</sup> et non univoce."<sup>F632</sup> Like as "Sancta Maria picta non est sancta Maria, et homo pictus non est homo," as the schools do say (that is, "As the picture of the holy Virgin is not the holy Virgin, and as a man painted on the wall is not a man"), so it is to be said of the church of Rome (the institution and doctrine of the church of Rome I mean), that although it hath the name of the church apostolical, and doth bring forth a long genealogy of outward succession from the apostles, as the Pharisees did in Christ's time bring their descent from Abraham their father: yet all this is (as I said) but only *aequivoce*, that is, in name only, and not in effect or matter, which maketh the apostolical church indeed; forasmuch as the definition of the apostolical church neither now agreeth with this present church of Rome, nor yet the manner, form, and institution of the said Romish church, as it now standeth with this title, jurisdiction, life, and doctrine, had ever any succession or offspring from the primitive church of the apostles. But, as Christ said by the Pharisees, that they were the children, not of Abraham, but of the devil, in semblable wise may be answered, that this church of Rome now present, with this title, jurisdiction, life, and doctrine now used, cannot be fathered upon the apostles, neither Peter, nor Linus, but is of another author, whom here I will not name.

And here now cometh in the argument of **Pighius, Hosius,**<sup>a3</sup> and Eckius, to be answered unto, who, arguing for the antiquity and authority of the church of Rome, reason on this manner:<sup>f633</sup> —

That forsomuch as an ordinary and a known church visible must here be known continually on earth, during from the time of the

apostles, to the which church all other churches must have recourse:

And seeing then there is no other church visible, orderly known to have endured from the apostles' time, but only the church of Rome:

They conclude, therefore, that the church of Rome is that church whereunto all other churches must have recourse.

To the which paralogism I answer thus: that this word “durans ecclesia,” the “during church,” in the minor, hath *fallaciam aequivoci*. For although the name of the church and outward succession of bishops have had their durance from the time of the apostles, yet neither is the definition and matter which maketh a true apostolical church indeed, and *univoce*, now in the church of Rome, nor yet were the form and institution of the church now used in Rome ever from the apostles; which apostles were never authors or fathers of this title, jurisdiction, life, and doctrine, now taught in Rome; but rather were enemies ever to the same.

Again to the major, which standeth upon two parts, I answer, first; although the necessity of the church, during from the apostles, may and must be granted; yet the same necessity was not bound to any certain place or person, but only to faith: so that wheresoever (that is to say, in whatsoever congregation) true faith was, there was the church of Christ. And because the true faith of Christ must needs ever remain on earth, therefore the church also must needs remain on earth. And God forbid that the said true faith of Christ should only remain in one city in the world, and not another as well. And therefore to the second part of the major is to be said, that as this true and sincere faith of Christ is not so given, to remain fixedly in one place or city alone; so neither is there any one church in the world so ordained and appointed of God, that all other churches should have their recourse unto it, for determination of their causes and controversies incident. And thus much to the argument of Pighius and Hosius.

Now as touching the authorities and allegations of the ancient doctors and holy fathers in the commendation of the church of Rome, here cometh in also to be noted, that whosoever will understand rightly their authorities,

and answer to the same, must first learn to make a difference and distinction of the said church of Rome, from what it was, to what it is: forasmuch as the church of Rome is not the same church now, which it was then, but only *aequivoce*: otherwise, as touching the very property and definition of a church, it is another church, and nothing agreeing to what it was then, save only in outward name and place. Therefore, by this distinction made, I answer the places of Irenaeus, Cyprian, and other famous doctors, commending the church of Rome as catholic and apostolical, and say that these doctors, speaking of the church of Rome which *then was*, said not untruly, calling it catholic and apostolical; for that the same church took not only their ordinary succession of bishops but also their ordinary doctrine and institution from the apostles. But speaking of the church of Rome which *now is*, we say the said places of the doctors are not true, neither do appertain to the same; all which doctors neither knew the church of Rome that now is, nor, if they had, would ever have judged any thing therein worthy such commendation.

Over and besides, our adversaries yet more object against us, who, heaving and shoving for the antiquity of the Romish church, for lack of other sufficient reason to prove it, are driven to fall in scanning the times and years. "What!" say they, "where was this church of yours before these fifty years?" To whom briefly to answer, first we demand what they mean by this which they call *our* church? If they mean the ordinance and institution of doctrine and sacraments now received of us, and differing from the church of Rome, we affirm and say, that our church was, when this church of theirs was not yet hatched out of the shell, nor did yet ever see any light: that is, in the time of the apostles, in the primitive age, in the time of Gregory I. and the old Roman church, when as yet no universal pope was received publicly, but repelled in Rome; nor this fullness of plenary power yet known; nor this doctrine and abuse of sacraments yet heard of. In witness whereof we have the old acts and histories of ancient time to give testimony with us, wherein we have sufficient matter for us to shew that the same form, usage, and institution of this our present reformed church, are not the beginning of any new church of our own, but the renewing of the old ancient church of Christ; and that they are not any swerving from the church of Rome, but rather a reducing to the church of Rome. Whereas contrary, the church of Rome which now is, is nothing but

a swerving from the church of Rome which then was, as partly is declared, and more shall appear, Christ willing, hereafter.

And whereas the said our adversaries do moreover charge us with the faith of our fathers and godfathers, wherein we were baptized accusing and condemning us for that we are now revolted from them and their faith, wherein we were first christened: to this we answer, that we being first baptized by our fathers and godfathers in water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, the same faith wherein we were christened then, we do retain: and because our godfathers were themselves also in the same faith, therefore they cannot say that we have forsaken the faith of our godfathers. As for other points of ecclesiastical uses, and circumstances considered, besides the principal substance of faith and baptism, if they held any thing which receded from the doctrine and rule of Christ, therein we now remove ourselves; not because we would differ from them, but because we would not with them remove from the rule of Christ's doctrine. Neither doth the sacrament of our baptism bind us in all points to the opinions of them that baptized us, but to the faith of him in whose name we were baptized. For as, if a man were christened of a heretic, the baptism of him notwithstanding were good, although the baptizer were naught; so, if our godfathers or fathers, which christened us, were taught any thing not consonant to christian doctrine in all points, neither is our baptism worse for that, nor yet are we bound to follow them in all things, wherein they themselves did not follow the true church of Christ.

Wherefore as it is false, that we have renounced the faith of our godfathers wherein we were first baptized, so is it not true, that we are removed from the church of Rome; but rather we say, and (by the leave of Christ) will prove, that the church of Rome hath utterly parted from the church of Rome, according to my distinction before touched. Which thing the more evidently to declare, I will here compare the church of Rome with the church of Rome; and in a general description set forth (by God's grace) the difference of both the churches, that is, of both the times of the church of Rome: to the intent it may be seen whether we, or the church of Rome, have more apostatized from the church of Rome. And here first I divide the church of Rome in a double consideration of time; first, of those first six hundred years which were immediately after Christ; and secondly, of

the other six hundred years, which now have been in these our latter days: and so, in comparing these two together, will I search out what discrepance is between them both. Of the which two ages and states of the Roman church, the first I call the primitive church of Rome, the other I call the latter church of Rome, counting this latter church from the expiration of the thousand years between the binding of Satan and the time of his loosing again, according to the prophecy of St. John's revelation (Revelation 20:3); counting these thousand years from the ceasing of persecution, under Constantine the Great, to the beginning of persecution of the church again under Boniface VIII. and Ottoman the first Turkish emperor. <sup>F634</sup> And thus have ye the church of Rome parted into two churches, in a double respect and consideration of two sundry states and times. Now in setting and matching the one state with the other, let us see whether the church of Rome hath swerved from the church of Rome more than we, or no.

And to begin, first, with the order and qualities of life, I ask here of this Roman clergy, where was this church of theirs which now is, in the ancient time of the primitive church of Rome, with this pomp and pride, with this riches and superfluity, with this *gloria mundi*, and name of cardinals; with this prancing dissoluteness, and whoring of the courtesans; with this extortion, bribing, buying and selling of spiritual dignities; these annates, reformations, procurations, exactions, and other practices for money; this avarice insatiable, ambition intolerable, fleshly filthiness most detestable, barbarousness and negligence in preaching, promise-breaking faithlessness, poisoning and supplanting one another; with such schisms and divisions, which never were more seen than in the elections and court of Rome these seven hundred years, with such extreme cruelty, malice, and tyranny in burning and persecuting their poor brethren to death?

It were too long, and a thing infinite, to stand particularly upon these above rehearsed. And if a man should prosecute at large all the schisms that have been in the church of Rome since the time of Damasus I., which are counted to the number of eighteen schisms, <sup>f635</sup> what a volume would it require? Or, if here should be recorded all that this see hath burned and put to death since the loosing out of Satan, who were able to number them? Or if all their sleights to get money should be described, as process of matter would require, who were able to recite them all? Of which all

notwithstanding, the most principal grounds are reckoned at least to fourteen or fifteen sleights. <sup>F636</sup>

1. Annates, or taxes on vacant archbishoprics, bishoprics, abbacies, priories conventual, and other benefices elective. <sup>F637</sup>
2. Annates for retaining all previous preferments, along with the new one, although there had been paid similar annates before, on similar occasions, for the same preferments.
3. New annates for all the same are required again, *tories quoties* they be, or are feigned to be, vacated by presentation to a new benefice, whereby it hath sometimes chanced that three or four annates have been paid by the same person for the same benefice.
4. Preventions of benefices given out before they fell; the same prevention being often given to divers and sundry persons by the pope's officials, for money's sake.
5. Resignations upon favor, which used to be granted by the ordinary, but which now in all cases the pope forbiddeth, or rather challengeth to be reserved to himself.
6. Commendams.
7. Vacancies in Curia Romana. <sup>F638</sup>
8. Dispensations without end, as to dispense with age, with order, with benefices incompatible, as, if the number be full, if the house be of such or such an order. *Item*, dispensation for irregularity of various kinds, as for times of marriage, for marrying in degrees forbidden, or in affinity canonical (as for gossips to marry):

It hath been known in France that a thousand crowns have been paid to Rome in one instance, for dispensing with this canonical affinity (of gossips, as we call it), the same being yet not true but feigned. *Item*, dispensing for eating meats in times prohibited.

9. Innumerable privileges, exemptions, graces for not visiting, or visiting by a proctor, for confirmations of privileges, for transactions

made upon special favor of the pope, for exchanges of benefices with dispensation annexed, or making of pensions, with such like.

**10.** Mandates issued by the pope to ordinaries, whereof every ordinary, if he have ten benefices in his gift, is liable to be served with one: if he have fifty benefices in his gift, he may be served with two mandates: and for every mandate there comes to the pope about twenty ducats. And yet, notwithstanding, so many mandates are sold, as will come buyers to pay for them and take their chance.

**11** The pope's penitentiary, for absolution of cases reserved to the pope, for breaking and changing of vows, for translation from one monastery to another, also from one order to another, for license to enter into certain monasteries, to carry about altars, with many other things of like device, pertaining to the office of the pope's penitentiary.

**12.** Giving and granting of innumerable pardons and indulgences, not only in public churches, but also to be bought in private chapels.

**13.** Appointing notaries, and prothonotaries apostolic, and bishops "vague," termed "nullitenentes" <sup>f639</sup> at Rome.

**14.** Granting bulls and commissions for new foundations, or for changing of the old; reducing regular monasteries to a secular state, or restoring again to the old; and writs without end about matters depending in controversy, that otherwise might and ought to be decided by the ordinary.

**By reason of all which** <sup>a7</sup> devices (not including the first, of the annates), it was found by a computation made in the time of Louis XI. (A.D. 1463), that, at that time, the sum of 200,000 crowns was yearly paid, and transported to Rome out of France alone; which sum Carolus Molineus testifies, had in his time, A.D. 1551, been doubled to 400,000, besides a like sum for annates; to all which add the revenues of French benefices, held by aliens at the court of Rome: which altogether are thought to make the total sum yearly going out of France to the pope's coffers of late years, ten hundred thousand, or a million, crowns. Now what hath risen besides in other realms and nations, let other men conjecture.

Wherefore if the gospel send us to the fruits to know the tree, I pray you what is to be thought of the church of Rome, with these fruits of life? Or, if we will seek the church in length and number of years, where was this church of Rome with these qualities then, at what time the church of Rome was a persecuted church, not a persecuting church? And when the bishops thereof did not make martyrs, as these do now, but were made martyrs themselves, to the number of five-and-twenty, in order one after another? Or when the bishops thereof were elected and exalted, not by factious conspiring, not by power or parts-taking, not by money or friends-making, as they be now, but by the free voices of the people and of the clergy, with the consent of the emperor joined withal, and not by a few conspiring cardinals, closed up in a corner, as now they be, etc.

And yet, if there were no other difference in the matter, but only corruption of life, all that we would tolerate, or else impute to the common fragility of man, and charge them no further therein than we might charge ourselves. Now over and beside this deformity of life, wherein they are clean gone from the former steps of the true church of Rome, we have moreover to charge them in greater points, more nearly touching the substantial ground of the church, as in their jurisdiction presumptuously usurped, in their title falsely grounded, and in their doctrine heretically corrupted. In all which three points, this latter pretended church of Rome hath utterly sequestered itself from the image and nature of the ancient and true church of Rome, and they have erected to themselves a new church of their own making, as first usurping a jurisdiction never known before to their ancient predecessors. For although the church of Rome in the old primitive time had his place due unto that see among other patriarchal churches, and due authority over and upon such churches as were within his precinct, and bordering near unto it, as appears by the acts of the Nicene council: <sup>f640</sup> yet the universal fullness and plenitude of power in both the regiments, spiritual and temporal, in deposing and dispensing matters of the church not to him belonging, in taking appeals, in giving elections, investing in benefices, in exempting himself from obedience and subjection of his ordinary power and magistracy, with his coactive power newly erected in the church of Rome, was never received nor used in the old Roman church, from the which they disagree in all their doings.

For although Victor, then bishop of Rome, about A.D. 190, went about to excommunicate the east churches, for the observation of Easter-day, yet neither did he proceed therein, neither was permitted by Irenaeus so to do. And although Boniface I. likewise, writing to the bishops of Carthage, required of them to send up their appellations unto the church of Rome, alleging moreover the decree of the Nicene council for his authority; the bishops and clergy of Carthage assembling together in a general council (called the Sixth Council of Carthage) to the number of two hundred and seventeen bishops, after that they had perused the decrees in the authentic copies of the aforesaid Nicene council, and found no such matter as was by the said Boniface alleged, made therefore a public decree, that none out of that country should make any appeal over the sea. And what marvel if appeals were forbidden them to be made to Rome, when both here in England the kings of this land would not permit any to appeal from them to Rome, before king Henry II., who was thereunto compelled by pope Alexander III., because of the murder of Thomas Becket; and also in France, the like prohibitions were expressly made by **Saint Louis**,<sup>a8</sup> A.D. 1268, who did forbid by a public instrument called “*pragmatica sanctio*,” all exactions of the pope’s court within his realm. Also by king Philip the Fair, A.D. 1296, the like was done, who not only restrained all sending or going up of his subjects to Rome, but also that no money, armor, nor subsidy should be transported out of his realm.<sup>F641</sup> The like also after him did king Charles V., surnamed the Wise, and his son likewise after him Charles VI., who also punished as traitors certain seditious persons for appealing to Rome. The like resistance, moreover, was in the said country of France, against the pope’s reservations, preventions, and other like practices of his usurped jurisdiction, in the days of pope Martin V., A.D. 1418. *Item*, when king Henry VI. in England, and king Charles VII. in France, did both accord with the pope, in investing and in collation of benefices, yet, notwithstanding, the high court of parliament in France did not admit the same, but still maintained the old liberty and customs of the French church: insomuch that when the duke of Bedford came with the king’s letters patent to have the pope’s procurations and reservations admitted, yet the court of parliament would not agree to the same, but the king’s procurator-general was fain to go betwixt them, as is to be seen in their registers, A.D. 1425, the 5th day of March. In the days of the which king Charles VII. was set forth in France “*pragmatica sanctio*,”<sup>a9</sup> as they

call it, against the annates, reservations, expectatives, and such other proceedings of the pope's pretended jurisdiction, A.D. 1488. Wherefore, what marvel if this jurisdiction of the pope's court in excommunicating, taking appeals, and giving of benefices, was not used in the old church of Rome, when in these latter days it hath been so much resisted?

**EVIDENCES PROVING ECCLESIASTICAL PERSONS TO HAVE  
BEEN SUBJECT TO THEIR MAGISTRATES IN CAUSES BOTH  
ECCLESIASTICAL AND TEMPORAL.**

And what should I speak of the form and manner of elections now used in the church of Rome, clean converted from the manner of the old church of their predecessors? For, first, in those ancient days, when yet the church remained in the apostles only, and a few other disciples, the apostles then, with prayer and imposition of hands, elected bishops and ministers; as, by the apostles, James was made bishop of Jerusalem, Paul in Crete elected Titus, and Timothy in Ephesus: also Peter ordained Linus and Clement in Rome, etc. After which time of the apostles, when the church began more to multiply, the election of bishops and ministers stood by the clergy and the people, with the consent of the chief magistrate of the place, and so continued during all the time of the primitive church, till the time and after the time of **Constantine IV., emperor of Constantinople,** <sup>a10</sup> which emperor (as write Platina and Sabellicus) <sup>f642</sup> published a law concerning the election of the Roman bishop, that he should be taken for true bishop, whom the clergy and people of Rome did choose and elect, without any tarrying for any authority of the emperor of Constantinople, or the deputy of Italy: so as the custom and fashion had ever been before that day, A.D. 280. And here the bishops began first to writhe out their elections and their necks a little from the emperor's subjection, if it be so as the said Platina, and Sabellicus after him, report. But many conjectures there be, not unprofitable, rather to think this constitution of Constantine to be forged and untrue: **first, for that it is** <sup>a11</sup> derived <sup>f643</sup> from the pope's bibliothecary, that is to say, from the keeper and master of the pope's library, a suspected author, who, whatsoever feigned or apocryphal writings he could find in the pope's chests of records, making any thing on his master's side, that he compiled together, and thereof both Platina,

Sabellicus, and Gratian take most part of their reports, and therefore may the more be suspected.

Secondly, whereas Platina and Sabellicus say, that this Constantine IV. was moved by the holiness of pope Benedict II. to make that constitution, how seemeth that to stand with truth, when both the emperor was so far off from him, being at Constantinople, and also for that the said pope reigned but ten months? which was but a small time to make his holiness known to the emperor so far off. And grant he were so holy, yet that holiness might rather be an occasion for the emperor so to confirm and maintain the old received manner of his institution, than to alter it.

The third conjecture is this, for that the said constitution was not observed, but shortly after by the said Benedict, was broken in the election of pope Conon. <sup>F644</sup> And yet notwithstanding, albeit the constitution were true, yet the election thereby was not taken away from the people, and limited to the clergy only, and much less might be taken away from the clergy, and be limited only to the cardinals, without the consent of their prince and ruler, according to their own rubric in their decrees, where the rubric saith: <sup>f645</sup> “Let no bishop be given to any people against their wills; but let the consent and desire both of the clergy and of the people, and of the order, be also required,” etc. And in the same distinction, <sup>f646</sup> also, we read the same liberty and interest to be granted by Charlemagne and Louis his son; not to a few cardinals only, but to the order as well of the clergy, as of the people, to choose not only the bishop of Rome, but any other bishop within their own diocese whatsoever, and to the monks likewise to choose their own abbot, setting aside all respect of persons and gifts, only for the worthiness of life, and gift of wisdom, so as might be most profitable for doctrine and example unto the flock, etc. And this continued till the time of the aforesaid Charlemagne and Louis his son, of the which two, Charlemagne the father received expressly of pope Adrian I., A.D. 775, full jurisdiction and power to elect and ordain the bishop of Rome, like as did also Otho, the first German emperor, of pope Leo VIII., A.D. 961. The other, that is Louis, son to the aforesaid Charlemagne, is said to renounce again, and surrender from himself and his successors, unto pope Paschal and the Romans, the right and interest of choosing the Roman bishop, and moreover to give and grant to the said Paschal the full possession of the city of Rome, and the whole territory to the same

belonging, A.D. 821; as appeareth by the decree, “Ego Ludovicus.”<sup>F647</sup> But admit that feigned decree to be unfeignedly true (as it may well be suspected for many causes, as proceeding out of the same fountain with the constitution of Constantine aforementioned, that is, from the master of the pope’s library, of whom both Gratian and Voluteran, by their own confession, take their ground), yet the same decree doth not so give away the freedom of that election, that he limiteth it only to the cardinals, but also requireth the whole consent of the Romans; neither doth he simply and absolutely give the same, but with condition:<sup>f648</sup> — “Whomsoever all the Romans with one counsel, and with one accord, without any promise of their voices granted before, shall choose to be bishop of Rome.” And moreover in the same decree is required, that at the consecration of the said bishop, messengers should be directed incontinent to the French king concerning the same.

Furthermore, neither yet did the same decree (albeit it were true) long continue. For although pope Stephen IV. and pope Paschal I. in Louis’s time were impasied through discord, without election of the emperor, yet they were fain by message to send their purgation to him of their election. And after that, in the time of Eugene II., who succeeded next to Paschal, Lothaire son of Louis, and emperor with his father, came to Rome, and there appointed laws and magistrates over the city. Whereby may appear the donation of Louis, in giving away the city of Rome to the pope, to be feigned. And after Eugene, pope Gregory IV., who followed in about three years, durst not take his election without the consent and confirmation of the said emperor Louis. And so in like manner his successors, pope Sergius II., pope Leo IV., pope Nicholas I.; and so orderly in a long tract of time, from the aforesaid Nicholas I. to pope Nicholas II., A.D. 1059 (which Nicholas in his decree, beginning “In nomine Domini,”<sup>f649</sup> ordained also the same); so that in the election of the bishops of Rome, commonly the consent of the emperor and the people with the clergy of Rome was not lacking. After which Nicholas, came Alexander II., and wicked Hildebrand; which Alexander being first elected without the emperor’s will and consent, afterward repenting the same openly in his preaching to the people, declared that he would no longer sit in the apostolical see, unless he were by the emperor confirmed. Wherefore he was greatly rebuked, and cast into prison by Hildebrand, and so deposed.

Then Hildebrand and his followers so ordered the matter of this election, that first the emperor, then the lay people, after that the clergy, also, began to be excluded. And so the election by little and little was reduced to the hands of a few cardinals, contrary to all ancient order, where, ever since, it hath remained.

And like as in elections, so also in power judiciary, in deciding, and determining of causes of faith, and of ecclesiastical discipline, the state of the church of Rome now being, hath no conformity with the old Roman church heretofore. For then bishops debated all causes of faith only by the Scriptures, and other questions of ecclesiastical discipline they determined by the canons, not of the pope, but of the church, such as were decreed by the ancient councils, as writeth Gregory of Tours. <sup>F650</sup> Whereas now, both the rule of scripture and sanctions of the old councils set aside, all things for the most part are decided by certain new decretal and “extravagant,” that is, extra-decretal constitutions, in the pope’s canon law compiled, and in his consistories practiced.

And whereas the old ordinance and disposition, as well of the common law as of the sacred councils, and the institution of ancient fathers, have given to bishops, and other prelates, also to patrons and doctors of ecclesiastical benefices, every one within his own precinct and dominion, also to cathedral churches and others, to have their free elections, and to prosecute the same in full effect; ordering and disposing promotions, collations, provisions and dispositions of prelacies, dignities, and all other ecclesiastical benefices whatsoever, after their own arbitrement, as appeareth by the first general council of France; <sup>f651</sup> by the first general council of Nice; <sup>f652</sup> also by the general council of Antioch, and is to be seen in the pope’s decrees; <sup>f653</sup> and likewise, beside these ancient decrees, the same is confirmed again in more later years by Louis IX. the French king, in his constitution, called “Pragmatica sanctio,” made and provided by full parliament against the pope’s exactions, A.D. 1268, in these words as follow. <sup>F654</sup> “*Item*, the exactions and importable burdens of money, which the court of Rome hath imposed upon the church of our kingdom (whereby our said kingdom hath been miserably hitherto impoverished), or hereafter shall impose, we utterly discharge and forbid to be levied or collected hereafter, unless there come some reasonable, godly, and most urgent cause and inevitable necessity; and even then not without the

express and voluntary commandment of us, and of the aforesaid church of our kingdom.” Now, contrary to and against these so manifest and express decreements of general councils, and constitutions synodal, this latter church of Rome of late presumption, degenerating from all the steps of their ancestors, have taken upon them a singular jurisdiction by themselves and for their own advantage, to intermeddle in disposing and transposing churches, colleges, monasteries, with the collations, exemptions, elections, goods, and lands, to the same belonging: by reason and example whereof have come in these impropriations, first-fruits, and reservations of benefices, to the miserable despoiling of the clergy, and horrible decay of christian faith; which things among the old Roman fathers were never known. For so far was it then from being the case that due necessities were plucked from the church, that emperors, kings, and princes, plucking, from their own, did rather cumulate the church with superfluities.

Again, when such goods were given the church by those ancestors, they were neither so given, nor yet taken, to serve the private use of certain churchmen taking no pains therein, but rather to serve the public subvention of the needy, as is contained in the canonical institutions <sup>f655</sup> by the emperor Louis the Pious, set forth A.D. 830. The words be these: “The goods of the church are the vows and bequests of the faithful, the fines of sinners in satisfaction for their crimes, and patrimonies to succor them with hospitality, that are needy.”

Whereunto agreeth also the testimony of Prosper, whose words be these: <sup>f656</sup> “Good men took not the goods of the church as their own, but distributed them as given and bequeathed to the poor.” And saith moreover: <sup>f657</sup> “Whatsoever the church hath, it hath in common with all such as have nothing.”

Add the worthy testimony of St. Augustine to Boniface: “Si autem privatim, quae nobis sufficiant possidemus, non sunt illa nostra, sed pauperum, quorum procuracionem quodammodo gerimus, non proprietatem nobis usurpatione damnabili vendicamus,” etc. <sup>f658</sup>

Likewise vowsons and pluralities of benefices were things then as much unknown, as now they are pernicious to the church, taking away all free election of ministers from the flock of Christ.

All which inconveniences as they first came and crept in chiefly by the pretended authority and jurisdiction abused in this latter church of Rome, so it cannot be denied, but the said latter church of Rome hath taken and attributed to itself much more than either the limits of God's word do give, or standeth with the example of the old Roman church, in these three things especial. Whereof as mention is touched before, so briefly I will recapitulate the same.

The first is this: that whatsoever the Scripture giveth and referreth, either to the whole church universally, or to every particular church severally, this church now of Rome doth arrogate to itself absolutely and only; both doing injury to other churches, and also abusing the Scriptures of God. For albeit, the Scripture doth give authority to bind and loose, it limiteth it neither to person nor place, that is, neither to the city of Rome only, more than to other cities, nor to the see of Peter, more than to other apostles, but giveth it clearly to the church, whereof Peter did bear the figure; so that wheresoever the true church of Christ is, there is annexed power to bind and loose, given and taken merely as from Christ, and not mediately by the pope or bishop of Peter's see.

The second point wherein this present church of Rome abuses its jurisdiction contrary to the Scripture and steps of the old Roman church, is this: for that it extendeth its authority farther and more amply than either the warrant of God's word, or example of time, will give. For although the church of Rome hath (as other particular churches have) authority to bind and absolve, yet it hath no such authority to absolve subjects from their oath, subjection, and loyalty to their rulers and magistrates; to dispense with perjury; to pronounce remission where no earnest repentance is seen before; to number remission by days and years; to dispense with things expressly in the word forbidden, or to restrain that which the word maketh free; to divide religion into religions; to bind and burden consciences with constitutions of men; to excommunicate for worldly matters, — as for breaking of parks, for not ringing of bells at the bishops' coming, for not bringing litter for their horse, for not paying their fees and rents, for withholding the church goods, for holding on their prince's side in princely cases, for not going at the pope's commandment, for not agreeing to the pope's election in another prince's realm; with other such things more, and more vain than these. Again, although the Scripture giveth leave and

authority to the bishop and church of Rome to minister sacraments, yet it giveth no authority to make sacraments, much less to worship sacraments. And though their authority serveth to baptize men, yet it extendeth not to christen bells; neither have they authority by any word of God to add to the word of God, or take from the same, to set up unwritten verities under pain of damnation, to make fresh articles of belief, or to institute strange worship, otherwise than He hath prescribed who hath told us how he would be worshipped.

The third abuse of the pope's jurisdiction standeth in this; that as in spiritual jurisdiction they have vehemently exceeded the bounds of Scripture, so they have impudently intermeddled themselves in temporal jurisdiction, wherein they have nothing to do;<sup>f659</sup> insomuch that they have translated the empire, they have deposed emperors, kings, princes, rulers, and senators of Rome, and set up others, or the same again at their pleasure; they have proclaimed wars, and have warred themselves. And whereas emperors in ancient time have dignified them in titles, have enlarged them with donations, yet they, receiving their confirmation by the emperors, have, like ungrateful clients to such benefactors, afterward stamped upon their necks, have made them to hold their stirrup,<sup>f660</sup> some to hold the bridle of their horse, and have caused them to seek their confirmation at their hand; yea, have been emperors themselves, "sede vacante, et in discordia electionis," and also have been senators of the city; moreover, have extorted into their own hands the plenary fullness of power and jurisdiction of both the swords, especially since the time of pope Hildebrand; which Hildebrand, deposing the emperor, Henry IV., made him give attendance at his city gate. And after him pope Boniface VIII. showed himself to the people on the first day like a bishop, with his keys before him; and the next day in his robes imperial, having a naked sword borne before him, **like an emperor**,<sup>a13</sup> A.D. 1300.

And forsomuch as this inordinate jurisdiction hath not only been used of them, but also to this day is maintained in Rome; let us therefore now compare the usage hereof to the old manner in times past, meaning the primitive and first age of the church of the Romans; wherein the old bishops of Rome in those days, as they were then subject to their emperor, so were other bishops in like manner of other nations subject every one to his king and prince, acknowledging them for their lords; and

were ordered by their authority, and obeyed their laws, and that not only in causes civil, but also in regiment ecclesiastical.

So was Gregory, surnamed the Great, subject to Mauritius, and to Phocas, although a wicked emperor. So also both the pope and people of Rome took their laws of the emperors of Constantinople, and were subject to them, not only in the time of Honorius, a hundred years after Constantine the Great, but also in the time of Martian, A.D. 451, and so further unto the time of Justinian and of Charlemagne, and also after their days. <sup>F661</sup> In all which continuance of time, it is manifest, that the imperial law of Martian did rule and bind in Rome both in the days of Justinian, and one hundred and fifty years after, till the time of the empire being translated from Greece unto France. Whereby it is clearly false, that the city of Rome was given by Constantine I. unto the bishop of Rome to govern: for that pope Boniface I., writing to the emperor Honorius, calleth in the same place Rome the emperor's city. <sup>F662</sup> And the emperor Lothaire also appointed magistrates and laws in Rome, as is above mentioned. <sup>f663</sup>

Moreover, for further probation hereof, that both the bishop of Rome, and all other ecclesiastical persons were in former time, and ought to be subject to their emperors and lawful magistrates, in causes as well spiritual as civil, by many evidences may appear, taken out both of God's law and man's law. And first by God's law, we have example of godly king David, who numbered all the priests and Levites, and disposed them into four-and-twenty orders or courses, appointing them continually to serve in the ministry, every one as his proper order and turn came about: which institution of the clergy good king Hezekiah, also, afterward renewed, of whom it is written: "He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, according to all things as his father David had done before: he took away the high groves, and brake down images," etc. (2 Kings 18:3, 4) The said Hezekiah also reduced the priests and Levites unto their orders prescribed by David before, to serve every one in his office of ministration (2 Chronicles 29, 30, 31). And this order from David still continued till the time of Zachary, at the coming of Christ our Lord, being of Abias' course, which was the eighth order of the priests appointed to serve in the tabernacle (1 Chronicles 24:10; Luke 1:8). To pass over other lighter offices translated from the priests' to the kings' authority, as concerning the ordering of oblations in the temple, and reparations of the Lord's house

(2 Kings 12, 23), king Solomon displaced Abiathar the high-priest by his kingly power, and placed Sadoc in his stead (1 Kings 2:27). Also, dedicating the temple of the Lord with all the people, he “blessed the whole congregation of Israel” (1 Kings 8:14). Judas Maccabeus also elected priests, such as were without spot and had a zeal to the law of the Lord, to purge the temple, which the idolatrous Gentiles had before profaned. (1 Maccabees Also king Alexander, writing to Jonathan, appointed him chief priest in his4:42.) country. (1 Maccabees 10:19.) Demetrius ordained Simon and Alcimus in the like office of priesthood. (1 Maccabees 7:9; 14:38.) Jehoshaphat likewise, as in the whole land he did set judges, so also in Jerusalem he appointed Levites and priests, and heads of families to have the hearing of causes, and to minister judgment over the people (2 Chronicles 19:8).

By these and many other examples it is to be seen, that kings and princes in the old time, as well when priests were born priests, as when they were made by election, had the dealing also in ecclesiastical matters; as, in calling the people to God’s service, in cutting down groves, in destroying images, in gathering tithes into the Lord’s house, in dedicating the temple, in blessing the people, in casting down the brazen serpent within the temple, in correcting and deposing priests, in constituting the order and offices of priests, in commanding such things as pertained to the service and worship of God, and in punishing the contrary. And in the New Testament, what meaneth the example of Christ himself, both giving and teaching tribute to be given to Caesar? to Caesar, I say, and not to the high-priest. What meaneth his words to Pilate, not denying power to be given to him from above? (John 19:11) And again, declaring the kings of nations to have dominion over them, and willing his disciples not so to do, giving us to understand the difference between the regiment of his spiritual kingdom, and of the kingdoms of this world, willing all worldly states to be subject under the superior rulers and magistrates, in whose regiment are dominion and subjection, and not in the other. Whereunto accordeth also the doctrine of St. Paul, where it is written: “Let every soul be subject to the higher powers” (Romans 13:1), from whose authority, neither pope, cardinal, patriarch, bishop, priest, friar nor monk is excepted nor exempted: as Theophylact, expounding the same place declareth and saith, “He teacheth all sorts, whether he be priest, or monk, or else apostle, that they should

submit themselves under their princes,” etc. <sup>f664</sup> And St. Augustine writing to Boniface saith in much like sort: “Whosoever refuseth to obey the laws of the emperor, which make for the verity of God, incurreth the danger of great punishment,” etc. <sup>f665</sup> Also, in another place, writing against Cresconius, he hath these words: “Kings, according as it is enjoined them of God, do serve God in that they are kings, if they in their kingdoms command those things that be good, and forbid things that be evil, such as appertain not only to human society, but also to God’s religion,” etc. <sup>f666</sup> And yet, to come more near to the pope’s own doctors, Thomas Aquinas, not much discrepant from the injunction of the apostle above alleged, thus describeth the office of a king: “Let a king,” saith he, “understand, that he hath taken this office upon him to be as the soul within the body, and as God in the world.” <sup>f667</sup> In like agreement with the holy apostle St. Paul joineth also St. Peter: “Be you subject,” saith he “to every human creature, whether it be to the king as most preeminent, or to others set over you,” etc. (1 Peter 2:13) Where the common gloss addeth thereto, “To obey the same, whether they be good or evil.” These places rightly pondered, let any man now judge, whether the pope hath not done open wrong to the emperor, in exalting himself above the jurisdiction of his lawful prince and magistrate, notwithstanding whatsoever his own canon law saith to the contrary.

And as it is sufficiently hitherto proved by God’s law, that all ecclesiastical persons owe their due subjection to their lawful princes, in matters as well temporal as spiritual: so no less evidences may also be inferred out of man’s law, and examples of the oldest fathers to prove the same. And first, to begin with the example of Gregory the Great, who in his epistle to Mauritius, writeth thus: “You were then ‘my lord,’ when you were not the lord of the whole empire: behold Christ himself shall make you answer by me, which am his most simple servant and yours,” etc. <sup>f668</sup> And before him Eleutherius his predecessor, bishop of Rome, writing to Lucius, king of this realm, calleth him by the name of Christ’s vicar. But what needeth much confirmation of this matter, when the pope’s decrees and canons be full of records hereof, testifying how the ancient church of Rome, not only received, but also required of the emperors, laws and constitutions to be made, touching not only such causes, but also such persons as were ecclesiastical? And here, to omit by

the way the chapter “Principes seculi,” also the chapter “Administratores,” <sup>f669</sup> with divers other beside, I will recite out of the epistle of Boniface I. to the emperor Honorius, so much as serveth for our purpose; <sup>f670</sup> where it is mentioned, that the said Boniface, bishop of Rome, sent an humble supplication to the aforementioned emperor, desiring him, by his authority, to provide some remedy against the ambitious contentions of the clergy, concerning the bishopric of Rome: which emperor Honorius, incontinent at his request, directed and established a law, that none should be made bishop of Rome through ambition, and charging all ecclesiastical ministers to surcease from ambition: appointing moreover, that if two were elected together, neither of them both should be taken, but the election to proceed further to another, to be chosen by a full consent of voices. <sup>F671</sup>

To this I adjoin also the law and constitution of Justinian the emperor, ratified and renewed afterward in the council of Paris, in time of King Louis the Pious; where all bishops and priests be expressly forbidden not to excommunicate any man, before his cause was known and proved to be such as, for the which, the ancient canons of the church would have him to be excommunicate. And if any should otherwise proceed contrary to the same, then the excommunicate person to be absolved by the authority of a higher decree, and the excommunicate to be sequestered from the communion, so long as should seem convenient to him that had the execution thereof. <sup>F672</sup> The same Justinian, moreover, in his laws and constitutions, how many things did he dispose and ordain in church matters; as to have a determinate number of churchmen or clerks in churches; <sup>f673</sup> also concerning monasteries and monks; <sup>f674</sup> how bishops and priests should be ordained; <sup>f675</sup> concerning removing of ecclesiastical persons from one church to another; <sup>f676</sup> also concerning the constitution of the churches in Africa; <sup>f677</sup> and that the holy mysteries should not be done in private houses, so that whosoever should attempt the contrary, should be deprived; <sup>f678</sup> moreover, concerning clerks leaving their churches; <sup>f679</sup> also concerning the order and manner of funerals; <sup>f680</sup> and that bishops should not keep from their flock. <sup>F681</sup> The same Justinian granted to the clergy of Constantinople the privilege of the spiritual court, in certain causes only civil, and not belonging to the bishop’s cognizance; otherwise in all criminal causes he left them to the judgment of the secular court. <sup>F682</sup>

He giveth also laws and decrees for breach of matrimony, in his Constitutions, and in divers other places. And, after the doctrine of St. Paul, he commandeth all bishops and priests to sound out their service, and to celebrate the mysteries, not after a secret manner, but with a loud voice, so as they might not only be heard, but also be understood of the faithful people, what was said and done. <sup>f683</sup> Whereby it is to be gathered, that divine prayers and service were then in the vulgar tongue.

And as the said Justinian, and other emperors in those days, had the jurisdiction and government over spiritual matters and persons, the like examples also may be brought of other kings in other lands, who had no less authority in their realms, than emperors had in their empire. As in France, Clovis, the first christened king, caused a council to be called at Orleans, of thirty-two bishops, <sup>f684</sup> where thirty-one canons were instituted concerning the government of the church, about five hundred <sup>f685</sup> years after Christ. Charlemagne, beside his other laws and edicts political, called five synods, <sup>f686</sup> one at Mentz, the second at Rouen, <sup>f687</sup> the third at Rheims, the fourth at Chalons upon the Saone, and the fifth at Aries, where sundry rites and ordinances were given to the clergy, about eight hundred and thirteen years after Christ. The same Charlemagne also decreed, that only the canonical books of Scripture should be read in the church, and none other. <sup>f688</sup> Which before also was decreed A.D. 397, in the third general council of Carthage <sup>f689</sup> *Item*, he exhorteth and chargeth bishops and priests to preach the word, with a godly injunction to bishops; “The bishops, either by themselves or their deputies, shall set forth the food of God’s word to the people with all diligence. For, as St. Gregory saith, the priest which goeth without the sound of preaching procureth against himself the wrath of the secret Judge. And also they shall bring up their clergy to them committed, in soberness and chastity. The superstition which in certain places is used of some, about the funerals of the dead, let them exterminate and pluck up by the roots.” <sup>f690</sup>

Moreover, instructing and informing the said bishops and priests in the office of preaching, he willeth them not to suffer any to feign or preach to the people any new doctrine of their own invention, and not agreeing to the word of God; but that they themselves both will preach such things as lead to eternal life, and also that they set up others to do the same: and joineth withal a godly exhortation, “Ideo, dilectissimi, toto corde

praeparemus nos in scientia veritatis, ut possimus contradicentibus veritati resistere: et divina donante gratia verbum Dei currat et crescat, et multiplicetur, in profectum ecclesiae Dei sanetae, et salutem animarum nostrarum, et laudem et gloriam nominis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Pax praedicantibus, gratia obedientibus, gloria Domino nostro Jesu Christo, Amen.” <sup>F691</sup> Furthermore, the said Charlemagne, in his Constitutions, divideth the goods given to the church, so that, in the more wealthy places, two parts should go to the use of the poor, the third to the stipend of the clergy. Otherwise, in poorer places, an equal division to be made between the poor and the clergy, unless the gift had some special exception. <sup>F692</sup> And in the same book, a little after, <sup>f693</sup> the same author, Ansegisus, declareth it to be by the said Charlemagne decreed, that no ecclesiastical person or persons from thenceforth should presume to take, of any person, any such gift or donation whereby the children or kinsfolks of the said donor should be defeated of their inheritance duly to them belonging. Louis the Pious, king of France, and afterwards emperor, was son to the foresaid Charlemagne, who, being joined together with the said Charlemagne his father in the empire, ordained also with his father sundry acts and observances touching the government of the church, as in the author before alleged may be seen: as first, that no entry should be made into the church by simony; <sup>f694</sup> again, that bishops should be ordained by the free election of the clergy and of the people, without all respect of person or reward, only for the merit of life, and gift of heavenly wisdom. <sup>F695</sup>

Also the said kings and emperors forbade that any freeman or citizen should enter the profession of monkery, without licence asked of the king before; and added a double cause wherefore: first, for that many not for mere devotion, but for idleness, and avoiding the king’s wars, do give themselves to religion; again, for that many be craftily circumvented and deluded by subtile covetous persons, seeking to get from them that which they have. <sup>F696</sup> *Item*, that no young children or boys should be shaven, or enter any profession without the will of their parents. And no young maidens should take the veil or profession of a nun, before they came to sufficient discretion of years to discern and choose what they will follow. That none should be interred or buried thenceforth within the church: <sup>f697</sup> which also was decreed by Theodosius and Valentinian, four hundred

years before them. *Item*, the said Charlemagne, two and twenty years before he was emperor enacted that murderers, and such as were guilty of death by the law, should have no sanctuary by flying into the church: which also was decreed by Justinian three hundred years before this Charlemagne. <sup>F698</sup>

Moreover, the aforesaid Louis the Pious, with his son Lothaire (or as some call him Clothaire) joined with him, among other ecclesiastical sanctions, ordained a godly law, for laymen <sup>f699</sup> to partake of the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, in these words: “That laymen do communicate at least thrice [a year], if not oftener, except they be let, percase, by some heinous and grievous offenses.” *Item*, they enacted that no goods of the church should be alienated under the pain “Leoninae constitutionis.” <sup>f700</sup> **Unto this Lothaire**, <sup>a14</sup> the French king and emperor, pope Leo IV. maketh suit, in these words: — “The Roman law (meaning the law of the French emperors), as it hath hitherto stood in force, so now it may continue still in its vigor and strength.” <sup>F701</sup> About A.D. 848, after this Lothaire, succeeded his son Louis II. in the kingdom and empire of France, before whom the foresaid pope Leo was brought into judgment for treason, and pleaded his cause; and there was, before the emperor, quit and released: which declareth that popes and bishops all this while were in subjection under their kings and emperors. <sup>F702</sup>

Moreover, descending yet to lower times, A.D. 1228, Louis IX. called Saint Louis, established a law or decree, against the new inventions, reservations, preventions, and exactions of the court of Rome; and in the same year, another law against the pestiferous simony prevailing in the church; also, A.D. 1268, he made a famous law for the maintenance of the liberty of the church of France, called “Pragmatica sanctio Sancti Ludovici,” the which sanction was also practiced long after in the kingdom of France against the pope’s collectors and under-collectors, as appeareth by the Arestum of the parliament of Paris, A.D. 1463. Furthermore, king Philip the Fair, A.D. 1308, set forth a law called “Philippina,” wherein was forbidden any exaction of new tithes and first fruits, and other unaccustomed collections, to be put upon the church of France. Charles V. named the Wise, A.D. 1369, by a law, commanded that no bishops nor prelates, or their officials within his kingdom of France, should execute any sentence of interdict, or excommunication, at the pope’s commandment, over or upon the cities or

towns, corporations, or commons of his realm. <sup>F703</sup> *Item*, Charles VI. A.D. 1388, against the cardinals and other officials and collectors of the pope, revoking again the power which he had given to them before, provided by a law, that the fruits and rents of benefices, with other pensions and bishops' goods, that departed, should no more be exported by the cardinals and the pope's collectors unto Rome, but should be brought to the king, and so restored to them to whom they did rightly appertain. <sup>F704</sup>

The like also may be inferred and proved by the stories and examples of our kings here in England, as king Offa, and the kings Egbert, Edgar, Alfred, Ethelwold, Canute, Edward, William the Conqueror, William Rufus, Henry I., Henry II., till the time of king John, and after. Whose dealing, as well in ecclesiastical cases as temporal, is a sufficient demonstration to prove what injury the popes, in these latter days, have done unto the emperors, their lawful governors and magistrates, in usurping such fullness of power and jurisdiction over them, to whom properly they owe subjection; contrary to the steps and example of the old Roman bishops their ancestors: and therefore have incurred the danger of a *praemunire*, worthy to be deprived. Although it is not to be denied, but that ecclesiastical ministers and servitors have their power also committed unto them, after their sort, of the Lord, yet it becometh every man to know his own place and standing, and there to keep him, wherein his own precinct doth pale him; and not rashly to break out into other men's walks. As it is not lawful for a civil magistrate to intermeddle with a bishop's or a preacher's function, so unseemly and unorderly it is again, that Boniface VIII. should have borne before him the temporal mace and naked sword of the emperor; or that any pope should bear a triple crown, or take upon him like a lord and king. Wherefore let every man consider the compass and limitation of his charge, and exceed no further. The office of a bishop or servitor ecclesiastical, was in the old law to offer sacrifice, to burn incense, to pray for the people, to expound the law, to minister in the tabernacle, with which office it was not lawful for any prince or man else to intermeddle: as we read how Uzziah was punished for offering incense, and Uzzah for touching the ark, so now the office of christian ministers, is, to preach the word, to minister the sacraments, to pray, to bind and loose where cause urgently requireth; to judge in spiritual cases; to publish and denounce free reconciliation and remission in the name of Christ; to erect and comfort

troubled consciences, with the rich grace of the gospel; to teach the people the true difference betwixt the law and the gospel, whereof the one belongeth to such as be not in Christ, and come not to him, the other pertaineth to the true believers in the Son of God: to admonish also the magistrates erring or transgressing in their office.

And as these properly belong to the function of the ecclesiastical sort, so hath the civil governor or magistrate again his proper charge and office to him assigned, which is, to see the administration of justice and judgment, to defend with power the right of the weak that suffer wrong, to defend from oppression the poor oppressed, to minister with equity that which is right and equal to every man, to provide laws good and godly, to see the execution of the same as cause moveth: especially to see the law of God maintained, to promote Christ's glory and gospel in setting up and sending out good preachers; in maintaining the same; in providing bishops to be elected that be faithful; in removing or else correcting the same being faulty or negligent; in congregating the clergy, when need is of any counsel or election, to hear their learning in causes propounded; and, according to the truth learned, to direct his judgment in disposing such rites and ordinances for the church as make to edification, not to the destruction thereof: in conserving the discipline of the church, and setting all things in a congruous order. Briefly, the office of the civil ruler and magistrate extendeth to minister justice and judgment in all courts, as well ecclesiastical as temporal; to have correction over all transgressors, whether they be laymen or persons ecclesiastical. And finally, all such things as belong to the moving of the sword whatsoever (that is to say, all outward punishment) are referred to the jurisdiction of the secular magistrate, under whose subjection the ordinance of God hath subjected all orders and states of men.

Here we have the witness also of Hormisdas, bishop of Rome, which being well weighed, maketh the matter plain, that princes have to deal in spiritual causes also, not only in temporal: where the said Hormisdas writeth to Epiphanius, patriarch of Constantinople in this sort: "*Clara coelestis misericordiae demonstratio procedit, quando reges seculi causas de fide cum gubernatione politiae conjungunt.*" etc. <sup>1705</sup> And thus much, and too much peradventure, concerning the matter of jurisdiction, in which point this new church of Rome hath swerved from the ancient church of Rome

which was, as is sufficiently proved. The third point wherein the church of Rome hath broken, and is departed from the church of Rome, is the form of style and title annexed to the bishop of that see. As where he is called pope, most holy father, vicar general, and vicar of Christ, successor of Peter, universal bishop, prince of priests, head of the church universal, <sup>f706</sup> head bishop of the world, the admiration of the world, neither God nor man, but a thing between both, etc.; for all these terms be given him in popish books. Albeit the name “pope,” being a Greek name, derived of Πάππας, which soundeth as much as father in the Syracusan speech, may peradventure seem more tolerable, as one which hath been used in the old time among bishops; for so Augustine was called of the council of Africa, of Jerome, of Boniface, and others. Also Cyprian, bishop of Cartilage, was called *papa*. <sup>F707</sup> **Item**, Clovis or (as Rhenanus calleth him) Louis, first christian king of France, calleth a certain simple bishop, *papam*; <sup>f708</sup> Jerome also, in his Epistle to Chromatius, calleth Valerian by the name of pope; and likewise writing to Eustathius and Fabiola, he calleth Epiphanius, “*beatum papam*.” In the Apologies of Athanasius, we read oftentimes that he was called *papa*, and *archiepiscopus*. Ruffinus also calleth him *pontificem maximum*. <sup>F709</sup> Also Aurelius, president in the sixth council of Carthage was called of the said council *papa*. <sup>F710</sup> And before this, Eleutherius, bishop of Rome, writing to king Lucius, the first christian king in this land, calleth him in his Epistle, the vicar of Christ, etc. But that any of these terms were so peculiarly applied to the bishop of Rome that other bishops were excluded from the same, or that any one bishop above the rest had the name of oecumenical, or “universal,” or “head,” to the derogation of other bishops, or with such glory as is now annexed to the same; that is not to be found neither in histories of the old time, nor in any example of the primitive church, nor in the testimonies of ancient approved doctors. First, before the council of Nice, it is evident by pope Pius II. <sup>F711</sup> that there was no [special] respect had then to the church of Rome, but every church was ruled by her own governance, till the year of our Lord, 325. Then followed the council of Nice, wherein was decreed, that throughout the whole university of Christ’s church, which was now far spread over all the world, certain provinces or precincts, to the number of four, be appointed, every one to have his head church, and chief bishop, called by them metropolitan or patriarch, to have the oversight of such churches as did lie about him. <sup>F712</sup> In the number of which patriarchs or

metropolitans, the bishop of Rome had the first place, the bishop of Alexandria was the second, the bishop of Antioch the third, the bishop of Jerusalem was the fourth patriarch. Afterward, to the number of these patriarchs came in also the bishop of Constantinople, **ranking above the bishop**<sup>a15</sup> of Alexandria.<sup>F713</sup> So these four or five metropolitans or patriarchs had their peculiar circuits and precincts to them peculiarly appointed, in such sort, as one of them should not deal within another's precinct, and also that there should be among them equality of honor, whereupon we read so oft in the decrees of the old councils of "equal degree of thrones, and of honor among priests and ministers."<sup>F714</sup> Again, speaking of the said patriarchs or primates, we read in the second and third chapters of the council of Constantinople, "That bishops should not invade the diocese of other bishops without their borders, nor confound churches together," etc.<sup>F715</sup> Moreover, the old doctors, for the most and best part, do accord in one sentence, that all bishops wheresoever placed in the church of God, "be of one merit, of like honor, and be all successors together of the apostles."<sup>F716</sup> Also, he that is the author of the book, called Dionysius Areopagita, calleth all the bishops "of equal order, and of like honor," etc.<sup>F717</sup> All this while the bishop of Rome was called a patriarch, and a metropolitan, or bishop of the first see; but no oecumenical bishop, nor head of the universal church, nor any such matter. Insomuch, that he, with all other bishops, was debarred from that, by a plain decree of the council of Carthage, in these words, "That the bishop of the first see shall not be called the prince of priests, or the high priest, or any such thing."<sup>F718</sup>

And lest any here should take occasion of cavilling, to hear him called "bishop of the first see," here is to be expounded what is meant by the "first see," and wherefore he was so called: not for any dignity of the person, either of him which succeedeth, or of him whom he is said to succeed, but only of the place wherein he sitteth. This is plainly proved by the council of Chalcedon, wherein is manifestly declared the cause why the see of Rome, among all other patriarchal sees, is numbered for the first see by the ancient fathers: "The fathers," saith the council, "did worthily attribute the chief degree of honor to the see of old Rome," for why? "because," saith the council, "the principal seat of empire was in that city."<sup>F719</sup> The same also is confirmed by Eusebius, bishop of Caesarea,

who declareth, “That the excellency of the Roman empyr did advance the popedom of the Roman bishop above other churches.” <sup>F720</sup> Moreover, saith the said Eusebius, “The council,” saith he, “of Nice gave this privilege to the bishop of Rome, that like as the king of the Romans is named emperor, above all other kings, so the bishop of the same city of Rome should be called pope, above other bishops.” <sup>F721</sup> By these places hitherto alleged (and such other, many more than be here alleged), it appeareth that though these titles of superiority had been attributed to the bishop of Rome, yet it remaineth certain, that the said bishop received that preferment <sup>f722</sup> by man’s law, not by the law of God. And so is the distinction of the pope’s proved false, where is said, “That the church of Rome took not its primacy by any council, but only by the voice of God.” <sup>F723</sup> And this is to be said: although it were true that these titles and terms were so given to the bishop of Rome in the old time, yet how and by whom they were given, ye see.

Now, to try this matter, as joining an issue with our adversaries, whether these aforesaid titles of sovereignty were applied in the old time of the primitive church to the bishop of Rome, as to be called the vicar-general of Christ, the head of the whole church, and universal bishop, remaineth to be proved. Whereto this in my mind is to be answered, that albeit the bishops of Rome of some (peradventure) were so called by the names of higher pre-eminence [in respect] of that city, of some going about to please them, or to crave some help at their hands; yet that calling, First, was used then but of a few: Secondly, neither was given to many: Thirdly, was rather given than sought for, of the most: Fourthly, was not so given that it maketh or can make any general necessity of law why every one is so bound to call them, as the bishop of Rome now seeketh to be taken and called, and that by necessity of salvation; as the decree of pope Boniface VIII. witnesseth, where is said, “That it standeth upon necessity of salvation, to believe the primacy of the church of Rome, and to be subject to the same,” etc. <sup>f724</sup>

As touching therefore these titles and terms of pre-eminence aforesaid, orderly to set forth and declare what histories of times do say in that matter, by the grace of Christ, First, we will see what be the titles the bishop of Rome doth take and challenge to himself, and what is the meaning of them. Secondly, when they first came in; whether in the

primitive time or not, and by whom. Thirdly, how they were first given to the Roman bishops; that is, whether of necessary duty, or voluntary devotion, whether commonly of the whole, or particularly of a few; and whether in respect of Peter, or in respect of the city, or else of the worthiness of the bishop which there sat. Fourthly, and if the aforesaid names were then given by certain bishops, unto the bishop of Rome, whether all the said names were given, or but certain, or what they were. Fifthly, or whether they were then received of all bishops of Rome, to whom they were given, or else refused of some. Sixthly, and finally, whether they ought to have been refused being given, or not. Touching the discourse of which matters, although it appertain to the profession rather of divines than historians, and would require a long and large debating, yet, forsomuch as both in these and divers other weighty controversies of divinity, the knowledge of times and histories must needs help divines disputing about the same, so much as the grace of Christ shall assist me therein, I will join to the seeking out of truth such help as I may.

And first, to begin with the names and titles now claimed and attributed to the see and bishop of Rome, and what they be, is sufficiently declared above, that is, “the chief priest of the world,” “the prince of the church,” “bishop apostolical,” “the universal head of the church,” “the head and bishop of the universal church,” “the successor of Peter,” “most holy pope,” “vicar of God on earth,” “neither God nor man, but a mixed thing between both,” “the patriarch or metropolitan of the church of Rome,” “the bishop of the first see,” etc. <sup>f725</sup> Unto the which titles or styles is annexed a triple crown, a triple cross, two crossed keys, a naked sword, seven-fold seals, in token of the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Ghost; he being carried pick-back upon men’s shoulders, after the manner of the heathen kings, having all the empire and the emperor under his dominion. And that it is not convenient for any terrene prince to reign there, where he sitteth, having the plenary fullness of power, as well of temporal things as spiritual things in his hands. That all things are his, and that all such princes as have given him any thing, have given him but his own: having power at his will and pleasure to preach indulgences, and the cross against christian princes whatsoever. And that the emperor, and certain other princes, ought to make to him confession of subjection at their coronation: having authority to depose, and that he, *de facto*, hath deposed emperors

and the king of France; also to absolve the subjects from their allegiance to their princes: whom kings have served for footmen to lead his horse, and the emperor to hold his stirrup. That he may and doth give power to bishops upon the bodies of men, and hath granted them to have prisons: without whose authority no general council hath any force; and to whom appellations in all manner of causes may and ought to be made. That his decrees be equal with the decrees of the Nicene council, and are to be observed and taken in no less force than if they had been confirmed with the heavenly voice of St. Peter himself. <sup>F726</sup> *Item*, that the said bishop of Rome hath the heavenly disposition of things, and therefore may alter and change the nature of things, by applying the substance of one thing to another. <sup>F727</sup> *Item*, that he can of nothing make something; and cause the sentence, which before was null, to stand in effect; and may dispense above the law, and of injustice make justice, in correcting and changing laws, for he hath the fullness of power. And again, <sup>f728</sup> if the pope do lead with him innumerable souls by flocks into hell, yet no man must presume to rebuke his faults in this world. *Item*, That it standeth upon necessity of salvation to believe the primacy of the see of Rome, and to be subject to the same, etc.

These things thus declared, now let us see whether these names and titles, with the form and manner of this authority and regality above rehearsed, were ever attributed by any in the primitive time to the bishop of Rome: for all these he doth challenge and claim unto him by old possession from the time of St. Peter. And here a question is to be asked of our adversaries the papists, Whether they will avouch all these aforesaid titles, together with the whole form and tenor of regality to the same belonging as is afore touched, or not? If they will, let them come forth with their allegations; which they never have done yet, nor ever shall be able. If they will not, or cannot avouch them altogether in manner as is specified, then why doth the bishop claim them altogether so stoutly, usurp them so falsely, and obtrude them upon us so strictly? Moreover, if the said our adversaries, being convicted by plain evidence of history and examples of time, will yield unto us (as they must needs) in part, and not in the whole; let us come then to the particulars, and see what part of this regality they will defend, and derive from the ancient custom of the primitive church, that is, from the first five hundred years, I mean after Christ. **First, in the**

**council of Nice**, <sup>a16</sup> which was A.D. 325, in the sixth canon of the said council we find it so decreed, <sup>f729</sup> that in every province or precinct some one church, and bishop of the same, was appointed and set up to have the inspection and regiment of other churches about him. “After the ancient custom,” <sup>f730</sup> as the words of our council do purport, “let the bishop of Alexandria have authority over all Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, forasmuch as the like custom hath obtained in the case of the bishop of Rome. In like manner, also, in the province of Antioch and in the other provinces let the pre-eminence be reserved to the metropolitan churches.” It then follows in the seventh canon, that the bishop of Jerusalem, also, should enjoy the honor which belonged to him by usage and ancient tradition, provided only, that his metropolitan be not defrauded of his proper dignity. In this council, and in the said sixth and seventh canons, First, whereas the bishops of Alexandria, of Rome, and of Antioch are joined together in one like manner of dignity, there appeareth no difference of honor to be meant therein: Secondly, forsomuch as in the said two canons, after mention made of them immediately followeth, that no bishop should be made without consent of the metropolitan, yea and that the bishop also of Jerusalem should be under his metropolitan, and (can. 4.) that the metropolitan should have the full power to confirm every bishop made in his province; <sup>f731</sup> therefore it may be well suspected, that the third epistle decretal of pope Anacletus and of pope Stephen, with other more, are forged; <sup>f732</sup> wherein these bishops, and especially the bishop of Rome, is exempted and dissevered from the name of a metropolitan or an archbishop, to the name of a patriarch or primate, as appeareth in the decrees. <sup>f733</sup> Wherefore, as we must needs grant the bishop of Rome to be a metropolitan or archbishop by the council of Nice; so we will not greatly stick in this also, to have him numbered with patriarchs or primates. Which title seemeth in the old time to be common to more cities than to Rome, both by the Epistle of Anacletus, of pope Stephen, of pope Julius and Leo, etc.

**After this followed** <sup>a17</sup> a general council in Africa, called the sixth council of Carthage, A.D. 419, where were congregated two hundred and seventeen bishops, among whom was also Augustine, Prosper, Orosius, with divers other famous persons. This council continued the space of five years, <sup>f734</sup> wherein was great contention about the supremacy and jurisdiction of

Rome; the [occasion whereof arose the year before, by Zosimus,] then Roman bishop. This Zosimus had received into the communion of the church, without any examination, one that came to complain to him out of Africa, named Apiarius, a priest, whom Aurelius the metropolitan, with the council of Africa, had worthily excommunicated for his detestable conditions before. <sup>F735</sup> Upon this, Zosimus, after that he had received and showed such favor to Apiarius, for that he did appeal to him, sendeth to the council his legates, to wit, Faustinus, bishop of Potenza, and two priests of the church of Rome, named Philippus and Asellus, with these four requests: First, that Apiarius, whom he had absolved, might be received of them again, and that it might be lawful for bishops or priests to appeal from the sentence of their metropolitans, and [even] of a council, to the see of Rome. Secondly, that bishops should not sail over importunately “ad comitatum.” <sup>F736</sup> Thirdly, that if any priest or deacon were wrongfully excommunicate by the bishops of their own province, it should be lawful for them to remove the hearing and judging of their cause to their neighbor bishops. Fourthly, that Urban, Apiarius’s bishop, either should be excommunicated, or else sent up to Rome, unless he would correct those things that were to be corrected. For the maintenance whereof, the said Zosimus alleged for himself the words (as he pretended) taken out of Nicene council. The African council hearing this, and remembering no such thing in the council of Nice to be decreed, and yet not suspecting that the bishop of Rome would dare wrongfully to falsify the words of that council, writeth to Zosimus, declaring that they never read, to their remembrance, in their common Latin exemplar of the Nicene council any such canon, yet notwithstanding, for quietness’ sake, they would observe the same till they might procure the original copies of that council to be sent to them from Constantinople, Alexandria, and from Antioch. In like effect afterward they wrote to pope Boniface, who shortly after succeeded Zosimus; and thirdly also to Celestine, who succeeded Boniface.

In the mean time this aforesaid council sent their legates, Marcellus and Innocent, to Atticus, patriarch of Constantinople, and to Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, for the authentic copies in Greek of the Nicene council; which being sent unto them, and they, finding in the true originals no such canon as the bishop of Rome had falsely forged, [they sent them to pope Boniface. After him succeeded Celestine, A.D. 422, who likewise sent his

legates to the bishops of Africa, in behalf of Apiarius: whereupon] they wrote a sharp and [yet] a handsome letter to pope Celestine, (calling him in the said letter, by the way, “Domine frater,”) declaring to him, how they had perused all the copies of the council of Nice, and could find no such canon as he and his predecessors had falsely alleged, and (therewithal, reciting the sixth canon afore mentioned) declaring how the decrees of the Nicene council had committed all and singular persons ecclesiastical, as well bishops as others, unto the charge of their metropolitans. Moreover, expounding the same decree, they showed the reason thereof.

**First**, For that (say they) the fathers of that council did most prudently and justly provide, that all controversies be ended “in iisdem locis, where they began.

**2.** For that it is not to be supposed contrary, but that the grace of God will be as prest and ready in one province as in another, to instruct his ministers both prudently to understand judgment, and constantly to maintain the same.

**3.** Specially, for that there is no need to seek further to any foreign help, because that the party, who is not contented with the determination of his judges or commissioners, may lawfully appeal either to a provincial or else to a general council.

**4.** That way to be better than to run to any foreign judge, it must needs be granted; because it is not likely that our God will inspire justice, in hearing and determining causes, into one bishop, and deny it unto a multitude congregated in a whole council.

**5.** Neither can it be, that any foreign judgment-can stand good, for that the necessary witnesses will never be able to attend, either through infirmity of sex, of age, or of sickness, or some other impediment. Wherefore, as by these and other reasons they thought it not convenient for them to carry their matters over thence unto Rome; so neither was it to be found (say they) by any council of the old fathers decreed, that any legates should be sent from Rome to them, for deciding of their matters. And therefore exhorted they the said bishop of Rome, that he would not introduce “Fumosum typhum (or rather as I may call it, ‘typhos’) seculi in ecclesiam Christi, quae lucem

simplicitatis et humilitatis Deum videre cupientibus praeferat:” that is, “that he would not introduce the fuming and swelling pride of the world into the church of Christ, which church showeth and giveth the light of simplicity and of humility to such as desire to behold God.”

F737

In these aforesaid letters, moreover, is signified, how the forenamed malefactor Apiarius, whom the bishop of Rome before had absolved and received to the communion of the church, was afterward found culpable; and therefore the council proceeded against him, brought him to open confession of his faults, and so enjoined him due penance for his demerits, notwithstanding the absolution and inconsiderate clearing of the bishop of Rome before proceeding.

In sum, out of this council of Carthage these points are to be noted.

**First**, How glad the bishops of Rome were to receive such as came to them for succor.

**2.** What pride they took by the occasion thereof, thinking and seeking thereby to have all under their subjection.

**3.** To the intent to allure others to seek to them, how ready they were to release and quit this Apiarius as guiltless, who afterwards was to be tried culpable by his own confession.

**4.** How, contrary to the acts and doings of the Romish bishop, this council condemned him whom the said bishop of Rome before had absolved, little respecting the proceedings of the Romish church.

**5.** How the bishops, of old time, have been falsifiers of ancient councils and writings, whereby it may be suspected, that they which shamed not to falsify and corrupt the council of Nice, much less would they stick to abuse and falsify the decretal epistles and writings of particular bishops and doctors for their own advantage, as no doubt they have done many one.

**6.** In this aforesaid council, whereat Augustine himself was present, and where Aurelius, president of the same, was called *papa*, the bishop of Rome was called expressly in their letters but “bishop of the city of Rome,” and *dominus frater*, that is, “brother lord bishop.”

7. The dominion of this Roman patriarch, in the said council of Carthage, was cut so short, that neither it was permitted to them of Africa to appeal over the sea to him, nor for him to send over his legates to them, for ending their controversies. Whereby it may sufficiently appear, that the bishop of Rome in those days was not at all admitted to be the chief of all other bishops, nor the head of the universal church of Christ in earth, etc.

8. We hear in this council, five causes or reasons given, why it is not necessary nor yet convenient for all foreign causes to be brought to one universal head or judge, as is before recited.

**Ninthly** and lastly, By the said council of Carthage we hear a virtuous exhortation to be given to the bishop of Rome, that he would not introduce into the meek and humble church of Christ, the fuming and swelling pride of the world, as is before declared. In this, or in some other council of Carthage, it was moreover provided by express law, and also specified in the pope's decrees, that no bishop of the first see should be called the prince of priests, or the chief priest, or any such like thing; but only the bishop of the first see, as followeth more in the said decree. "Be it enacted, that no bishop, no, not the bishop of Rome, be called universal bishop." <sup>F738</sup> And thus much concerning this aforesaid council of Carthage.

Not long before this council, was celebrated in Africa another council, called the second synod of Milevis, about A.D. 416, at the which council also St. Augustine was present, where it was decreed, under pain of excommunication, that no minister or bishop should appeal over the sea to the bishop of Rome. <sup>F739</sup> Whereby it may appear that the bishop of Rome, all this space, was not universally called by the term of oecumenical or universal bishop, but bishop of the first see: so that if there were any preferment therein, it was in the reverence of the place, and not in the authority of the person. And yet it was not so in the place, that the place importeth the city of Rome only, but the first see then was called the metropolitan church; as by the words of the Nicene council, and other constitutions more, is to be seen, where the four patriarchs were called **πρῶτοι** or **πρωτεύοντες** or **προεστῶτες**, as, namely, by the words of the council of Cartilage may appear, which be these, "Except he have some

special license or exception, by the consent of the proper bishop of the first see in every country, that is, of him that is the primate in the said country.” <sup>F740</sup> Also the words of the thirty-ninth canon of the council of Carthage, before touched, be these, “That the bishop of the first see be not called prince of priests, or head priest, or else any such like.” <sup>F741</sup> Again, Anicetus, the tenth bishop of Rome, and pope Stephen, and pope Felix, making a difference between a primate and metropolitan, write thus: “Let no archbishops be called primates, but only such as have the first see.” <sup>F742</sup> Thus it is made plain, how the bishop of the first see, or first bishop, or primate, is none other but he which was called patriarch, and belonged not only to the church of Rome, but to all such cities and places where before, among the gentiles, were “*primi flamines*.” <sup>F743</sup> And here, by the way, is to be noted the repugnance to truth of such as craftily, but falsely, have counterfeited the pope’s decretal epistles; which, besides other great and many conjectures, hereby also may be gathered. For, whereas Clement, Anacletus, <sup>f744</sup> Anicetus, and others, joining together the office of patriarchs and primates, <sup>f745</sup> do divide the same from the order of metropolitans, or archbishops, alleging there-for the constitutions of the apostles and their successors, that is to be found false by the canons of the apostles, by the council of Nice, and by the council of Antioch, with others more. For in the canons of the apostles, <sup>f746</sup> whereas in almost every canon mention is made of bishops, priests, and deacons, no word is there touched either of any order above the bishop, or lower than the deacon; save only in the thirty-third canon, setting an order among bishops, the canon willeth the bishops of every nation to know their first or chief bishop, and him to be taken for the head of them: he saith not the head of the church, or head of the world, but “the head of those bishops.” And where? Not in Rome only, but plainly and expressly in every nation, for so the words purport: “The bishops of every nation ought to know the first or chief among them.” <sup>F747</sup> Moreover, the council of Antioch, reciting the aforesaid canon word for word, expoundeth the matter plainly, instead of *τὸν πρῶτον* writing *τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον*, which is as much to say, “metropolitan;” and in the end of the said canon, calleth him *τὸν τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον*, that is, “metropolitanum.” <sup>F748</sup> Whereby it is concluded that to be false, that Clement and Anacletus and Anicetus are reported (but falsely) <sup>f749</sup> to put a difference between primates or patriarchs, and metropolitans or archbishops: whereas, by

sufficient authority it is to be proved, that in the old church both primates, first bishops, bishops of the first see, patriarchs, metropolitans, bishops of the mother-city, and archbishops, were all one. First, that primates and metropolitans were both one, is before declared by the canons of the apostles, and by the council of Antioch aforesaid. Again, that patriarchs and archbishops were all one, is evident by the 123d Novella of Justinian, <sup>f750</sup> who in the said constitution, reciting the five patriarchs above mentioned, <sup>f751</sup> calleth them by the name of archbishops: and, a little after, calleth the patriarch of Constantinople archbishop, by these words: “Which be under the archbishop and patriarch of Constantinople.” <sup>F752</sup> And after, speaking most plainly in the matter, he setteth another order, divers from that of Clement, Anacletus, and Anicetus, in placing these aforesaid persons, first beginning with bishops, then over them setting the metropolitan, and over him again the archbishop, and there stayeth, making no further mention of any other above him: whose words be these, “If a bishop be accused, the metropolitan to have the examination of those things that are brought against him: if the metropolitan be accused, then the archbishop to have the hearing thereof, under whom he dwelleth.” <sup>F753</sup> And in the same constitution moreover, “If any suit or supplication be brought against a bishop by a minister, or any other, first the metropolitan to have the deciding of the matter, and if any default shall be found in the judgment thereof, then the hearing and ending of the case to be brought before the archbishop.” <sup>F754</sup>

In this constitution of Justinian, although the metropolitan be placed above the bishop, and the archbishop above the metropolitan, yet, notwithstanding, by this are sufficiently confuted the forged constitutions of Clement, Anacletus, Anicetus, Stephen, and Felix; who, in their epistles decretal, join together in one form and order both archbishop and metropolitan, and above them both do place the patriarch, and above the patriarch the apostolical see, to wit, the bishop of Rome; as may appear in reading the first epistle of Clement: <sup>f755</sup> the second epistle of Anacletus. <sup>F756</sup> Also the epistle of pope Stephen I. <sup>F757</sup> (where note by the way, that Gratian referreth this place of the epistle to pope Lucius): item, the first epistle of pope Felix II. <sup>F758</sup> In all which aforesaid epistles, this order and difference of degrees is taken: that the first and principal place is given to primates or patriarchs, the second to metropolitans or archbishops, the

third to bishops; and finally, above all these, is extolled the apostolical see of the bishop of Rome, contrary to all that which before hath been alleged out of Justinian, the council of Nice, and of Antioch, etc. Whereby it may appear, that either Justinian in preferring archbishops above metropolitans, had not read these epistles decretal, if they were genuine; or if they were forged, they which forged the said epistles in their names did not well consider what Justinian had written in this matter before.

Thus then these titles above recited, as “bishop,” “metropolitan,” “the bishop of the first see,” “primate,” “patriarch,” “archbishop,” that is to say, chief bishop, or head bishop to other bishops of his province, we deny not but were in the old time applied, and might be applied to the bishop of Rome, like as the same also were applied to other patriarchs in other chief cities and provinces.

As touching the name likewise of “high priest,” or “high priesthood,” neither do I deny but that it hath been found in old monuments and records of ancient times; but in such wise and sort as it hath been common to bishops indifferently, and not singularly attributed to any one bishop or see. Whereof testimony we have out of the seventh general council, where the bishop’s office is called “summum sacerdotium,” <sup>f759</sup> “the high priesthood,” in these words: “Substantia summi sacerdotii nostri sunt eloquia divinitus tradita, (id est) vera divinarum scripturarum disciplina,” etc.: that is, “The substance (say they) of our high priesthood, is the word or discipline of holy Scriptures given us from above.”

And likewise the council of Agda maketh relation “of bishops set in the high priesthood,” <sup>f760</sup> meaning not of any one, but indefinitely and indifferently of whomsoever. Also Fabian, bishop of Rome, A.D. 240, writing in general to his brethren and to all bishops and ministers ecclesiastical, doth attribute to them the same title of “summum sacerdotium,” in these words: “God, which hath preordained you brethren, and all them which bear the office of high priesthood.” <sup>F761</sup> With like phrase of speech Anacletus also, in his second epistle, speaking of bishops in general, calleth them “summos sacerdotes:” “Unde liquet quod summi sacerdotes, (id est) episcopi, a Deo sunt judicandi,” etc.: “The high priests, that is, bishops,” saith he. <sup>F762</sup> And moreover in the same place he calleth them “apostles,” and “successors of the apostles.” So doth Innocent I. in

A.D. 405. <sup>F763</sup> Also Zosimus, <sup>f764</sup> bishop of the said city of Rome, in A.D. 418; speaketh “de summo sacerdotio,” that is, “of high priesthood,” not only of the church of Rome, but of all other churches. The same Zosimus, in his writings alleged by Gratian, referreth the name and place *summi pontificis*, of “the high bishop,” not only to the see of Rome, but uniformly to every bishop, as there appeareth. <sup>F765</sup>

And thus much as touching the name or title of high priest, or supreme bishop; which title as I do not deny to have been used in manner and form aforesaid, so do I deny this title and style of *summus orbis pontifex*, as it is now used in Rome, to have been used, or usually received during all the primitive time of the church that is, five hundred years after Christ (after the manner and sort I mean of that authority and glory, which in these days now is used and is given to the same), until the time of Phocas, the wicked emperor, which was after the year of the Lord 608. The which title as it is too glorious for any one bishop in the church of Christ to use, so is it not to be found in any of the approved and most ancient writers of the church, namely, these: Cyprian, Basil, Fulgentius, Chrysostome, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine, or Tertullian: but rather written against by the same, especially of the last. And therefore not without cause it is written and testified of Erasmus, who, speaking of the said name of “*summus orbis pontifex*,” denieth plainly the same to be heard of among the old writers, whose words be these: “*Certe nomen hoc nondum illis temporibus erat auditum, quantum ex veterum omnium scriptis licet colligere,*” etc. <sup>f766</sup> as whosoever readeth the same authors, shall find to be true.

The like is to be affirmed also of other presumptuous titles of like ambition, as “the head of the universal church,” “the vicar of Christ in earth,” “prince of priests,” with such like: which all be new found terms, strange to the ears of the old primitive writers and councils, and not received openly and commonly before the time of Boniface III. and the aforesaid Phocas.

Now remaineth the name of the pope, which, of its nature and by its first origin, being a word of the Syracusan speech called *πάππας* signifieth as much as “pater,” father, and was then used and frequented of them in the old time; not so as proper only to the bishop of Rome, but common and indifferent to all other bishops or personages, whosoever were of worthy

excellency, as is partly before declared. But now, contrarily, the generality of this name is so restrained and abused, that not only it is appropriate to the bishop of Rome, but also distincteth and dissevereth the authority, and pre-eminence of that bishop alone from all other bishops, for which cause it is now worthily come into contempt and execrations. No less is to be rejected also the name of “universalis” or “oecumenicus pontifex,” “summus orbis episcopus,” “caput universalis ecclesiae,” “Christi in terris vicarius,” “princeps sacerdotum,” etc. All which terms and vocables, tending to the derogation of other bishops and patriarchs, as they were never received nor allowed in Rome (if we believe Gregory) during the time of the primitive church, so now are worthily of us refused.

**It cannot, indeed, be** <sup>a18</sup> denied, but there were certain in the primitive time which began privately to assume that proud and wicked title of “universal bishop;” as John II. and Menna, patriarchs of Constantinople; as appeareth in the Acts of the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 536, wherein both Menna, <sup>f767</sup> and also John, is titled “oecumenicus patriarcha.” <sup>F768</sup> Afterward, the patriarch John IV. (surnamed the Faster), holding a council at Constantinople, A.D. 588, went about to establish and ratify this title, and to dignify his throne therewith, by the consent of the council and the emperor of Constantinople, and obtained the same. Concerning the which title, although it was then used in Constantinople through the sufferance of the emperors, being then willing to have their imperial city advanced, yet notwithstanding, this aforesaid title, all this while, was not in the city of Rome. And in Constantinople it stood not then in force “jure aliquo divino,” but only by man’s law. And thirdly, it was then but only “verbalis titulus,” having no true domination over all other churches, nor any real authority, belonging to the same; forasmuch as neither the bishop of Rome, nor any of the west churches were subject or did acknowledge service unto them, but rather did repugn the same, **namely, Pelagius II. and Gregory** <sup>a19</sup> **I.**, both bishops of Rome at that period; whereof Pelagius, writing to all bishops, saith plainly in these words, “That no patriarch should take the name of universality at any time; because that if any be called “universal,” the name of patriarch is derogated from all others.” <sup>F769</sup> “But let this be far,” saith he, “from all faithful men, to will to take that thing to him, whereby the honor of his brethren is diminished.” Wherefore the said Pelagius chargeth all such bishops, that none of them in

his letters will name any patriarch to be universal, lest he take from himself the honor due to him, while they give that which is not due to another. What can be more evident than these words of Pelagius, who was bishop of Rome next before Gregory, A.D. 583? In like manner, or more plainly and more earnestly, writeth also Gregory of this matter in his register, **proving and disputing that no man ought to be called “universal bishop;”**<sup>a20</sup> moreover, with sharp words and rebukes detesting the same title, calling it new, foolish, proud, perverse, wicked, profane; and such, that to consent unto it is as much as to deny the faith. He addeth further and saith, “that whosoever goeth about to extol himself above other bishops, in so doing followeth the example of Satan, to whom it was not sufficient to be counted equal or like unto other angels.” In his epistles how oft doth he repeat and declare the same to repugn directly against the gospel, and ancient decrees of councils? affirming that none of his predecessors did ever usurp to himself that style or title; and concludeth that whosoever so doth, declareth himself to be a forerunner of Antichrist.<sup>F770</sup> With this judgment of Gregory well agree also the words of St. Augustine,<sup>f771</sup> where, reciting the words of Cyprian, he thus saith: “For none of us doth ever set himself to be bishop of bishops, or after a tyrannical manner doth subdue and bring under his fellows unto the necessity of obedience.” By these words of Cyprian and Augustine it is manifest, that in their time was no supremacy or universal title among bishops received, nor that any great respect was had to the bishop of Rome (as pope Pius II. Saith<sup>f772</sup>), before the council of Nice. And after, in that council, the said bishop of Rome had no further authority to him limited, than only over his province, and places suburban, bordering about the city of Rome.<sup>F773</sup> Against whose primacy divers churches also did resist long after that; as the churches of Ravenna, Milan, and Aquileia. Also the Greek churches have resisted the same to this day, likewise the churches of Asia, Russia, Moscow, Wallachia, and other more.<sup>F744</sup>

But to return again to Gregory, who, confirming the sentence of Pelagius his predecessor above mentioned, had no small conflicts about this title-matter, both with the patriarch and with the emperor of Constantinople, as witness Antoninus and others, etc.<sup>f775</sup> The history is thus: After that John, being made, of a monk, patriarch of Constantinople, by his flattery and hypocrisy had obtained of Mauritius the emperor to be extolled above

other bishops, with the name of “universal patriarch,” and that he would write to Gregory (then bishop of Rome) for his consent concerning the same, Gregory, abiding still in his constancy, did set himself stoutly against that antichristian title, and would give no place. At the same time the Lombards had invaded the country of Italy and the city of Rome, the emperor keeping then at Constantinople, and setting in Italy an overseer called “exarchus,” to rule in Ravenna. Gregory, perceiving the emperor Mauritius to be displeased with him about the matter afore touched, writeth to Constantina the empress, arguing and declaring in his letters, that for him to be universal patriarch would be in him presumption and pride, for that it was both against the rule of the gospel and the decrees of the canons, namely, the sixth canon of the Nicene council; and the novelty of that new-found title would declare nothing else, but that the time of Antichrist was near. Upon this, Mauritius the emperor, taking displeasure with him, calleth home his soldiers again from Italy, and inciteth the Lombards against the Romans, who, with their king Agilulph, thereupon, contrary to their league made before, set upon the city of Rome, and besieged it a whole year together; Gregory, yet notwithstanding, still remaining in his former constancy. After these afflictions thus overpast, Eulogius, patriarch of Alexandria, writeth to the said Gregory in his letters, naming him “universal pope:” unto whom Gregory, refusing the same, answereth again as followeth.

### **THE LETTER OF GREGORY TO THE PATRIARCH OF ALEXANDRIA.**

Behold, in the preface of your epistle directed to me, ye have used a proud appellation, calling me “universal pope,” which I beg your holiness hereafter not to do, for that is derogated from you, whatsoever is attributed to another more than reason requires. As for me, I seek not advancement in words, but in manners; neither do I account that any honor, wherein I see the honor of my brethren to be hindered: for my honor I take to be the honor of the universal church: my honor is the whole and perfect vigor of my brethren. Then am I really honored, when to no man is denied the due honor which to him belongeth; for, if your holiness call me “universal pope,” in so doing you deny yourself to be that, which ye affirm me to be, universal: but that God forbid. Let go these

words, therefore, which do nothing but puff up vanity, and wound charity. <sup>F776</sup>

It were too long here to infer all such letters and epistles of his concerning this matter, written to the emperor Mauritius and Constantina the empress, but that shall more largely appear hereafter (Christ willing) in the body of the history, when we come to the year and time of Gregory, which was well nigh six hundred years after Christ. In the mean season this is sufficient to declare, how the church of Rome, with the form and manner of their title of universal supremacy now used and maintained, hath utterly swerved from the ancient steps of the primitive church of Rome.

Now let us see what the adversary-side hath to object again for the title of their universality, or rather singularity. And first, here cometh in a blind cavillation of a certain sophister, who, glossing upon the words of Pelagius above recited, laboureth to color the plain text with a subtle meaning, as though the sense of the canon were this, not to deny absolutely that any one may be universal bishop, but only to deny it after this sense and meaning, viz. that he should be the proper pastor of every church alone, so that there should be no other bishop beside himself.” <sup>F777</sup> Thus goeth this sophister about to dash out this text; but he cannot so discharge the matter. For neither did John the patriarch then seek any such thing as to be bishop and proper pastor of every church alone; nor, if he had, would the council of Constantinople and the emperor Mauritius <sup>F778</sup> ever have agreed thereunto. Neither is it true, what this glosser saith, viz. that Pelagius does not, here forbid the primacy or supremacy of that patriarch, which indeed is the only intent of Pelagius in that canon, witnessing as well other historiographers, as namely Antoninus, <sup>F779</sup> and also the gloss ordinary upon the same canon.

Out of the same fountain springeth the like or very same reason, of late renewed by a certain new-start English clerk in these our days, who, answering to the places of Gregory touching the said matter, laboureth to avoid the clear authority of him by a like blind cavillation, saying that John, bishop of Constantinople, by this title of “universal bishop,” understood himself only to be a bishop, and none else; and that Gregory in resisting him, had none other meaning but the same. And to prove this to be the very meaning of Gregory, he reciteth the words of Gregory, written

to the said John archbishop of Constantinople as followeth: “For thou (John bishop of Constantinople) who sometime didst grant thyself unworthy the name of a bishop, art now come to this, that thou dost seek to be called a bishop alone.” <sup>F780</sup> Upon this word “episcopus solus,” this glosser would ground a surmise, that Gregory did find fault with the archbishop, not for any primacy which he sought for above other bishops, but only for that he coveted to be a bishop and pastor alone in every church, in such sort, as there should be no other bishop or pastor else, but himself only. But, as is said, that was never the archbishop’s seeking, nor the matter of Gregory’s reprehension. For the said archbishop of Constantinople went not about to be bishop alone (which was much too absurd, and also impossible), but to be universal alone: nor to take away the office from others, but the honor from others; not to depose them, but to despise them. And therefore saith Gregory “despectis fratribus,” not “depositis fratribus:” so that this word “solus” here noteth a despising of others, not a deposing of others, and importeth a singularity in condition above others, and not the office or substance of ministration without others; that is, to be universal among many, and not to be one alone without any; nor to diminish the number of them, but only to increase the honor to himself. For the more evident probation whereof (although the thing itself is so evident, that it needeth no proof), what can be more plain than the words themselves of Pelagius and Gregory? wherewith they charge him for running before his brethren, for challenging superiority above them, for diminishing their honor by taking more honor than to him was due, for following the angel of pride in exalting himself, in admitting that to him, which the bishops of Rome and their predecessors had refused, being offered to them before: all which words declare, that he sought not to thrust out all other bishops out of their churches, and to be bishop himself alone, for that was never offered to the bishops of Rome by the council of Chalcedon, <sup>f781</sup> that they should be bishops alone, and none other: neither did Lucifer seek to have no more angels in all heaven but himself, but he to be above all other alone.

Likewise the word “praecurrere,” that is, “to run before other,” in the epistle of Pelagius, <sup>f782</sup> declareth that John sought not to be bishop alone, but bishop universal. We say not that a man runneth before another, when he runneth alone and no man followeth him; that is not properly

“praecurrere,” but “solus currere.” Moreover, in seeking to be superior to other bishops, he seeketh not to take away other bishops, but to make other bishops inferior to himself: for where no inferior is, there can be no superior, forso much as these together are correlatives, and infer necessary respect mutually. And if it were true, as this glosser saith, that he had sought to be bishop alone, how would that council either have granted that unto him, or have offered it to the bishop of Rome before? or if they had, how could it be possible for him alone to serve all churches, without any fellow-bishop to help him? And whereas this aforesaid clerk standeth so much upon the words of St. Gregory “solus episcopus,” Gregory therefore shall expound Gregory, and one “solus” shall declare another. Wherefore, if this divine (whatsoever he be, doctor or bachelor) either knoweth not, or would learn, what “only bishop” meaneth in this place, another place of the said Gregory may instruct him; <sup>f783</sup> where Gregory, writing to Eulogius patriarch of Alexandria, giveth this reason why he refused the same title offered to himself, which before was offered to the said John, patriarch of Constantinople, saying, “For if one alone would be called a “patriarch universal,” then should the name of patriarchs be derogated from all others.” Whereby two things are to be noted; first, what thing it was which the patriarch of Constantinople did seek, for Gregory here findeth no other fault, but with the same which was given to John, which was to be called “patriarch universal.” The second thing to be noted is, the cause why Gregory did rebuke this title, both given to John, and offered to him: “Because,” saith he, “if one take upon him the name of universal patriarch, then is the name patriarch taken from the rest.” As who would say, If I would take upon me to be named universal patriarch, then should there be no other patriarch, but I should be bishop patriarch alone. And here cometh in your “solus episcopus.”

Furthermore the same Gregory, speaking of the said *solus* in another place by, seemeth to declare there, what he meaneth by this “solus” here, in these words as follow: “So that he would be subject to none, and would alone be chieftain to all other.” <sup>F784</sup> And so by this place may the other place be expounded: “Ut solus episcopus sit is, qui solus inter episcopos praeesse appetat:” that is, “Solus episcopus meaneth one, who alone seeketh to be extolled above other bishops.” But to be short in a matter that needeth not many words, he that thus cavilleth upon this place,

“solus episcopus,” in Gregory, must be desired here not to take “solus” alone, but join withal the word going before, which is, “despectis fratribus.” By the which might seem sufficiently declared what Gregory meant by “solus episcopus;” meaning, that to despise other bishops, and to diminish their honor, to set up his own, and to be subject to none, but to prefer himself unequally before all others, is as much as to be counted bishop alone. And thus much touching this objection.

Another objection of our adversaries is this: Although (say they) no bishop of Rome was ever called, or would be called by the name of “universal bishop,” yet it followeth not therefore, that they be not, or ought not, to be heads of the universal church. Their reason is this:

‘As St. Peter had the charge of the whole church (by the testimony of Gregory) committed unto him, although he were not called universal apostle: so no more absurd it is for the pope to be called the head of the whole church, and to have the charge thereof, although he be not called universal bishop.’

Wherein is a double untruth to be noted; first, <sup>f785</sup> in that they pretend Peter to be the head, and to have the charge, of the whole church. If we take here “charge or head” for dominion or mastership upon or above the church in all cases judiciary, both spiritual and temporal; to that I answer, The words of the Scripture be plain, “Not as masters over the clergy,” etc. <sup>f786</sup>; “But you not so,” etc. <sup>f787</sup> Again, that the church is greater, or rather the head of Peter, it is clear, “All things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas; either the world, death, or life; you be Christ’s, Christ is God’s,” etc. (1 Corinthians 3:22). In which words the dignity of the church no doubt is preferred above the apostles, and above Cephas also. Moreover, as the dignity of the wife is above the servant, so must needs the honor and worthiness of the church (being the spouse of Christ) surmount the state of Peter or other apostles, who be but servants to Christ and to the church; yea, and though they were princes of the church, yet, after the mind of Baldus, “Magis attenditur persona intellectualis, quam organica.” <sup>F788</sup> Otherwise, if by this word “charge” he meant only the office and diligence of teaching; to that I answer, The same Lord that said to Peter, “Feed my sheep,” said also to the others, “Go and preach this gospel to all nations.” And he that said to Peter, “Whatsoever thou

loosest,” said also to the others, “Whatsoever ye remit in the earth.” Moreover, if the matter go by preaching, Paul the apostle labored more therein than ever did Peter, by his own confession, “plus laboravi;” also suffered more for the same, “plus sustinui;” neither was his doctrine less sound, yea, and in one point he went before Peter, and was teacher and schoolmaster unto Peter, whereas Peter was by him justly corrected (Galatians 2:11). Furthermore, teaching is not always, nor in all things, a point of mastership, but sometimes a point of service. As if a Frenchman should be put to an Englishman to teach him French, although he excelleth him in that kind of faculty, yet, it followeth not therefore, that he hath fulness of power upon him, to appoint his diet, to rule his household, to prescribe his laws, to stint his lands, and such other. Wherefore, seeing in travail of teaching, in pains of preaching, in gifts of tongues, in largeness of commission, in operation of miracles, in grace of vocation, in receiving the Holy Ghost, in vehemency of torments, and death, for Christ’s name, the other apostles were nothing inferior to Peter; why Peter then should claim any special prerogative above the rest, I understand no cause; as indeed *he* never claimed any, but the patrons of the apostolical see do claim it for him, which he never claimed himself, neither if he were here, would no less abhor it with soul and conscience than we do now; and yet our abhorring now is not for any malice of person, or any vantage to ourselves, but only the vehemency of truth, and zeal to Christ and to his congregation. Moreover, if these men would needs have Peter to be the curate and overseer of the whole universal church (which was too much for one man to take charge of), and to be prince of all other apostles, then would I fain learn of them, what meaneth “*dextrae societatis*,” “the right hand of society,” between Peter, Paul, and Barnabas, mentioned in the Galatians (Galatians 2:9). What taking of hands is there between subjects and their prince, in way of fellowship? or, where fellowship is, what mastership is there? Or again, what state of mastership is it likely that Christ would give to Peter, who, being indeed master of all, took such little mastership upon himself, that he washed Peter’s feet, to give Peter ensample to take no mastership upon him, but rather to humble himself, and that not only in inward affection, but also in outward fact? Although I am not ignorant that Peter, in divers places of the Gospel, hath his commendation, neither do I deny Peter to be worthy of the same. But yet these words of commendation give to him no state of superiority, or jurisdiction upon all

others, to have all under his subjection. As if a schoolmaster should give more special charge to some one of his scholars for his riper towardness; yet this giveth him no fullness of authority, or power coactive upon the rest, unless by special admission he be deputed thereunto. Whereof nothing can be gathered of Peter; for if it be true that St. Augustine saith, <sup>f789</sup> that such things as were spoken to Peter have no lightsome understanding except they be referred to the church, whereof Peter did bear a figure, then hath the person of Peter nothing to claim by these words, but all redoundeth to the church, which, being meant by Peter, hath power by this reason, both over the person of Peter, and all other persons in the Lord.

But here stumbleth in an argument of our adversary again, which he, in the margin of his book, calleth an invincible argument, drawn out of the bowels of St. John Chrysostome, <sup>f790</sup> whereby he supposeth to have given a shrewd blow to protestants, and to have gotten Hector's victory upon a certain English prisoner taken in plain field, and of all such as take his part. The text only of Chrysostome he reciteth, but maketh no argument, albeit he maketh mention of an invincible argument in the margin. But, because he either wist not, or list not to shew his cunning therein, I will form that argument for him which he would have done, but did not: and so will form it (the Lord willing) as he himself must of necessity be driven to do, if the matter ever come to the trial of act, and not to the trifling of words. First, he taketh his text out of Chrysostome, as followeth: — "For what cause, I pray you, did Christ shed his blood? Truly to redeem those sheep, whose charge he committeth to Peter and to Peter's successors." Upon this place of Chrysostome, this clerk taketh his *medium*, Christ's suffering. His conclusion is, that all which Christ died for, were committed to Peter; wherefore the form of the argument must needs stand thus, in the third figure: — Christ suffered for all men: Christ suffered for them whom he committed to Peter. *Ergo*, all that Christ died for, were committed to Peter.

If this be the form of his insoluble argument, as it seemeth to be by the order of his reasoning, and also must needs be, taking that *medium*, and making that conclusion as he doth (for else in the first figure and first mood, the text of Chrysostome will not serve him), then must the form and violence of this inexpugnable argument be denied, for that it breaketh

the rules of logic, making his conclusion universal, which in that figure must needs be particular, either affirmative or negative. And so this “argument invincible” falleth into one of these two straits; either concluding thus, the form will not serve him, or concluding, in another figure, the words of Chrysostome will not answer to his purpose, to prove that all the world was committed to Peter. Which proposition, as it is strange in Scripture, so neither is it the proposition of Chrysostome. And though it were, yet both without inconvenience might be granted of us, and being granted, serveth his purpose nothing, so long as the proposition is not exceptive, excluding other apostles. For the words of Chrysostome do not so sound, that the whole world was committed to Peter only, and to none other. Likewise then, as it may be well affirmed of us, that, the world was committed to Peter: so can it not be denied of them that the world was also committed to John, James, Bartholomew, Paul, Barnabas, and other all and singular apostles. For he that said to Peter, “Feed my sheep,” said also to all and singular his apostles, “Go into all the world and preach,” etc. (Matthew 28:19). Moreover, forasmuch as this man collecteth out of Chrysostome, that the whole world was committed to Peter, how shall we then join this meaning of Chrysostome with St. Paul, which saith that the gospel was committed to Peter over the circumcision, as was Paul over the uncircumcision? And here an answer to this doughty argument, both to the form and to the matter thereof: albeit concerning the matter, here lacketh much to be said more of Peter’s successors in the text of Chrysostome. By the which successors is not meant the bishop of Rome only (as the papists would bear us in hand), but all such true and faithful pastors, whom the Lord’s calling sendeth, and setteth over his flock, wheresoever, or whatsoever they be. For as Peter beareth a representation of the church, by the testimony of Augustine,<sup>f791</sup> so the successors of Peter be all faithful pastors and overseers of Christ’s church, to whom Christ our Lord hath committed the charge of his flock. Wherefore they are not a little deceived, who, looking upon the rock only of the person and not the rock of confession (contrary to the rule of Hilary,<sup>f792</sup>) do tie the apostleship or rock of Peter to one only bishop, and the succession of Peter to one only see of Rome; whereas this being a spiritual office and not carnal, hath no such carnal race or descent, after any worldly or local understanding; but hath a more mystical meaning, after a spiritual sense of succession, such as

Jerome speaketh of, “All,” saith he, speaking of bishops, “be successors of the apostles,” etc. <sup>f793</sup>

Of like force and fashion, and out of the same figure, the same author patcheth, moreover, another argument; proving that the bishop of Rome was titled the head of Christ’s church, in the primitive time of the old ancestors, before the age of Gregory. His argument proceedeth thus, in the third figure: St. Peter was called by the ancient fathers, head of Christ’s church: St. Peter was bishop of Rome: *ergo*, the bishop of Rome was called head of the church in the old ancient time.

This argument expository, being clouded up in the third figure, and concluding singularly, hath rather a show of an argument, than maketh any necessary conclusion; standing upon no mood in the said figure, if the author thereof were put to his trial. Albeit, to leave the form, and **to come to the matter of the argument.** <sup>a21</sup> First, how well will he dispatch himself of the major, and prove us that St. Peter, although he were at Rome, and taught at Rome, and suffered at Rome; yet that he was bishop and proper ordinary of that city and special see of Rome? As touching the allegation of Abdias, Orosius, Ado, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Optatus, Augustine, <sup>f794</sup> brought forth for his most advantage, to prove his major: thus I answer concerning Orosius, Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine, that whereas they speak of St. Peter’s chair, or planting the faith at Rome, straightway this man argueth thereupon, that Peter was bishop of Rome. But that doth not clerkly follow: for the office of the apostles was to plant the faith in all places, and in every region, yet were they not bishops in every region. And as for the chair, as it is no difference essential that maketh a bishop (forsomuch as a doctor may have a chair, and yet be no bishop), so cannot he conclude, by the chair of Peter, that St. Peter was bishop of Rome. For all this proveth no further but that Peter was at Rome, and there taught the faith of Christ, as Paul did also; and peradventure in a chair likewise; yet we say not that Paul was therefore bishop of Rome; but that he was there as an apostle of Christ, whether he taught there standing on his feet, or sitting in a chair. In the Scripture commonly the chair signifieth doctrine or judgment, as sitting also declareth such as teach or judge, whether they sit in the chair of Moses, or in the chair of pestilence. “Planting,” likewise, is a word apostolical, and signifieth not only the office of a bishop. Wherefore it is

no good consequent, he sat, he taught, he planted at Rome, his chair and seat was at Rome; *ergo*, he was bishop of Rome. — And thus much touching Orosius, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine.

As for Abdias, Ado, Optatus, and such others — although we should have much wrong offerred, and never should make an end, if we should be prest with the authority of every one that could or did move pen, in all the whole first age of the church, to be our judges in every ecclesiastical matter; and much more wrong should have, if the authors either corrupted or counterfeited should be laid unto us, speaking not in the same sense, or in the same tongue, or in the same time wherein they wrote; — yet, to help and to salve the authorities of these authors, so much as we may, I answer to their allegations with this distinction of a bishop, which is to be taken either generally, or specially. After the first, a bishop is he to whomsoever the public cure and charge of souls is committed, without any limitation of place. And so the name of bishop is coincident with the office of apostle, or any public pastor, doctor, or curate of the universal flock of Christ. And thus may Paul, Peter, or any other of the apostles be called bishops. So also is Christ himself by express word called *ἐπίσκοπος καὶ ποιμήν* that is, “bishop and pastor” (1 Peter 2:25); and thus may Peter well be named a bishop of these foresaid authors after this manner of taking. But this public and general charge universally over the whole, without limitation, ceased after Christ and the apostles. For then were bishops by places and provinces appointed, to have special oversight of some particular flock or province, and so to be resident and attendant only upon the same.

The other diversity of this name “bishop,” is to be taken after a more special sort; which is, when any person, orderly called, is assigned namely and specially to some one certain place, city, or province, whereunto he is only bound to employ his office and charge, and no where else; according to the old canons of the apostles, and of the council of Nice. <sup>F795</sup> And this bishop, differing from the other, is called “Episcopus intitulatus,” having his name of his city or diocese. And thus we deny that Peter the apostle was ever bishop elected, installed, or intituled to the city of Rome: neither doth Optatus, Abdias, Ado, or Jerome affirm the same. And if Ado say that Peter was bishop of Rome five and twenty years, until the last year of Nero, that is easily refuted both by the scriptures and histories: for so we

understand by the declaration of St. Paul (Galatians 2:1), that, fourteen years after his conversion, St. Paul had Peter by the hand at Jerusalem.

Moreover, the said Paul in the aforesaid epistle witnesseth that the charge apostolical was committed unto Peter over the circumcised, and so was he intituled. Also St. Paul writing to the Romans, in his manifold salutations to them in Rome, maketh no mention there of St. Peter, who doubtless should not have been unremembered, if he had been then in Rome. Again, St. Peter, dating his epistle from Babylon, was not then belike at Rome.

Furthermore, histories do record that Peter was at Pontus five years, then at Antioch seven years. How could he then be five and twenty years at Rome? Finally, whereas our adversary, alleging out of Ado, saith, that St. Peter was there five and twenty years, until the last year of Nero, how can that stand, when St. Paul, suffering under Nero, was put to death the same day twelve months, that is, a whole year after Peter? But especially how agreeth this with Scripture, that Christ should make Peter an apostle universal to walk in all the world? “*Ite per universum orbem.*” *Item*, “*Eritis mihi testes usque ad fines terrae.*” And our papists would needs make him a sitting bishop, and intitle him to Rome. How accord these, “*apostolus*” and “*episcopus*,” “*ire*” and “*sedere*,” “*omnes gentes*” and “*Roma*” together?

And thus have I resolved the first untruth of that popish demonstration before rehearsed, wherein they think to prove that as Peter, although he was not called “*universal apostle*,” yet was the head of the whole church: so the pope might have had, and hath had, after him, the charge of the whole church, although he was not called “*universal bishop*” in the old time.

Now followeth the second untruth <sup>f796</sup> to be touched in the same argument; which is, that because Peter was the head of the church, so therefore the pope must also be the head of the church, and was; albeit he was not called “*universal bishop*” for a long time. But this we do deny, yea, the matter denieth itself by their own position; for, being granted by them, that the title of “*universal bishop*” was not received at Rome, but refused to the time of Gregory, then must it necessarily be granted, that the bishops of Rome, before St. Gregory, had not the charge of the whole church, neither could be admitted by that reason to be heads of the church: forsomuch as

there can be no head, but that which is universal to the whole body, neither can any have charge of the whole, but he must needs be universal to all and singular parts of that, whereof he hath the charge. As in sciences, whosoever hath knowledge and cunning in all the seven liberal sciences, and all the parts thereof pertaining to liberal knowledge, is said to be a universal learned man: so, in office, to whomsoever the public charge of all churches doth appertain, how is he not to be called “bishop universal?” Now if before St. Gregory’s time the name of “universal bishop” was repealed in Rome, how then can the name be refused, and the definition of the name be admitted? Or else let our adversaries tell us how they define a universal bishop, seeing this word “bishop” is properly the name of office whereto is annexed charge. Wherefore, if a bishop be he which hath the charge of all souls in his diocese committed to him, and must render account for them all; then to him whose charge extendeth to all and singular churches, and must render account for every christian soul within the whole world, the name of an universal bishop cannot be denied, having the office of an universal bishop. Or, if he be not an universal bishop, he cannot then have the charge of the whole, that is, of all and singular churches of Christ. For such is the rule of true definition: “cui convenit definitio, eidem convenit definitum.” Et contra: “cui adimitur definitio, eidem et definitum adimitur.”

Although this word “universal” in the Greek writers signifieth that which we in our vulgar English tongue call “catholic,” yet I suppose our adversaries here will not take “universal” in that sense. For after that meaning, as we do not deny that the bishops of Rome may be universal bishops, so neither can they deny but other bishops may also be as universal, that is, as catholic as they. But such as more distinctly and school-like discuss this matter, define universal or catholic by three things; to wit, by time, place, and person; so that whatsoever extendeth itself to all times, all places, and all persons, that is properly universal or catholic. And contrariwise, what thing is to be called universal or catholic, reacheth to all those three aforesaid, comprehending all places, times, and persons, and extendeth itself of his own nature to the same; or else it is not to be called properly universal or catholic. And thus three things there are, which most commonly we call catholic or universal: that is, the church, which is called the catholic church: faith, which is called the catholic faith:

a man, whom also we call a man catholic: because these three of their own nature and disposition (no contrary obstacle letting) extend themselves so to all, that no time, place, nor person is excluded. Which three conditions, if they altogether concur in the charge of the bishop of Rome, then is it an universal charge, and he an universal bishop: if not, then neither is his charge universal, nor he the head of the church, nor yet universal bishop. For how these three can be separated, I cannot see, except the adversary-part do prove it more evidently than they have done.

And thus much to the objection of our adversaries; arguing thus, that as St. Peter being not called universal apostle, yet was the head of the universal church; so the pope, although he was not first called universal bishop, had, and might have the charge of the whole church, and was the universal head of the same. Which objection containing (as is said) a double untruth, our adversaries, yet notwithstanding, do busy themselves greatly to fortify by sundry testimonies and allegations, patched out of old and ancient doctors, but specially out of Theodoret, Irenaeus, Ambrose and Augustine, proving by them, that the see of Rome, having the pre-eminence and principality, hath been honored above all other churches; whereupon the said adversary, before minded, grounded this consequent.

Irenaeus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoret affirm, that the church of Rome is the chief of all other churches: <sup>f797</sup> — *ergo*, the bishop and head of that church is chief and head over all bishops, and head over all other churches.

But this consequent is to be denied, for that the excellency of the church or place doth not always argue the excellency of the minister or bishop, nor yet necessarily doth cause the same. For, in matters of the church which are spiritual, all pre-eminence standeth upon spiritual and inward gifts: “*spiritualia enim spiritualibus comparantur,*” as faith, piety, learning and godly knowledge, zeal and fervency in the Holy Ghost, unity of doctrine, etc.; which gifts many times may excel in a church, where the minister or bishop is inferior to bishops or ministers of other churches. As the most famous school in a realm hath not alway the most famous schoolmaster, neither doth make him thereby most excellent in learning above all others; so, if our adversaries do mean by this pre-eminence of the church of Rome such inward gifts of doctrine, faith, unity, and peace of religion, then, say

I, the excellency hereof doth not infer or argue the excellency of the bishop. And thus concerning the principality of the church of Rome, commended at that time of the doctors, it may be true, and so well expounded one way. And thus do I grant the antecedent of this argument, and deny the consequent. But here will our adversaries peradventure reply again, and say, that the principality of the church of Rome, which is commended by the doctors, is not meant here so much of inward gifts and endowments belonging to a christian church, as of outward authority and domination over other churches. Whereto is to be answered, first, What necessity is there, or where did our papists learn, to bring into the spiritual church of Christ this outward form of civil regiment and policy; that as the Roman emperors, in times past, governed over all the world, so the Roman bishop must have his monarchy upon the universal clergy, to make all other churches to stoop under his subjection? And where then be the words of our Savior, “Vos autem non sic?” If they hold <sup>1798</sup> their affirmative “quod sic,” where then is Christ’s negative “non sic?” If they say, there must needs be distinction of degrees in the church, and in this distinction of degrees superiority must necessarily be granted for the outward discipline of the church, for directing matters, for quieting of schisms, for setting orders, for commencing of convocations and councils, as need shall require, etc.; against this superiority we stand not, and therefore we yield to our superior powers, kings and princes, our due obedience, and to our lawful governors under God of both regiments, ecclesiastical and temporal. Also in the ecclesiastical state, we take not away the distinction of ordinary degrees, such as by the scripture be appointed or by the primitive church allowed, as patriarchs or archbishops, bishops, ministers, and deacons; for of these four we specially read as chief. In which four degrees, as we grant diversity of office, so we admit in the same also diversity of dignity; neither denying that which is due to each degree, neither yet maintaining the ambition of any singular person. For as we give to the minister place above the deacon, to the bishop above the minister, to the archbishop above the bishop: so we see no cause of inequality, why one minister should be above another minister; one bishop in his degree above another bishop to deal in his diocese; or one archbishop above another archbishop. And this is to keep an order duly and truly in the church, according to the true nature and definition of order by the authority of Augustine, where he thus defineth that which we call order: “Order,” saith he, “is a disposition

or arrangement of all things, according as they are matches or not matches, giving to every one respectively his own right and proper place.” <sup>F799</sup>

This definition of St. Augustine standing with the things before premised, now here joineth the question between us and the papists; whether the metropolitan church of Rome, with the archbishop of the same, ought to be preferred before other metropolitan churches and archbishops through universal christendom, or not? To the answer whereof, if the voice of order might here be heard, it would say, “Give to things that be matches and alike, like honor; to things unlike, unlike honor.” Wherefore, seeing the see of Rome is a patriarchal see appointed by the primitive church, and the bishop or archbishop thereof limited within his own bordering churches (which the council of Nice calleth “suburbicarias ecclesias,” <sup>f800</sup>) as other archbishops be; he ought therefore orderly to have the honor of an archbishop (ordering himself thereafter), and such outward preeminence as to other archbishops is due. More if he do require, he breaketh the rule of right order, he falleth into presumption, and doeth wrong unto his fellows: and they also do wrong unto themselves, whosoever they be, who, feeding his humor of ambition, give more unto him than the aforesaid rule of order doth require. For, so much as they yield to him more than is his right, so much they take from themselves which is due to them. And the same is the cause, why Gregory reprehendeth them, who gave to the archbishop of Constantinople that which now the bishop of Rome claimeth to himself, charging them with the breach of order in these words: “Lest that while any singular thing is given to one person, all other priests be deprived of their due honor.” <sup>F801</sup> And for the like cause, Pelagius his predecessor exhorteth that no priest do give to any one archbishop the name of “universal bishop,” “lest,” saith he, “in so doing, he take from himself his due honor, while he yieldeth to another that which is not his due.” <sup>F802</sup> And also in the same epistle, “for,” saith he, “if he be called the chief universal patriarch, then is the name of patriarch derogated from others,” etc. <sup>f803</sup> Wherefore, as is said, seeing the bishop of Rome is an archbishop, as others be, order giveth that he should have the dignity which to archbishops is due; whatsoever is added more, is derogation to the rest. And thus much concerning distinction of degrees, and order in giving to every degree his place and honor.

The second reason and answer to the objection before moved is this: That being granted to the papists, that the doctors aforesaid (speaking of the principality of the church of Rome) do mean not only of the inward virtues of that church, but also of the outward authority and jurisdiction of the same, above other churches: yet the cause wherefore they did attribute so much to that church, is to be considered; which was this, as before was alleged out of the council of Chalcedon, “for the rule and empery which that city of Rome had then above other cities;” <sup>f804</sup> which cause, being outward and carnal, was neither then cause sufficient, and, now ceasing, importeth not to us the like effect, according as they say, “Sublata causa tollitur effectus.” So that by the reason thereof, the aforesaid principality of the church of Rome did not hold them “jure divino, sed humano.” And as it holdeth by man’s law, so by man’s law it may be repealed again.

Wherefore, be it admitted that both the pope sitteth and succeedeth in the chair of Peter, and also that he is the bishop of the greatest city in the world; yet it followeth not thereby that he should have rule and lordship over all other bishops and churches of the world. For First, <sup>f805</sup> touching the succession of Peter, many things are to be considered: First, Whether Peter sat and had his chair in Rome, or not. Secondly, Whether he sat there as an apostle, or as a bishop. Thirdly, Whether the sitting in the outward seat of Peter maketh successors of Peter. Fourthly, Whether he sitteth in the chair and seat of Peter, which sitteth not in the doctrine of Peter. Fifthly, Whether the succession of Peter maketh not rather an apostle than a bishop, and so should we call the pope the “apostle” of Rome, and not the “bishop” of Rome. Sixthly, Whether ecclesiastical functions ought to be esteemed by ordinary succession of place, or by God’s secret calling and sending. Seventhly and lastly, Whether it stand by scripture, any one succession at all to be appointed in Christ’s church, or why more from Peter, than from other apostles.

All which interrogatories being well discussed (which would require a long process), it should well appear what little hold the pope hath to take this state upon him, above all other churches, as he doth. In the mean time, this one argument by the way may suffice, instead of many, for our adversaries to answer to at their convenient leisure. Which argument thus I form and frame in *Camestres*. <sup>F806</sup>

All the true successors of Peter sit in the chair of the doctrine of Peter, and other apostles uniformly:

No popes of this latter church of Rome sit in the chair of St. Peter and other apostles doctrine uniformly:

*Ergo*, No popes of this latter church of Rome be the true successors of Peter.

And when they have well perused the minor of this argument, and have well conferred together the doctrine taught them of St. Peter with the doctrine taught now by the popes, of justification of a christian man, of the office of the law, of the strength and largeness of sin, of men's merits, of free-will, of works of supererogation, of setting up images, of seven sacraments, of auricular confession, of satisfaction, of sacrifice of the mass, of communicating under one kind, of elevating and adoring the sacramental elements, of Latin service, of invocation, of prohibition of meats and marriage, of vowing chastity, of sects and rules of divers religions, of indulgences and pardons; also with their doctrine taught now of magistrates, of the fullness of power and regality of the see of Rome, with many others like to these; — then will I be glad to hear what they shall say to the premises.

Secondly, <sup>f807</sup> if they would prove by the allegation of the doctors, Irenaeus, Ambrose, Augustine, Theodoret aforesaid, the bishop of Rome to be the chief of all bishops therefore, because the city whereof he is bishop is the chief and principal above all other cities, that consequent is to be denied. For it followeth not (taking, as I said, the principality of that church to stand *διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν*, that is, upon the principal dominion of that city), no more than this consequent followeth:

London is the chief city in all England: ergo, the bishop of London is the chiefest of all bishops in this realm: which argument were derogatory to the archbishops both of Canterbury and York.

Yea, to grant yet more to our adversaries (which is all they can require) viz. that the aforesaid doctors, as Irenaeus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoret, in giving principality unto Rome, meant to have respect unto the virtue of succession from Peter, and not unto the greatness of the city:

yet notwithstanding, for all this, their argument holdeth not, if it be rightly considered; to say,

The apostolic see of Rome, having succession from Peter, with the bishops thereof, was chief then of all other churches in the primitive time of these doctors: *ergo*, the apostolical see of Rome, with the bishops thereof, having succession from Peter, ought now to be chief of all other churches in these our days.

This consequent might well follow, if the times were like, or if succession, which gave then the cause of principality, were the same now, as it was then. But now the time and succession is not correspondent, for then succession, in the time of these doctors, was as well in doctrine apostolical, as in place apostolical. Now, the succession of doctrine apostolical hath long ceased in the see apostolical: and nothing remaineth but only place, which is the least matter of true spiritual and apostolical succession. And thus much to the authority and testimony of these forenamed doctors.

Besides these objections heretofore recited out of Irenaeus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Theodoret; our adversaries yet object and heap up against us, moreover, examples of the primitive time of the church, testimonies of general councils, and opinions of ancient writers taken out of the book of councils and epistles decretal, whereby their intent is to prove the foresaid terms of “the head of the church,” “ruler of the church,” “chief of all other priests,” to be applied not only to Peter, but also to the bishop of Rome within the compass of the primitive time. And here cometh in the testimony cited of Vincentius of Lerins; of the epistle of Paschasius and his fellows, writing to Leo from the council of Chalcedon; the testimony also of Justinian the emperor in his Codex, where John, then pope, is called “caput omnium ecclesiarum.”<sup>F808</sup> The testimony also of Athanasius, with his fellow-bishops of Egypt, of Thebais, and Lybia, in their epistles to popes Marcus, Liberius, and Felix. Likewise the testimony of Jerome,<sup>f809</sup> of St. Ambrose,<sup>f810</sup> of St. Augustine to Boniface,<sup>f811</sup> of Theodoret, in his epistle to pope Leo,<sup>f812</sup> and of Chrysostome.<sup>F813</sup> By which testimonies our adversaries would prove St. Peter, and after him the bishop of Rome, to be called and taken for head of the church, chief bishop, prince and ruler of the whole clergy.<sup>F814</sup> To all which objections

fully and exactly to answer in order, would require a whole volume by itself. In the mean time, leaving the rest unto them unto whom it doth more properly appertain, briefly with this one short distinction I answer these and all other such-like places, where St. Peter with his successors is called head of the church, chief of bishops, prince of the apostles, etc. In which places, the words “head,” “chief,” and “prince of the apostles,” may be taken two manner of ways; to note either dominion or else commendation. For so we read sometimes “caput” and “princeps” to be words not of authority, but of excellency, whereby is declared the chiefest and worthiest part among many parts, and not possessor and governor of the whole. Like as, in the person of man, the head is the principal part of the whole body, being endued with reason, and furnished with most excellent senses, by the which the whole body of man is directed: so, thereof is derived by a metaphor, to what man or thing soever nature or condition hath given the greatest excellency of gifts and properties above other parts or members of the same society, that the same should be called “caput” or “princeps,” head or prince, of the said parties. And yet the same head or prince, so called, hath not always dominion or jurisdiction of the rest. So we call those, in our vulgar speech, the head or chief men of the parish, who, for their riches, wisdom, or place, are most specially noted; after like phrase of speech we call him the head man of the inquest, that hath first place: and yet neither they, nor these, have any dominion or jurisdiction upon the residue. In a school, the chiefest scholar in learning is not therefore the master or governor of his fellows. Neither hath Marcus Cicero any title thereby to claim subjection and service of all other orators, because he is named “princeps eloquentiae,” and goeth before them in that kind of phrase. The same Cicero <sup>f815</sup> calleth Cratippus, “principem hujus aetatis philosophorum:” as Homer may be also called “poetarum princeps:” and yet neither philosophers to Cratippus, nor poets to Homer, owe any thing else, but only fame and praise.

And what if St. Peter, the blessed apostle, be called and counted by the old ancient doctors “Coryphaeus apostolorum,” which is, head and prince of the apostles, for his excellent faith, for his divine confession, and singular affection to the Lord Jesus; yet what interest or charge either hath he to challenge over the apostles, or the pope after him over all other bishops and the whole church of Christ, although the pope have the like excellency

of Christ's faith which Peter had; as would God he had! As concerning these allegations therefore out of the doctors, two things are to be observed: first, that neither these names and titles, though they be given to Peter, do give him any state or dominion over other apostles; nor yet the succession of him doth further, any whit, this celsitude and regality of the pope to advance him above his fellow archbishops, as now he doth.

And (speaking of the writers and councils of the primitive age) if our adversaries would needs provoke us to the numbering of testimonies and dividing the house, for these aforesaid testimonies alleged on their side I could, on the contrary part, recite out of the witness of doctors, out of the examples of councils, and practices of emperors, no less than sixty voices, much more repugnant against their assertion, than there is for the pope. The tractation whereof for this present I do either refer to them that have more leisure at this time to discourse them, or else defer to another time, if the good pleasure of the Lord shall be to grant me further leisure in another book to treat thereof at large; in such order, as (if the Lord so grant) shall appear sufficient matter, to prove by the doctors, general councils, examples and histories of time, that the bishops of Rome, during the first five hundred years after Christ, although for the greatness of the empire they were somewhat more magnified than the others, and therefore were sought of many, and were flattered of some, and they themselves divers times did set forth themselves more than they should, yet, by the common consent of churches, were stopped of their purpose, so that by the consent of the most part, within the compass of that age, the bishops of Rome had not this regal state of title, jurisdiction, and fullness of power, which now they usurp, but were taken as archbishops of equal honor, of equal merit, with other archbishops and rulers of the church. And if any preferment was given unto them something above the rest, yet neither was it so given of all, nor of the most part: secondly neither was it so given of them for any such necessity of God's word, "aut jure aliquo divino," as which did so bind them thereunto; nor yet so much for the respect of Peter, and his succession, as for certain other causes and respects, as may be gathered to the number of thirteen. <sup>F816</sup>

1. Of which, the first is the greatness of the city and monarchy of Rome.

**2.** The second is the authority of the emperor Constantine the Great, the first of the emperors converted to the faith, and ruling in the same city; by whom the universal liberty of the church was first promoted; and by whom the causes of bishops, who might be at variance, were sometimes (as a matter of indulgence) committed to the bishop of Rome, and to other bishops near at hand, to be decided; as appeareth in Eusebius. <sup>F817</sup>

**3.** The third was the council of Nice, which confirmed the preeminence of that church to have the oversight of the churches bordering about it. <sup>F818</sup>

**4.** The fourth cause of advancing the church of Rome, was the unquiet state of the eastern church, much troubled in those days with sects, factions, and dissensions, whereof we may read in Socrates and Sozomen. <sup>F819</sup>

**5.** The bishops of Rome being wont to be summoned, like other metropolitans, to attend synods, then, if it chanced them to be absent, and their sentence nevertheless to be required, by the occasion thereof they began at length to take it for a canon or rule ecclesiastical that their sentence *must* be required, and thereupon to disallow those acts of synods, whereto their sentence was not required.

**6.** Another cause was, that when any matter affecting the common interests of the church was in hand at any particular place, whatsoever was done, commonly the manner was to write to the Roman bishop for his approbation in the same, for public unity and consent to be had in Christ's church, as appeareth by Ambrose. <sup>F820</sup>

**7. *Item,*** for that the testimonial sometimes of the Roman bishop was wont in those days also to be desired for admitting teachers and bishops in other churches, whereof we have example in Socrates. <sup>F821</sup>

**8.** Moreover, this was a great setting-up of that church, when their sentence not only was required, but also received divers times of other bishops. <sup>F822</sup> And when bishops of other provinces were at any dissension among themselves, they of their own accord appealed to the bishop of Rome, desiring him to cite up both parties, and to have the

hearing and deciding of the cause, as did Macarius and Hesychius send to Julius then bishop of Rome. <sup>F823</sup>

**9. *Item*,** in that certain of the Arians, returning from their Arianism, offered up and exhibited unto the bishops of Rome their recantations, and were thereupon of them received again, as Ursacius and Valens did to Julius. <sup>F824</sup>

**10.** The tenth cause was also, for that Gratian the emperor made a law, that all men should retain that religion which Damasus bishop of Rome, and Peter bishop of Alexandria did hold. <sup>F825</sup>

**11.** And also, if the bishop of Rome happened to disallow the appointment of any minister or ministers, the popes, perceiving how diligent and ready such were to seek their favor, and to send up their messengers to Rome for their purification, took thereby no little means of exaltation. <sup>F826</sup>

**12.** Besides these aforesaid, the bishops of Rome had also another artificial practice, that in sending out their letters abroad, as they did so many, in all their epistles (if the epistles be theirs, and not forged) <sup>f827</sup> ever they were harping of the greatness of their name, and of their apostolic see, and of the primacy of St. Peter, their predecessor and prince of all the apostles, etc. And this they used in every letter whensoever they wrote to any, as appeareth in all their letters decretal, namely, in the letters of Melchiades, Marcellus, and Marcus, etc.

**13.** Again, if any of the eastern church directed any writing to them, wherein any signification was contained of ever so little reverence given unto them (as learned men commonly use for modesty's sake), that was taken by and by and construed for plain subjection and due obedience, as declareth the letter of Damasus, written to the bishops of the eastern church beginning thus: "Quod debitam reverentiam," etc. In English thus: "Whereas your charity yieldeth due reverence to the apostolical see, you in so doing, dear children, do much for yourselves," etc. <sup>f828</sup> Whereas the bishops of the eastern church, notwithstanding, had shewed little or no reverence in their epistle to pope Damasus before.

Thus have ye the first and original grounds, by the means whereof, the archbishops of the Romish see have achieved this their great kingdom and celsitude over Christ's church, first beginning the mystery of their iniquity by that which was modestly and voluntarily given them; afterward, by use and custom, claiming it ambitiously unto them of duty and service; and lastly, holding fast (as we see) that which once they had gotten into their possession, so that now in no case they can abide the birds to call home their feathers again, which they so long have usurped.

And thus much concerning the life, jurisdiction, and title of the Roman bishops: in all which (as is declared) they, and not we, have fallen from the church of Rome. To these I might also join the manner of government, wherein the said Romish bishops have no less altered, both from the rule of scripture, and from the steps of the true church of Rome; which government as it hath been, and ought to be, only spiritual, so hath the bishop of Rome used it of late years no otherwise than an earthly king or prince governeth his realm and dominions — with riches, glory, power, terror, outward strength, force, prison, death, execution, laws, policies, promoting his friends to dignities, revenging his affections, punishing and correcting faults against his person more than other offenses against God committed, using and abusing in all these things the word of God for his pretext and cloak to work his worldly purpose withal: whereas indeed, the word of God ministereth no such power to spiritual persons, but such as is spiritual: according to the saying of the apostle, “The armor and artillery,” saith St. Paul, “of our warfare, are not carnal, but spiritual: such as serve not against flesh and blood, nor against the weak person of man; but against Satan, against the gates of hell, and the profundities of the wicked power.” <sup>F829</sup> Which armor as it is all spiritual, so ought they which have the dealing thereof to be likewise spiritual, well furnished with all such gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost, as are meet for the governance of his spiritual church: as, with wisdom and knowledge in the scripture to instruct the ignorant; with inward intelligence and foresight of the crafty cogitations and operations of Satan, and with power of the Spirit to resist the same; with practice and experience of temptations, to comfort such as be afflicted and oppressed of Satan; with heavenly discretion to discern spirits, and truth from untruth; with judgment and knowledge of tongues, and learning to convict error; with zeal of God's glory; with fervency of

prayer; with patience in persecution; with a mind contented with all cases and states incident; with tears and compassion on other men's griefs; with stoutness and courage against proud and stout oppressors; with humility toward the poor and miserable; with the counsel of the Lord Jesus by his word and Spirit to direct him in all things to be done; with strength against sin; with hatred of this world; with gift of faith; power of the keys in spiritual causes — as to minister the word, the sacraments, and excommunication when the word biddeth, that the spirit may be saved, and to reconcile again as case requireth, etc. These and such like are the matters wherein consist the sinews and strength of the church, and for true governance of the same. But, contrary to these aforesaid, both the bishop and clergy of this latter church of Rome proceed in their administration and governance as those who, under the name and pretense of Christ and his word, have exercised of long time nothing else but a worldly dominion, seeking indeed their own glory, not the glory of Christ; riches of the world, not the lucre of souls; not feeding of the flock, but filling the purse; revenging their own wrongs, but neglecting God's glory; striving against man only, and killing him, but not killing the vice, nor confuting the error of man; strong against flesh and blood, but weak against the devil; stout against the simple, but meek against the mighty: briefly, doing almost all things preposterously, more like to secular princes, than spiritual pastors of Christ's flock, with outward enforcement, and fear of punishment, with prisoning, famishing, hanging, racking, drowning, heading, slaying, murdering and burning, and warring also: on the other side, with their riches and treasures; with their guard and guardiance; with strength of men; with court and cardinals; <sup>f830</sup> with pomp and pride about them; with their triple crown; with the naked sword; with their ordinary succession; with their laws and executions; their promotions and preferments; their biddings and commandings; threatenings and revengings, etc.

In fine, to compare therefore the image of a worldly kingdom, with this kingdom of the pope, there is no difference, save only that this kingdom of the pope, under hypocrisy, maketh a face of the spiritual sword, which is the word of God; but, in very deed, doeth all things with the temporal sword; that is, with outward forcement and coaction, differing nothing from civil and secular regiment in all properties and conditions, if it be well considered. For, as in an earthly kingdom, first there is a prince or some

chief magistrate appointed, having dominion over his nobles and commons, containing all his subjects under his statutes and laws (with the which laws notwithstanding he dispenseth at his pleasure), under whom all other inferior magistrates have their order and place to them appointed to rule over the subjects, and yet to be subject under him: so, if the state and form of the pope be well considered, we shall see it altereth nothing from the same, but only in the names of the persons. In civil government, all subjection is referred to one head ruler, whose authority surmounteth all the rest, and keepeth them under obedience: in like manner the government of the popish church is committed to one man, who, as chief steward, overseer, and ruler of Christ's household in his absence, hath supreme power over all churches, to moderate and direct all the affairs thereof. But here standeth the difference; in civil policy he is called a king or prince; here he is called a pope.

The king hath next unto him his dukes and earls; the pope's nobility standeth in his cardinals and legates, who, though they be no dukes in name, yet in pomp and pride, will not only give check to them, but also mate to kings themselves, if they might be suffered, as did Theodore, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Thomas Becket; and so would Thomas Wolsey have done, had not the king given him a check to his mate betime. In civil policy, next to dukes and earls, followeth the order of lords, barons, knights, esquires, gentlemen, with mayors, sheriffs, constables, bailiffs, wardens, etc. The like race is to be seen also, although under other names, in the pope's policy: of primates, bishops, suffragans, provosts, deans, canons, vicars, archdeacons, priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectors, door-keepers, singsters, with other clerks. And as, in the other, under wardens cometh the order of scavengers, so neither doth the pope's monarchy lack his channel-rakers, to whom may well be compared the rabblement of abbots, provincials, priors, monks, friars, with their convents, and nunneries.

Moreover, from justices, judges, lawyers, sergeants, attorneys, which be necessary officers in the commonwealth, what differ the pope's inquisitors, canonists, doctors, and bachelors of the pope's law, commissaries, officials, proctors, promoters, with such others, which serve no less in the spiritual court and in the consistory, than the other aforesaid do in the temporal court or in the Guildhall? Now, whoso listeth to

compare the glory and magnificence of the one, with the glory of the other; also the power and strength of the one regiment, with the power of the other, and so the riches of the one, with the riches of the other, I suppose he shall see no great odds between them both, taking the pope's kingdom, as it hath stood in his full ruff, and yet doth stand where churches are not reformed. As for subtlety and politic practice, there is no man, that is indifferent, that doubteth, or that hath his eyes, that seeth not, that the pope's hierarchy in holding up their state, far excelleth all the empires and kingdoms of worldly princes, of whom all others may take example to learn.

Thus, in comparing the pope's regiment with civil governance, as they do little or nothing disagree, so, in comparing again the same with the order of Scriptures, or with the regiment that was in the old ancient church of Rome, we shall see no resemblance between them. As we read in the apostles' time, all the armor of Christ's ministers was spiritual, and full of godly power against the spiritual enemies of our salvation, governing the church then with peace, patience, humility, true knowledge of God, the sword of the spirit, the shield of faith, the breast-plate of righteousness, hearty charity, sincere faith, and a good conscience: (2 Corinthians 10:4; Ephesians 6:14; 1 Timothy 1:19) so, after the apostles, in the time of Ambrose, by his own testimony it is to be understood, that the armor of churchmen was then "preces et lachrymae," prayers and tears; whereas now the armor of the pope's priesthood is nothing else but "ignis et ferrum," fire and sword, wherewith they keep all things under their subjection. And here cometh in the enormous and horrible abuse of excommunication, suspension, and interdiction, in cases frivolous or worldly; and for such things as for which the civil magistrate will not commit any citizens to the stocks, the pope's censure will not stick to commit a christian to the devil: not to speak of their other usurped dealings and doings in matters that belong to the civil sword, and which be to them impertinent; as, in punishing whoredom and adultery; in administration and probates of testaments; in bearing civil office, as, popes to be senators of Rome, and emperors also *sede vacante*; cardinals to be captains in war, and rulers of regions; bishops to be presidents or chancellors; priests to be stewards in great men's houses, or masters of mints, or clerks of the market, or gardeners to gentlemen, etc.: all which here I overpass, referring

them to the deeper consideration of such as have more leisure to mark the order of their doings, and so to judge of the same with indifferency, according to the rule of truth taught in God's word, and public examples of the ancient church of Christ in the primitive time.

Thus, having discoursed sufficiently so much as concerneth the manner of life, title, jurisdiction, and government of the pope's see (in all which points it is to be seen how this latter church of Rome hath receded from the true ancient church of Rome), it now remaineth, according to my promise, and order prefixed, consequently to proceed to the fourth and last point, which is of Doctrine: wherein consisteth the chiefest matter that maketh with us, and against them; in such sort as (their doctrine standing as it doth) neither are they to be reputed for true catholics, being altered so far from them; nor we otherwise than heretics, if we should now join with these. For the more trial whereof, let us examine the doctrine and rites of the said church of Rome, now used, and compare the same with the teaching of the ancient catholics; to the intent that such simple souls as have been hitherto, and yet are, seduced by the false vizard and image of this pretended and bastardly church, perceiving what lieth within it, may be warned betime, either to eschew the peril, if they list to be instructed, or, if not, to blame none but themselves for their own wilful destruction. And albeit I could here charge this new-fangled church of the pope with seven or eight heinous crimes, as blasphemy, idolatry, heresy, superstition, absurdity, vanity, cruelty and contrariety (in which it neither agreeth with the old learning of their fore-elders, nor yet with themselves in sundry points), yet, after a more temperate sort to pass this matter with them, these two things I will and dare boldly affirm, that in this doctrine of the pope now taught in the church of Rome, there is neither any consolation of conscience, nor salvation of man's soul. For, seeing there is no life, nor soul's health, but only in Christ, nor any promise of salvation or comfort made, but only by faith in the Son of God; what assurance can there be of perfect peace, life, or salvation, where that which only maketh all, is least made of, and other things which make least, are most esteemed? For, to say the simple truth, what else is the whole course and body of the pope's law now set forth, but a doctrine of laws, a heap of ceremonies, a teaching of traditions, a meditation of merits, a foundation of new religions? all which confer not one jot to the justification of our souls

before the terrible judgment of God. And therefore, as it may be truly said that this doctrine of the pope is void of all true comfort and salvation, so likewise it seemeth that these, who addict themselves so devoutly to the pope's learning, were never earnestly afflicted in conscience, never humbled in spirit, nor broken in heart, never entered into any serious feeling of God's judgment, nor ever felt the strength of the law and of death. For if they had, they should soon have seen their own weakness, and have been driven to Christ; then should they have seen what a horrible thing it is, to appear before God the Father, or once to think on him (as Luther saith) without Christ. And, on the contrary side, then should they know what a glory, what a kingdom, what liberty and life it were, to be in Christ Jesus by faith, holding their inheritance, not with the bond son of Hagar, but with the free son of Sarah; by promise, and not by the law; by grace, and not by works; by gift, and not by deserving: that God only might be praised, and not man.

And thus were the old Romans first taught by St. Paul writing to the Romans. The same did Cornelius the Roman, who was the first that was baptized of all the Gentiles, learn of St. Peter when he received the Holy Ghost, not by the deeds of the law, but only by hearing the faith of Jesus preached: and in the same doctrine the said church of the Romans many years continued, so long as they were in affliction. And in the same doctrine the bishop of Rome, with his Romans, now also should still remain, if they were such ancient catholics as they pretend, and would follow the old mother church of Rome, and hold the first liquor wherewith they were first seasoned. But the sweet verdour and scent of that liquor and pleasant must<sup>f831</sup> is now clean put out through other unsavoury infusions of the pope's thrusting in; so that almost no taste nor piece remaineth of all that primitive doctrine, which St. Paul and other apostles first planted among the Gentiles. And what marvel if the Romans now, in so long tract of time, have lost their first sap, seeing the church of the Galatians then, in the very time of St. Paul their schoolmaster, he being amongst them, had not so soon turned his back a little; but they were all turned almost from the doctrine of faith, and had much ado to be recovered again.

Of this defection and falling from faith, St. Paul expressly foretelleth us in his letters both to the Thessalonians, and also to Timothy, where he

showeth, that a defection shall come, and that certain shall depart from the faith, attending to spirits of error (1 Timothy 4:1). And to know what errors these shall be, the circumstance plainly leadeth us to understand in the same place; where the said apostle speaketh of marked consciences, forbidding men to marry, and to eat meats, ordained of God to be taken with thanksgiving, for man's sustenance; most evidently, as with his finger, pointing out unto us the church of Rome, which, not in these points only, but also in all other conditions almost, is utterly revolted from the pure original sincerity of that doctrine, which St. Paul planted in the church of the Romans, and of all other Gentiles.

### **THE SUM OF ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE DELIVERED TO THE GENTILES.**

- First**, the doctrine of St. Paul ascribeth all our justification freely and merely to faith only in Christ, as to the only means and cause immediate, whereby the merits of Christ's passion be applied unto us, without any other respect of work or works of the law whatsoever; and in this doctrine, the church of the Romans was first planted.
- 2.** Secondly, the same doctrine of St. Paul, cutting off, and excluding all glory of man's deserving, stayeth only upon God's promise and upon grace, not man's merits; upon mercy, not man's laboring or running; upon election and calling, not man's willing, etc.
- 3.** Thirdly, the same doctrine, casting down the strength of man and his *integra naturalia* (as the schools do term them), concludeth all flesh under sin, and maketh the same destitute of the glory of God.
- 4. Item**, it maketh manifest difference between the law and the gospel, declaring the use and end of them to be diverse: the one to kill, the other to quicken; the one to condemn, the other to justify; the one to have an end and a time, the other to be perpetual, etc.
- 5. Item**, the same doctrine of St. Paul, as it showeth a difference between the law and the gospel; so it maketh no less difference between "justitia Dei," and "justitia propria;" that is, the righteousness of God and the righteousness of man, abhorring the one, that is, man's own righteousness, coming by the law and works; and embracing the

other, which God imputeth freely and graciously to us for Christ his Son's sake, in whom we believe.

**6. *Item*,** it wipeth away all traditions, and constitutions of men whatsoever, especially from binding of conscience; calling them beggarly elements of this world.

**7.** Likewise it rejecteth and wipeth away all curious subtleties and superfluous speculations, and knoweth nothing else but Christ only crucified, which is the only object whereunto our faith looketh.

**8.** Furthermore, as the same doctrine of St. Paul defineth all men to be transgressors by disobedience of one Adam, though they never touched the apple, they coming of his stock by nature; so doth it prove all men to be justified by the obedience of one, though they did not his obedience, they being likewise born of him by spiritual regeneration and faith.

**9.** And therefore, as all men, coming of Adam, are condemned originally, before they grow up to commit any sin against the law; so all men regenerated by faith in Christ, are saved originally, before they begin to do any good work of charity, or any other good deed.

**10. *Item*,** the doctrine of St. Paul, perpending the high glory of a christian man's state in Christ Jesus by faith, first setteth him in a perfect peace with Almighty God (Romans 5:1): secondly, exempteth him from all condemnation (Romans 8:1); thirdly, it matcheth him with angels: it equalleth him with saints and fellow-citizens of heaven; it numbereth him with the household of God; and co-inheriteth him with Jesus Christ himself (Ephesians 2:19): fourthly, it adopteth him from the state of a servant, to the state of a son of God, crying "Abba," Father (Galatians 4:6): fifthly, it openeth to him a bold access and entrance to the high majesty and throne of grace (Ephesians 2:20; Hebrews 4:16): sixthly, it subjecteth all things under him as ministers (yea, the apostles themselves in their highest office), death, life, things present, things to come, with the whole world besides; and assigneth him no spiritual head, but only Christ, saying, "And you are Christ's, and Christ is God's" (1 Corinthians 3:23): seventhly, it advanceth and setteth him in a spiritual liberty or freedom, above all terrors of spirit,

rising either of God's law or man's law, above all dreadful fears of sin, damnation, malediction, rejection, death, hell, or purgatory; above all servile bondage of ceremonies, men's precepts, traditions, superstitious vices, yokes, customs, or what else soever oppreseth and entangleth the spiritual freedom of a conscience, which Christ hath set at liberty; and requireth, moreover, that we walk and stand stout in that liberty whereto we are brought with the free son of Sarah, and not suffer ourselves any more to be clogged with any such servile bondage — that is to say, although we must be content to subject our bodies to all service, and to all men, yet must we not yield our spiritual consciences and souls as slaves and servants, to be subject to the fear or bondage of any terrene thing in this world (Galatians 4:3; Colossians 2:20), forsomuch as we are in that part made lords and princes over all things, whatsoever can harm, or bind, or terrify us.

**11. *Item*,** the right vein of St. Paul's doctrine putteth no difference nor observation in days and times (Galatians 4:10; Colossians 2:8).

**12. *Item*,** it leaveth all meats to be indifferent, with thanksgiving, to serve the necessity of the body, and not the body to serve them (Colossians 2:21; 1 Timothy 4:3).

**13. *Item*,** it permitteth marriage without restraint or exception, lawful and also expedient for all men, having need thereof (1 Corinthians 7:2).

**14 *Item*,** it admitteth no sacrifice for sin but the sacrifice of Christ alone, and that done, once for all, with blood. For without blood there is no remission of sin, which is applied to us by faith only, and by nothing else (Hebrews 9:22).

**15. *Item*,** as touching the holy communion, by the letters of St. Paul to the Corinthians (1 Corinthians 10:16, 17, 21; 11:20, etc.), we understand, that the use then amongst them was, to have the participation of the bread called the Lord's body, and of the cup called the Lord's blood, administered not at an altar, but at a plain board or table, the congregation there meeting together after the time of their supper; where, not the minister alone did receive, while the others looked on, but the whole congregation together did communicate with reverence and thanksgiving; nor lifting over the priest's head, nor

worshipping, nor kneeling, nor knocking their breasts; but either sitting at the supper, or standing after the supper. According to which form the Muscovites yet, to this day, following the old rite of their country (although being drowned otherwise in much superstition), use to receive it after they be risen from their dinner, standing. Experience whereof was seen here at London the first day of October, 1569.

**16. *Item*,** the said apostle, besides the sacramental supper, maketh mention of baptism, or washing of regeneration, although he himself baptized but few (1 Corinthians 1:16). Of the other sacraments, he maketh no mention.

**17. *Item*,** by the same doctrine of St. Paul, no tongue is to be used in the congregation, which is not known, and doth not edify (1 Corinthians 14:26).

**18. *Item*,** the rule of St. Paul's doctrine subjecteth every creature under the obedience of kings and princes and ordinary magistrates, ordained of God to have the sword and authority of public regiment, to order and dispose in all things, not contrary to God, whatsoever pertaineth to the maintenance of the good, or to the correction of the evil; from whose jurisdiction there is no exemption of vocations or persons, whether they be ecclesiastical or political. And therefore to this office it appertaineth to preserve peace, to set things in lawful order, to conserve christian discipline in the church of Christ, to remove offenses, to bridle the disobedient, to provide and procure wholesome and faithful teachers over the people, to maintain learning and set up schools, to have oversight, not only of the people, but also of all ecclesiastical ministers, to see every one to do his duty, and to remove or punish such as be negligent; also to call councils and synods, and to provide that the church goods be faithfully dispensed by the hands of true dealers; to the sustentation of the church, of true teachers, and to the public necessity of the poor, etc.

**19.** Furthermore, by St. Paul's doctrine, the ministers and superintendents of Christ's church have their authority and armor likewise to them limited; which armor is only spiritual and not carnal, whereby they fight not against flesh and blood, but against the power of darkness, error, and sin; against the spiritual seduction and craftiness

in heavenly things, against the works and proceedings of Satan, the prince of this world, in comforting weak consciences against the terrors of the devil and desperation; and, finally, against every cogitation lifted up against Christ, to subdue every celsitude to the subjection and power of Christ Jesus the Son of God.

### **ANOTHER BRIEF RECAPITULATION OF ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE, REDUCED TO FIVE POINTS.**

Briefly to reduce the whole doctrine of St. Paul into a compendious sum, it consisteth chiefly in these five points: —

1. First, in setting forth the grace, great love, and good will, and free promises of God the Father in Christ Jesus his Son, to mankind, “which so loved the world, that he hath given his own Son for the redemption thereof:” (John 3:16) “Which gave his Son to die for us being his enemies:” (Romans 5:10) “Which hath quickened us, being dead in sin:” (Ephesians 2:1) “Which so mercifully hath reconciled the world to himself by his Son, and also by his ambassadors desireth us to be reconciled unto him:” (2 Corinthians 5:20) “Who hath given his own Son to be sin for us:” (2 Corinthians 5:21) “To be accursed for us:” (Galatians 3:13) “Which, by firm promise, hath assured us of our inheritance:” (Romans 4:16) “Which, not by the works of righteousness that we have done, but of his own mercy, hath saved us by the washing of regeneration.” (Titus 3:5)
2. The second point consisteth in preaching and expressing the glorious and triumphant majesty of Christ Jesus the Son of God, and the excellency of his glory; “Who, being once dead in the infirmity of flesh, rose again with power, and ascending up with majesty, hath led away captivity captive:” (Ephesians 4:8) “Sitteth and reigneth in glory on the right hand of God in heavenly things above all principates and potestates, powers and dominations, and above every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the world to come:” (Ephesians 1:20) “At whose name every knee is to bend both in heaven and in earth, and under the earth, and every tongue to confess our Lord Christ Jesus to the glory of God the Father:” (Philippians 2:11) “In whom and by whom all things are made both in heaven and

earth, things visible and invisible, whether they be thrones or dominations, or principates or potestates, all are by him and for him created, and he is before all, and all things consist in him who is the head of his body the church, the beginning and first born from the dead, in whom dwelleth all fulness:" (Colossians 1:16-19) "To whom the Father hath given all judgment, and judgeth no man himself any more:" (John 5:22) "To whom the Father hath given all things to his hands:" (John 13:3) "To whom the Father hath given power of all flesh:" (John 17:2) "To whom all power is given in heaven and earth:" (Matthew 28:18) "In whom all the promises of God are Yea and Amen." (2 Corinthians 1:20)

**3.** Thirdly, he declareth the virtue of his cross and passion, and what exceeding benefits proceed to us by the same. "By whose blood we have redemption and remission of our sins:" (Ephesians 1:7) "By whose stripes we are made whole:" (Isaiah 53:5) "By whose cross all things are pacified, both in heaven and in earth:" (Colossians 1:20) "By whose death we are reconciled:" (Romans 5:10) "Who hath destroyed death, and brought life to light:" (2 Timothy 1:10) "Who by death hath destroyed him which had the power of death, that is, the devil; and hath delivered them which lived under fear of death all their life in bondage:" (Hebrews 2:14) "By whose obedience we are made just; by whose righteousness we are justified to life:" (Romans 5:9) "By whose curse we are blessed, and delivered from the malediction of the law:" (Galatians 3:13) "By whose blood we that once were far off, are made near unto God:" (Ephesians 2:13) "Who in one body hath reconciled both Jews and Gentiles unto God:" 27 (Ephesians 2:16) "Who, by his flesh, hath taken away the division and separation between God and us, abolishing the law which was set against us in precepts and decrees:" (Ephesians 2:14, 15) "Who is our peace, our advocate, and propitiation for the sins of the whole world:" (1 John 2:12) "Who was made accursed, and sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him:" (2 Corinthians 5:21) "Who is made of God for us, our wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption:" (1 Corinthians 1:30) "By whom we have boldness, and entrance with all confidence through faith in him:" (Ephesians 3:12) "Who forgiveth all our sins, and hath torn in pieces the obligation or hand-writing, which

was against us in the law of commandments; and hath crucified it upon the cross, and utterly hath dispatched and abolished the same; and hath spoiled principates and potestates, as in an open show of conquest, triumphing over them openly in himself.” (Colossians 2:13-15) “Who justifieth the wicked, by faith:” (Romans 4:5) “In whom we are made full and complete,” (Colossians 2:10) etc.

**4.** The fourth branch is, to teach us and inform us, to whom these benefits of Christ’s passion and victory do appertain, by what means the same is applied and redoundeth unto us; which means is only one, that is, only faith in Christ Jesus, and no other thing; which faith it pleaseth almighty God to accept for righteousness. And this righteousness it is, which only standeth before God, and none other, as we are plainly taught by the scriptures, and especially by the doctrine of St. Paul. Which righteousness, thus rising of faith in Christ, St. Paul calleth the righteousness of God, where he, writing of himself, utterly refuseth the other righteousness which is of the law, and “desireth to be found in him, not having his own righteousness, which is of the law, but the righteousness of Christ, which is of faith.” (Philippians 3:9) Again, the said apostle, writing of the Jews, which sought for righteousness and found it not; and also of the Gentiles, which sought not for it, and yet found it, showeth the reason why: “Because,” saith he, “the one sought it as by works and the law, and came not to it; who, knowing the righteousness of God, and seeking to set up their own righteousness, did not submit themselves to the righteousness which is of God. The other, which were the Gentiles, and sought not for it, obtained righteousness, that righteousness which is faith.” (Romans 9:30, 32) Also, in another place of the same epistle, St. Paul, writing of this righteousness which cometh of faith, calleth it the righteousness of God, in these words: “Whom God,” saith he, “hath set up for a propitiation by faith in his blood, whereby to make manifest the righteousness which is of himself, in tolerating our sins,” (Romans 3:25) etc. By the which righteousness it is evident that St. Paul meaneth the righteousness of faith, which Almighty God now revealeth and maketh manifest by preaching of the gospel. Wilt thou see yet more plainly this righteousness of God, how it is taken in St. Paul for the righteousness of faith, and therefore is called the

righteousness of God, because it is imputed only of God to faith, and not deserved of man? — In the same epistle to the Romans, and in the third chapter aforesaid, his words be manifest: “The righteousness of God,” saith he, “is by faith of Jesus Christ, in all, and upon all that do believe,” etc.

Wherefore, whosoever studieth to be accepted with God, and to be found righteous in his sight, let him learn diligently, by the doctrine of St. Paul, to make a difference and a separation, as far as from heaven to earth, between these two, that is, between the righteousness of works, and the righteousness of faith; and in any wise beware he bring no other means for his justification or remission of his sins, but only faith, apprehending the body or person of Christ Jesus crucified. For, as there is no way into the house but by the door, so is there no coming to God but by Christ alone, which is by faith. (Romans 9:32) And as the mortal body, without bodily sustenance of bread and drink, cannot but perish; so the spiritual soul of man hath no other refreshing but only by faith in the body and blood of Christ, whereby to be saved. With this faith the idolatrous Gentiles apprehended Jesus Christ, and received thereby righteousness. Cornelius, the first baptized Roman, so soon as he heard Peter preach Christ, received straightway the holy Ghost. (Acts 10:45) Peter himself confessed, and, for his confession, had the keys of heaven. (Matthew 16:19) Zaccheus received the person of Christ into his house, and, withal, received salvation both to him and his whole household. (Luke 19:9) What a sinner was Mary, who had no less in her than seven devils; and yet, because she set her heart and affection upon that person, many sins were forgiven her. (Luke 7:47) The right-hand thief, how far was he from all works of the law; and yet by faith entered he justified into paradise the same day with Christ. (Luke 23:43) In like manner, although the poor publican came to the church with less holiness, after the law, yet went he home to his house more justified than the Pharisee with all his works, and all by reason of faith. (Luke 18:14) The parable of the prodigal son who was lost, yet revived again; also of the lost goat, and of the lost sheep which went astray and was found again: what do these

declare, but that which is lost by the law is to be recovered by faith and grace? And how oft do we read in the gospels, “Thy faith hath saved thee,” (Luke 18:42) etc. “Jesus seeing their belief,” (Matthew 9:2) etc. “He that believeth in me, I will raise him up in the last day,” (John 6:40) etc. “Believe also in me,” (John 14:1) etc. “He that believeth in me hath everlasting life,” (John 6:47) etc. “Without me ye can do nothing,” (John 15:5) etc. “He that is in me,” (John 6:56) etc. “He that loveth me,” (John 14:21) etc. “He that heareth me,” (John 5:24) etc. “He that abideth in me,” (John 15:5) etc. “He that receiveth me,” (Matthew 10:40) etc. “Unless ye eat my flesh, and drink my blood,” (John 6:54) etc. “That they may receive remission of sins, by their faith in me,” (Acts 26:18) etc. “To him all the prophets give witness, to have remission of sins, whosoever believeth in his name,” (Acts 10:43) etc. “He that believeth and is baptized,” (Mark 16:16) “He that believeth in me, shall do the works that I do, and greater than these,” (John 16:12) etc.

And likewise in the writings of St. Paul, how often do we hear the name of Christ almost in every third or fourth line, where he still repeateth: “In Christo Jesu,” “per Christum Jesum,” “per Jesum Christum dominum nostrum,” etc. “Qui credunt in ipso,” etc. “Omnes qui credunt in eo,” etc.

“Credentes in illo, in eum,” “credentes illi,” “in nomen ejus, in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi,” etc. “Believe,” saith St. Paul to the jailor, “in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved and thy whole house,” (Acts 16:31) etc.

Thus, then, thou seest, as the passion of Christ is only the efficient or personal cause immediate of our salvation; so is faith only the instrumental or mean cause that maketh the merits of Christ to us available. For as the passion of Christ serveth to none but such as do believe, so neither doth faith itself (as it is only a bare quality or action in man’s mind) justify, unless it be directed to the body of Christ crucified, as to its object, of whom it receiveth all its virtue. And therefore these two must always jointly concur together; faith, and Christ Jesus crucified. As for example, when the children of

Israel were bidden of Moses to look up to the brazen serpent, neither could the serpent have helped them, except they had looked up, nor yet their looking upward have profited them, unless they had directed their eyes upon the said serpent, as the only object set up to the same purpose for them to behold; so our faith, in like case, directed to the body of Jesus our Savior, is the only means whereby Christ's merits are applied unto us, and we now justified before God; according to the doctrine of St. Paul, who, in express words defining to us what this faith is, and how it justifieth, saith: "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and believe with thy heart that God raised him from death, thou shalt be saved," (Romans 10:9) etc. Besides this, what action or quality soever is in man, either hope, charity, or any other kind of faith and believing, be it never so true, except it apprehend this object, that is, the body of Christ the Son of God, it serveth not to justification. And that is the cause why we add this particle "only" to faith, and say that faith only in Christ justifieth us; to exclude all other actions, qualities, gifts or works of man, from the cause of justifying; forso much as there is no other knowledge nor gift given of God to man, be it never so excellent, that can stand before the judgment of God unto justification, or whereunto any promise of salvation is annexed; but only this faith looking up to the brazen serpent, that is, to the body of Christ Jesus for us crucified.

As for example, when the Turk saith, that he believeth in one living God that made heaven and earth, his belief therein is true, yet it justifieth him not, because it lacketh the right object, which is Christ. So, when the Jew saith, that he believeth in one God, maker of heaven and earth, and believeth also the same God to be omnipotent, merciful, just, and true of promise, and that he hath elected the seed of Abraham: true it is that he believeth, and yet all this serveth him not, because Christ the Son of God is not joined withal. And though the said Jew should be never so devout in his prayers, or charitable in alms, or precise in keeping the law, and believe never so steadfastly that he is elect to be saved; yet he is never the nearer to salvation for all this, so long as his faith is not grounded upon the head corner-stone, which is the person and

body of Jesus Christ, the true Savior. After like sort it may be said of the papist, when he saith, that he is baptized, and believeth in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, three persons and one God, and also confesseth Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, who died for our sins, and rose again for our righteousness, etc.; his belief therein is true, and indeed would save him, if he did stay his salvation in this faith, and upon Christ his Savior only, according to the promise and grace of God, and go no further. But that he doth not: for neither doth he admit Christ only to be his perfect Savior without the help of other patrons, heads, advocates, and mediators, nor yet permitteth his faith in Christ only to be the means of his justification; but setteth up other bye-means, as hope, charity, sacrifice of the mass, confession, penance, satisfaction, merits, and pardons; supposing thereby to work his justification before God, contrary to the word of promise, to the gospel of grace, and to the doctrine of St. Paul, whereof we shall see more, the Lord willing, hereafter.

And thus much of the true causes of our justification after the doctrine of St. Paul. Concerning which causes this distinction furthermore, by the way, is to be added, that, as touching the original causes of our salvation, which be divers and sundry, some are external and without us; some are internal and within us. Of the external causes which are without us, the first and principal is the mercy and grace of God. Of this followeth predestination and election. Then cometh vocation. The last and next cause to us is the death and bloodshed of Christ, whereby we are redeemed, and all these be external causes, because they are without us.

Of internal causes that be in man through the gift of God, there is but one, and no more in Scripture appointed, that is our faith in Christ, which is the gift of God in us. Besides this, there is no gift of God given to man, virtue, work, merit, nor any thing else, that is any part or cause of salvation, but only this gift of faith, to believe in Christ Jesus. And this is the cause why we hold that faith only justifieth; meaning that amongst all the works, deeds, actions, labors, and operations, whatsoever man doeth or can do, there is nothing in man that worketh salvation, but only his faith given to

him of God to believe in Christ his Son; following therein the true trade of St. Paul's teaching, who, in precise words, so ascribeth justification to faith, that he excludeth all other actions of man, and works of the law. And therefore in the same epistle to the Romans, St. Paul, reasoning of the glory of justifying, asketh this question, How this glory is excluded; whether by the law of works? And concludeth No, ascribing only the glory thereof to the law of faith; and consequently upon the same he inferreth: "We hold that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." <sup>F832</sup>

And how then can that be accounted for any part of our justification, which St. Paul utterly debarreth and excludeth in that behalf? Of such like exclusives and negatives, the whole course of St. Paul's doctrine is full, where he still concludeth: "It is the gift of God, not of works, that no man should glory," etc. "Not of the works of righteousness, which we have done, but of his own mercy," etc. "Not after our works, but after his own purpose and grace which is given to us," etc. Again, "A man is not justified by works," etc. Also, "To him that worketh not, but believeth in him which justifieth the wicked, his faith is imputed for righteousness," etc. <sup>f833</sup>

By these exclusives and negatives in St. Paul's doctrine, what doth he else mean, but utterly to seclude all kind of man's merits, and works of the law from the office and dignity of justifying? And although he expresseth not the word, "only," yet, upon his exclusives and negatives, this exceptive must needs be inferred. For in all logic the consequence is necessary and formal, as, One man is suffered to come into the house, and no person else is suffered but one: *ergo*, one man only is suffered to enter into the house. And thus much concerning faith in Christ proved to be the only mean, or instrumental, or conditional cause of our salvation, and no other besides the same alone, by the doctrine of St. Paul taught to the ancient Romans.

**5.** The fifth branch, which I note in St. Paul's doctrine, is this: that after he hath thus established us in certainty of our salvation through faith in Christ, then after that, he exhorteth us vehemently, and with all

instance, to good works, showing the true use and end of good works; which is, First, to show our obedience and dutiful service (as we may) unto God, who hath done so great things for us: secondly, to relieve our neighbors with our charity and kindness, as God hath been kind to us his enemies: thirdly, to stir up others, by our example, to praise God, to embrace the same religion, and to do the like. For requisite it is, that as God hath been so merciful to us and gracious in eternal gifts, we should be merciful likewise to others, in temporal commodities. And seeing it hath pleased him, of his fatherly goodness (of our parts so little deserved), to call us to so high a vocation, to give the blood of his Son for us, to forgive us all our sins, to deliver us from this present wicked world, to make us citizens of heaven, yea, his children, more than servants: little then can we do, and well may we think those benefits ill bestowed, if we forgive not our neighbors, and show not something again worthy that holy calling wherewith he hath called us, in mortifying our worldly lusts here, and studying after heavenly things: and finally, if we, being provoked with such love and kindness, render not again some love for love, some kindness for kindness, seeking how to walk in the steps which he hath prepared for us to walk in, serving him (so much as we may) in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. And though our obedience shall always be imperfect, do the best we can, yet reason would that some obedience we should show, as loving children to such a loving Father.

And this is the cause why St. Paul is so vehement and urgent to call for good works, not that works should justify, but that we, being justified so mercifully and tenderly through his grace, should not abuse his grace in vain, but endeavor ourselves to our uttermost to render our service again to him, in such conversation of life as may most make to his glory, and profit of our neighbor. And though the words of our Savior seem, in some places, to attribute to our obedience and charity here in earth great rewards in heaven, that is, of his own free grace and goodness, so to impute small matters for great deserts, and not for us to claim any meed thereby or thank at his hand, as by any worthiness of our doings: no more than the servant can, who, when he cometh from the plough and serving the cattle in the field, serveth first his master at home and waiteth upon

his table: the master is not bound (saith Christ) to thank his servant there-for, and bid him sit down: "So you," saith he, "when you have done that is commanded you, say ye are unprofitable servants; ye have done but what your bound duty was to do." (Luke 17:10)

Again, here also is to be understood, that where such rewards be ascribed unto men's deeds, it is not for the worthiness of the deed itself, but for the faith of the doer, which faith maketh the work to be good in God's sight; for else if an infidel should do the same work that the christian doth, it were nothing but mere sin before God. In that, therefore, the christian man's work is accepted, be it never so small (as to give a cup of cold water), the same is only for his faith's sake that doth it, and not for the work which is done. Whereby again we may learn how faith only doth justify a man, and that three manner of ways.

First, it justifieth the person, in making him accepted, and the child of God by regeneration, before he begin to do any good work. Secondly, it justifieth a man from sin, in procuring remission and forgiveness of the same. Thirdly, it justifieth the good deeds and works of man, not only in bringing forth good fruits, but also in making the same works to be good and acceptable in the sight of God, which otherwise were impure and execrable in his sight.

The office therefore of faith and works is divers, and must not be confounded. Faith first goeth before, and regenerateth a man to God, and justifieth him in the sight of God, both in covering his ill deeds, and making his good deeds acceptable to God; climbing up to heaven, and there wrestling with God and his judgment for righteousness, for salvation, and for everlasting life. Works and charity follow faith, and are exercised here upon the earth, and glory only before man, but not before God, in showing forth obedience both to God and to man. Further than this, our good works do not reach, nor have any thing to do in the judgment of God touching salvation. I speak of our good works (as St. Paul speaketh) (Romans 7:18) as they be ours, and imperfect. For else, if our works could be perfect according to the perfection of the law,

as Christ wrought them in the perfection of his flesh, that is, if we could perform them, and transgress never a jot, so might we live in them; as it is said, “Qui fecerit ea, rivet in eis.” But now, seeing the imbecility of our flesh cannot attain thereto, it followeth thereof that all glory of justifying is taken from works, and transferred only to faith.

And thus much concerning the principal contents of St. Paul’s doctrine; wherein the church of the ancient Romans was first grounded and planted, and so continued in the same, or at least did not much alter, during the primitive state of the church. Likewise the same form of doctrine the latter Romans also, that followed, should have maintained, and not have fallen away for any man’s preaching, but hold him accursed, yea if he were an apostle or angel from heaven, teaching any other doctrine besides that institution which they have received (Galatians 1:8); for so were they warned before by the apostle St. Paul to do. And yet, notwithstanding all this forewarning and diligent instruction of this blessed apostle of the Gentiles, what a defection of faith is fallen among the Gentiles, especially among the Romans, whereof the said apostle also foretold them so long before, fore-propheying: “that the day of the Lord shall not come, except there come a defection before, and that the man of sin should be revealed, the proud adversary of God,” (2 Thessalonians 2:8) etc. meaning, no doubt, by this defection, a departing and a falling from that faith which the Holy Ghost had then planted by his ministry among the Gentiles, as we see it now come to pass in the church of Rome, which church is so gone from the faith that St. Paul taught, that if he were now alive, and saw these decrees and decretals of the bishop of Rome, these heaps of ceremonies and traditions, these mass-books, these portuses, these festivals and legends, these processions, hymns, and sequences, these beads and graduals, and the manner of their invocation, their canons, censures, and later councils, such swarms of superstitious monks and friars, such sects, and so many divers religions, the testament of St. Francis,<sup>f834</sup> the rule of St. Benedict, of St. Bridget, of St. Anthony, etc.; the intricate subtleties and labyrinths of the schoolmen, the infinite cases and distinctions of

the canonists, the sermons in churches, the assertions in schools, the glory of the pope, the pride of the clergy, the cruelty of persecuting prelates with their officials and promoters: he would say, this were not a defection, but rather a plain *destruction*, and a ruin of faith; neither that this were any true church of Christ, but a new-found religion, or paganism rather, brought in under the shadow of Christianity; wherein remaineth almost nothing else but the name only of Christ, and the outward form of his religion, the true vein and effect whereof is utterly decayed; as to them which list to examine all the parts of this new Romish religion may soon appear.

For, save only that they pretend the solemn form and words of the Creed, and are baptized, confessing the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost: as touching all other points and true sincerity of the christian faith, which they outwardly profess, they are utterly degenerated from that which St. Paul and the word of God first had taught them.

First, they confess the Father in word, but his will, in his word expressed, they renounce. His grace they acknowledge not; his benefits and promises, given unto us in his Son, they receive not; the vigor of his law they feel not; the terror of his judgments earnestly they fear not; his commandments they obscure by traditions and commandments of their own.

Likewise the name of Christ his Son in word they confess, but his office in deed they deface and diminish: his glory they seek not, but under his name they do seek their own; the power of his blood and passion they know not, or else dissemble it, whom neither they admit to be the head of his church alone, nor Savior alone, nor to be our only patron and advocate, but match him with our Lady and other patrons, so that every parish almost in Christendom hath its peculiar patron besides Christ to hold by.

In like manner they confess the name of the Holy Ghost; but God himself knoweth how far they are from the comfort, knowledge, and taste of the Holy Ghost; as well may appear by their councils, by their expounding of scripture, by their superstitious ceremonies;

by their outward worshipping and idolatrous invocation to stocks and stones, and to dead creatures; by their scrupulous observation of days, times, places, numbers and gestures: and no less also by their doctrine, which defraudeth the poor hearts of simple Christians of their due consolation, joy, and liberty in the Holy Ghost, and keepeth them still in a servile bondage, and a doubtful uncertainty of their salvation, contrary to the working of the Holy Spirit of God.

And thus the church of Rome, pretending only the name of Christ and of his religion, is so far altered from the truth of that which it pretendeth, that, under the name of Christ, it persecuteth both Christ and his religion; working more harm to the church of Christ, than ever did the open tyrants and persecuting emperors among the heathen: not much unlike herein to the old synagogue of the scribes and pharisees, who, under the name of God, crucified the Son of God, and, under pretense of the law, fought against the gospel; and, under the title of Abraham's children, persecuted the children of Abraham. And as they, bragging so highly of "the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord," did indeed destroy the true temple of the Lord; right so these pretended catholics, in these days, after they have raised up a catholic church of their own, and have armed the same with laws, and have gathered unto them a power of priests, prelates, abbots, priors, of religious men, of cardinals, and also of secular princes to take their part; now, under the name of the catholic church they persecute the true catholic church, and, colouring their proceeding still with "in nomine Domini," most cruelly put them to death who die "pro nomine Domini;" condemning them for heretics, schismatics, and rebels, not who deny any part of the creed, which they themselves profess, nor such whom they can convict by any scripture; but only such, who will not join with their errors and heresies, contrary to the honor of God and truth of his word.

And lest any should think this, that we here protest against the corrupt errors and manifold deformities of this latter church of Rome, to proceed of any rancour or private affection, rather than upon necessary causes and demonstrations evident, my purpose is (by the Lord's leave) to take herein

some little pains, as I have collected, a little before, the sum and contents of St. Paul's doctrine, wherewith the old church of Rome was first seasoned and acquainted, so now as in a like summary table to descry the particular branches and contents of the pope's doctrine now set forth, to the intent that all true christian readers, comparing the one with the other, may discern what great alteration there is between the church of Rome that now is, and the church of Rome that was planted by the apostles in the primitive time. And to the end to open unto the simple reader some way whereby he may the better judge in such matters of doctrine, and not be deceived in discerning truth from error; first we will propound certain principles or general positions, as infallible rules or truths of the scripture, whereby all other doctrines and opinions of men being tried and examined, as with the touchstone, may the more easily be judged whether they be true or the contrary, and whether they make against the scripture or no.

### **CERTAIN PRINCIPLES, OR GENERAL VERITIES, GROUNDED UPON THE TRUTH OF GOD'S WORD.**

**The first principle.** — As sin and death came originally by the disobedience of one to all men of his generation by nature: so righteousness and life come originally by the obedience of one to all men regenerated of him by faith and baptism (Romans 5:17).

**The second.** — The promise of God was freely given to our first parents, without their deserving, that “the seed of the woman should break the serpent's head.” (Genesis 3:15)

**The third.** — Promise was given freely to Abraham before he deserved any thing, that in “his seed all nations should be blessed.” (Genesis 12:3)

**The fourth.** — To the word of God neither must we add, nor take from it (Deuteronomy 4:2).

**The fifth.** — “He that doeth the works of the law shall live therein.” (Galatians 3:12; Leviticus 18:5)

**The Sixth.** — “Accursed is he which abideth not in every thing that is written in the book of the law.” (Deuteronomy 27:26; Galatians 3:10)

**The seventh.** — God only is to be worshipped. (Deuteronomy 6:5; Luke 4:8)

**The eighth.** — “All our righteousness is like a defiled cloth of a woman.” (Isaiah 64:6)

**The ninth.** — “In all my holy hill they shall not kill nor slay, saith the Lord.” (Isaiah 11:9; 65:25)

**The tenth.** — God loveth mercy and obedience more than sacrifice (Hosea 6:6; 1 Samuel 15:22).

**The eleventh.** — The law worketh anger, condemneth and openeth sin (Romans 3:19).

**The twelfth.** — The end of the law is Christ, to righteousness, to every one that believeth (Romans 10:11).

**The thirteenth.** — Whosoever believeth and is baptized, shall be saved (Mark 16:16).

**The fourteenth.** — A man is justified by faith without works, freely by grace, not of ourselves (Galatians 2:16; Ephesians 2:8).

**The fifteenth.** — There is no remission of sins without blood (Hebrews 9:22).

**The sixteenth.** — Whatsoever is not of faith is sin (Romans 14:23). Without faith it is impossible to please God (Hebrews 11:6).

**The seventeenth.** — One mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus (1 Timothy 2:5). And he is the propitiation for our sins (1 John 2:2).

**The eighteenth.** — Whosoever seeketh by the law to be justified, is fallen from grace (Galatians 5:4).

**The nineteenth.** — In Christ be all the promises of God, *Est* and *Amen*. (2 Corinthians 1:20)

**The twentieth.** — Let every soul be subject to superior powers, giving to Caesar that which is Caesar's, and to God that which is God's (Romans 13:1).

These principles and infallible rules of the scripture, as no man can deny, so, if they be granted, the doctrine then of the pope's church must needs be found not to be catholic, but rather full of errors and heresies, as in the sequel following remaineth more expressly and particularly, by the grace of Christ, to be convinced

**A SUMMARY COLLECTION OF THE ERRORS, HERESIES, AN ABSURDITIES, CONTAINED IN THE POPE'S DOCTRINE,**

*Contrary To The Rules Of God's Word, And The First Institution Of The Church Of Rome: — And First: Of Faith And Justification.*

First, as touching the only means and instrumental cause of our justification, whereby the merits of Christ's passion be applied to us and made ours, ye heard before how St. Paul ascribeth the same only to faith; as appeareth by all his epistles, especially that to the Romans, wherein he, excluding all kind of works, ascribeth all our salvation, justification, righteousness, reconciliation, and peace with God, only unto faith in Christ. Contrary to which doctrine, the pope and his church have set up divers and sundry other means of their own devising, whereby the merits of Christ's passion (they say) are applied to us and made ours, to the putting away of sins, and for our justification; as hope, charity, sacrifice of the mass, auricular confession, satisfaction, merits of saints, and holy orders, the pope's pardons, etc. So that Christ's sacrifice, stripes, and suffering, by this teaching, doth not heal us, nor is beneficial to us, though we believe never so well, unless we add also these works and merits above recited. Which if it be true, then it is false what Isaiah the prophet doth promise: "In his stripes we are all made whole," (Isaiah 53:5) etc. This error and heresy of the church of Rome, though it seem at first sight to the natural reason of man to be but of small importance, yet, if it be earnestly considered, it is in very deed the most pernicious heresy that ever almost crept into the church; upon the which, as the only foundation, all, or the most part of all the errors, absurdities, and inconveniences of the pope's church are grounded. For, this being once admitted, that a man is not

justified by his faith in Christ alone, but that other means must be sought by our own working and merits to apply the merits of Christ's passion unto us; then is there neither any certainty left of our salvation, nor end in setting up new means and merits of our own devising for remission of sins. Neither hath there been any heresy that either hath rebelled more presumptuously against the high majesty of God the Father, nor more perniciously hath injured the souls of the simple, than this doctrine.

First of all it subverteth the will and testament of God: for whereas almighty God of mercy hath given us his Son to die for us, and with him hath given out his full promise, that whosoever believeth upon him should be saved by their faith; and assigneth none other condition, either of the law, or any of works, but only of faith, to be the means between his Son and us: these men take upon them to alter this testament that God hath set, and adjoin other conditions, which the Lord in his word never appointed nor knew. To whom the words of Jerome upon the epistle to the Galatians, speaking of such, may be well applied: "Which make of the gospel of Christ the gospel of men, or rather the gospel of the devil," etc.

f835

Secondly, whereas the christian reader in the gospel, reading of the great grace and sweet promises of God given to mankind in Christ his Son, might thereby take much comfort of soul, and be at rest and peace with the Lord his God; there cometh in the pestiferous doctrine of these heretics, wherewith they obscure this free grace of God to choke the sweet comforts of man in the Holy Ghost, and oppress christian liberty, and bring us into spiritual bondage.

Thirdly, as in this their impious doctrine they show themselves manifest enemies to God's grace, so are they no less injurious to christian men, whom they leave in a doubtful distrust of God's favor and of their salvation, contrary to the word and will of God, and right institution of the apostolic doctrine. And whereas our new schoolmen of late, to maintain the said wicked point of doctrine, do object unto us that we rather leave men's consciences uncertain, forso much as, if life, say they, were not a due reward, it were uncertain; and now forso much as due debt is certain, and mercy or favor is uncertain, therefore, say they, we, leaving men's consciences to the mercy of God, do leave them in a doubtful uncertainty

of their salvation: — to this I answer, that due debt, if it be proved by the law duly deserved, must be certain; but if the law shall prove it imperfectly or insufficiently due, then it is not certain, neither can there be any thing duly claimed. Now, as touching mercy, so long as it remaineth secret in the prince's will, and not known to his subjects, so long it is uncertain. But, when this mercy shall be openly published by proclamation, ratified by promise, conferred by will and testament, established in blood, and sealed with sacraments, then this mercy remaineth no more doubtful, but ought firmly to be believed of every true faithful subject. And therefore St. Paul, to establish our hearts in this assurance, and to answer to this doubt, in his epistle to the Romans doth teach us, saying, "And therefore of faith, that, after grace, the promise might be firm and sure to the whole seed of Abraham," (Romans 4:16) etc.: meaning hereby, that works have nothing to do in this case of justifying; and noteth the reason why. For then our salvation should stand in a doubtful wavering, because, in working, we are never certain whether our deserts be perfect and sufficient in God's judgment or no. And therefore, saith St. Paul, to the intent our salvation should be out of all doubt, and certain, it standeth not of works in deserving, but of faith in apprehending, and of God's free grace in promising.

Fourthly, as in this their sinister doctrine, they break this principle of christian religion, which saith that a man is justified by "faith without works," so again, it breaketh another principle above rehearsed. For this rule being granted, that nothing is to be added to Godword, nor taken from it, then have these men done wickedly in adding (as they do) to God's word. For whereas the word of God limiteth our justification to no condition but faith; "Believe," saith he, "in the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved and thy whole house," (Acts 16:31) etc.; these justiciaries do add thereto divers and sundry other conditions besides, and such as the word also precisely excludeth, as hope, charity, the sacrifice of the mass, the work of the priest *ex opere operato*, auricular confession, satisfaction, meritorious deeds, etc.

And thus much concerning the doctrine of faith and justification; whereby it may appear into what horrible blindness and blasphemy the church of Rome is now fallen, where this kind of doctrine is not only suffered, but also publicly professed, which, speaking against faith, thus blasphemously

dare say: “That faith wherewith a man firmly believeth, and certainly assureth himself, that for Christ’s sake his sins be forgiven him, and that he shall possess eternal life, is not faith, but rashness; not the persuasion of the Holy Ghost, but presumption of a man’s boldness.” <sup>F836</sup>

## OF WORKS AND THE LAW.

As touching the doctrine of good works and the law, what the teaching of St. Paul was to the Romans, ye heard before; who, although he excludeth good works from the office of justifying, yet excludeth he them not from the practice and conversation of christian life, but most earnestly calleth upon all faithful believers in Christ, to walk worthy their vocation, to lay down their old conversation, to give their members servants of righteousness, and to offer their bodies up to God a lively sacrifice. The like example of whose teaching, if the churches now reformed do not follow, let their sermons, their preachings, writings, exhortings, and lives, also bear record; who, although they cannot say with Christ, “Which of you can blame me of sin?” yet they may say to the adversaries, Whosoever of you is without fault, cast the first stone of reproach against us. Wherefore Hosius <sup>f837</sup> and Pighius, with their fellows, do them open wrong, and slanderously belie them in comparing them in this behalf to AEtius, Eunomius, and other heretics called *Anomoi*, who, taking the good sentences of St. Paul, did abuse the same to filthy license of the flesh, and corruption of wicked life.

But to let these slanders pass, now what the errors be of the church of Rome touching this part of doctrine, remaineth to be declared; whose error first standeth in this; that they, misunderstanding the definition of good works, do call good works, not such as properly are commanded by the law of God, but such as are agreeable to the pope’s law; as building of abbeys and churches, giving to the high altar, founding of trentals, finding of chantries, gilding of images, hearing of masses, going on pilgrimage, fighting for the holy cross, keeping of vows, entering to orders, fasting of vigils, creeping to the cross, praying to saints, etc. All which are not only reputed for good works, but so preferred also before all other works; that to these is given pardon from the pope, double and triplefold, more than to any other good work of charity commanded in the law of almighty God.

Another error also may be noted in the papists, touching the efficient or formal cause of good works for, albeit they all confess in their books, that “*Gratia Dei gratis data*” is the chief and principal cause thereof, and worketh in us “*justitiam primam*,” as they call it, yet the good works after regeneration they refer to other subordinate causes, under God; as to free will, or to “*habitum virtutis*,” or “*ad integra naturalia*,” and nothing at all to faith, whereas faith only, next under God, is the root and fountain of all well doing: as in the fruits of a good tree, albeit the planter or the husbandman be the principal agent thereof, and some cause also may be in the good ground; yet the next and immediate cause is the root that maketh the tree fruitful. In like manner, the grace of God, in a soft and repentant mollified heart, planteth the gift of faith. Faith as a good root cannot lie dead or unoccupied, but springeth forth, and maketh both the tree fruitful, and also the fruit thereof to be good, which otherwise had no acceptation or goodness in them, were it not for the goodness of the root from whence they spring. So St. Paul, although he had certain works in him (such as they were) before his conversion, yet had he no good works before the grace of Christ had rooted faith in him. So Mary Magdalene the sinner, and Zaccheus the publican — so all the nations of the Gentiles — began to bring forth fruit, and especially good fruit, when they began to be engrafted in Christ, and to receive the root of his faith, whose fruits, before that, were all damnable and unsavoury. As touching the cause therefore of good works, there is no other in man but faith, whose office as it is to justify us in heaven, so the nature of it is here in earth to work by love, as the root worketh by the sap. For as a man seeth and feeleth by faith the love and grace of God toward him in Christ his Son, so beginneth he to love again both God and man, and to do for his neighbor as God hath done to him (Galatians 5:14). And hereof properly springeth the running fountain of all good works and deeds of charity.

Thirdly, as they err in the cause of good works, so do they err much more in the end of the law, and of good works; for, whereas St. Paul teacheth the law to be given to this use and end, to convict our transgressions, to prove us sinners, to show and condemn our infirmity, and to drive us to Christ, they take and apply no other end to the law, but to make us perfect, to keep us from wrath, and to make us just before God. And likewise whereas St. Paul proveth all our good works to be imperfect, and utterly

secludeth them from the end of justifying, they, contrariwise, do teach as though the end of good works were to merit remission of sins, to satisfy unto God, to deserve grace, to redeem souls from purgatory, and that by them the person of the regenerate man doth please God, and is made just before God. For so they teach most wickedly and horribly, saying, that Christ suffered for original sin, or sins going before baptism; but the actual sins, which follow after baptism, must be done away by men's merits. <sup>F838</sup> And so they assign to Christ the beginning of salvation, or obtaining the first grace, as they call it; but the perfection or consummation of grace they give to works and our own strength. Neither can they in any case abide, that we be justified freely by the mercy of God through faith only, apprehending the merits of Christ. Howbeit neither do all papists in this their error agree in one; for some make distinction, and say, that we are justified by Christ, "principaliter," that is, "principally;" "et minus principaliter," that is, "less principally," by the dignity of our own deeds, contrary to the eighth principle before mentioned. Others hold that we are made righteous before God, not by our works that go before faith, but by our virtues that follow after. Some again do thus expound the saying of St. Paul, "We are justified by faith:" that is (say they) by faith preparing us, or setting us in a good way to be justified. Others expound it by the figure *synecdoche*, that is, by faith conjoined together with other virtues; others thus: "by faith," that is, being formed with charity. Thus all these do derogate from the benefit of Christ, and attribute unto works a great or the greatest part of our justification, directly against the true vein of St. Paul's doctrine, and first institution of the ancient church of Rome, and against all the principles of holy scripture.

Furthermore, as touching the said doctrine of the law and good works, they err in misunderstanding the nature of the law, and works. For whereas St. Paul disputeth that the law is spiritual, and requireth of us perfect obedience of the whole power of man, which we, being carnal, are never able to accomplish; they affirm otherwise, that the law doth require but only outward obedience of man, and therewith is contented. And this obedience (they say) man is not only able to perform, but also to do more and greater things than the law requireth. Whereof rise the works of supererogation, contrary to the sixth and eighth principles above specified. Also there be, say they, among others, certain works of the law, which

pertain not to all men, but are “consilia,” counsels, left for perfect men, as matter for them to merit by, and these they call “opera perfectionis,” or “opera indebita;” adding unto these other new devices to serve God, after their own traditions and beside the word of God; as monastical vows, wilful poverty, difference of meats and garments, pilgrimage to relics and saints, worshipping of the dead, superstitious ceremonies, rosaries, etc., with such like: And these they call works of perfection, which they prefer before the others commanded in the law of God; insomuch that in comparison of these, the other necessary duties and functions commanded and commended by the word of God (as to bear office in the commonwealth, to live in the godly state of matrimony, to sustain the office of a servant in a house), are contemned, and accounted as profane in comparison of these, contrary to the tenth principle above mentioned.

### OF SIN.

Of sin, likewise, they teach not rightly, nor after the institution of the apostles and the ancient church of Rome, while they consider not the deepness and largeness of sin; supposing it still to be nothing else but the inward actions with consent of will, or the outward, such as are against will: whereas the strength of sin extendeth not only to these, but also comprehendeth the blindness and ignorance of the mind, lack of knowledge and true fear of God, the untowardness of man’s mind to God-ward, the privy rebellion of the heart against the law of God, the undelighting will of man to God and his word. The sense of flesh <sup>f839</sup> St. Paul also calleth an enemy against God, and feeleth in himself, that is, in his flesh, nothing dwelling but sin.

As touching also original sin, wherein we are born, which is the destruction of original justice, and of God’s image in us (remaining in us, and bringing forth in us wicked cogitations, affections, and motions of naughtiness against the law of God, and never ceasing so long as man liveth), this original sin the pope’s doctrine doth not deny, but yet doth much extenuate the same; and holdeth that this inward concupiscence and vicious affections, not bursting out in us with consent of will, are no mortal nor damnable sin, but only “fomes peccati:” and say moreover, that this “concupiscentia” in us is no depravation of the higher, but only of the lower, parts of man, being a thing ἀδιάφορον, indifferent, and no less

natural in us, than is the appetite to eat and drink; and that the same is left to remain in the saints after baptism, to be to them occasion of more meriting.

### **OF PENANCE OR REPENTANCE.**

Of penance, this latter Lateran church of Rome, of late, hath made a sacrament; contrary to the fourth principle before: which penance (say they) standeth of three parts; contrition, confession, and satisfaction canonical. Contrition (as they teach) may be had by strength of free-will without the law and the Holy Ghost, “per actus elicitos,” through man’s own action and endeavor. Which contrition first must be sufficient, and so it meriteth remission of sin. In confession they require a full rehearsal of all a man’s sins, whereby the priest, knowing the crimes, may minister satisfaction accordingly. And this rehearsing of sins *ex opere operato* deserveth remission; contrary to the fourteenth principle before. Satisfactions they call “opera indebita,” enjoined by the ghostly father. And this satisfaction (say they) taketh away and changeth eternal punishment into temporal pains, which pains also it doth mitigate. And again, these satisfactions may be taken away by the pope’s indulgence.

This unsavoury and heathenish doctrine of penance far differeth from the true teaching of holy scripture; by the which teaching, repentance properly containeth these three parts: contrition, faith, and new life. Contrition is called in scripture the sorrow of heart, rising upon the consideration of sin committed, and of the anger of God provoked, which sorrow driveth a man to Christ for succor; whereupon riseth faith. Faith bringeth afterward amendment or newness of life, which we call new obedience, working fruits worthy of repentance.

### **DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.**

As there is nothing more necessary and comfortable for troubled consciences, than to be well instructed in the difference between the law and the gospel, so is the church of Rome much to blame in this behalf, because it confoundeth together those two, being in nature so diverse and contrary one from another; as threatenings with promises, things temporal with things eternal, sorrowful things with glad tidings, death with life,

bondage with freedom, etc.: teaching the people that whatsoever the law saith, the gospel confirmeth; and whatsoever the gospel saith, the same is agreeable to the law, and so make they no difference between Moses and Christ; save only that Moses (they say) was the giver of the old law, Christ is the giver of the new and a more perfect law. And thus imagine they the gospel to be nothing else but a new law given by Christ, binding to the promises thereof the condition of our doings and deservings, no otherwise than to the old law. And so divide they the whole law after this distinction, into three parts: to wit, the law of nature, the law of Moses, and the law of Christ. And as for the gospel, they say it is revealed for no other cause, but to show to the world more perfect precepts and counsels, than were in the old law, to the fulfilling whereof they attribute justification; and so leave the poor consciences of men in perpetual doubt, and induce other manifold errors; bringing the people into a false opinion of Christ, as though he were not a remedy against the law, but came as another Moses to give a new law to the world.

Furthermore, as they make no difference between the nature of the law, and the nature of the gospel, confounding Moses and Christ together, so neither do they distinguish or discern the time of the law, and the time of the gospel, asunder. For whereas St. Paul bringeth in the law to be a schoolmaster, and limiteth him his time unto Christ, and saith that Christ is “the end of the law” (that is, where the law ceaseth, there Christ beginneth, and where Christ beginneth, there the law endeth), they, contrary, make the law to have no end nor ceasing, but give to it immortal life and kingdom equal with Christ, so that Christ and the law together do reign over the soul and conscience of man. Which is untrue; for either Christ must give place, and the law stand; or else the law (the condemnation and malediction of the law, I mean) must end, and Christ reign (Ephesians 1:20). For both these, Christ and the law, grace and malediction, cannot reign and govern together. But Christ the Son of God, who once died, can die no more, but must reign for ever. Wherefore the law with his strength, sting, and curse, must needs cease and have an end. And this is it that St. Paul, speaking of the triumph of Christ, saith, that he, “ascending up, led away captivity captive,” (Ephesians 4:8) and hath set man at liberty; not at liberty to live as flesh lusteth, neither hath freed him from the use and exercise of the law, but from the dominion and power of

the law, so that, “there is now no condemnation to them that be in Christ Jesus, which walk not after the flesh.” (Romans 8:1) And in another place St. Paul, speaking of the same power and dominion of the law, saith, that “Christ had taken the obligation written against us in decrees, and hath nailed it upon the cross, triumphing over all (Colossians 2:14). So that as the kingdom of Christ first began upon the cross, even so upon the same cross, and at the same time, the kingdom of the law expired; and the malediction of the law was so crucified upon the cross, that it shall never rise again, to have any power against them that be in Christ Jesus. For like as if a woman be discharged from her first husband being dead, and hath married another man, the first husband hath no more power over her; even so we, now being espoused unto Christ our second husband, are discharged utterly from our first husband, the Law (Romans 7:3), and (as St. Paul in another place (Romans 6:14) saith) “are no more under the law,” that is, under the dominion and malediction of the law, “but under grace;” that is, under perpetual remission of all sins, committed not only before our baptism, but as well also after baptism, and during all our life long. For therein properly consisteth the grace of God, in not imputing sin to us, so often as the repenting sinner, rising up by faith, flieth unto Christ, and apprehendeth God’s mercy and remission promised in him, according to the testimony both of the psalm, “Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth no sin,” (Psalms 32:2) and also of all the prophets, “who,” as St. Peter saith, “give record to him, that, through his name, all that believe in him shall receive remission of their sins.” (Acts 10:43) Which being so, as it cannot be denied, then what need these private and extraordinary remissions to be brought into the church by ear-confession, by meritorious deeds, and by the pope’s pardons? For if there be no condemnation but by the law, and if this law itself, which was the first husband, be captived, crucified, abolished, and departed, what condemnation then can there be to them that be in Christ Jesus, or by whom should it come? If there be no condemnation, but a free and general deliverance for all men, once gotten by the victory of Christ, from the penalty of the law, what needeth then any particular remission of sins at sundry times to be sought at the priest’s hands, or the pope’s pardons? He that hath a general pardon, needeth no particular. If remedy for sin be general and perpetual, once gotten for ever, to all them that be in Christ Jesus, what needeth any other remedy by auricular confession? If it be not general and perpetual, how

then is it true that St. Paul saith, “The law is crucified, and condemnation abolished?” or how standeth redemption perpetual and general, if remission be not general? For what is redemption else, but remission of sin, or sins bought out? or what else to kill the law, but to discharge us from condemnation for ever? He that delivereth his friend for a time out of his enemy’s hand, doth him a pleasure; but he that killeth the enemy once out of the way, giveth perpetual safety. So, if remission of sins by Christ were for some sins, and not for all, the law then must needs live still. But now the killing and crucifying of the law importeth full remission and absolute, and our safety to be perpetual. But here, percase, will be objected of some: How standeth remission of sins certain and perpetual, seeing new offenses, being daily committed, do daily require new remission? Hereto I answer: Albeit sins do daily grow, whereby we have need daily to desire God to “forgive our trespasses;” yet, notwithstanding, the cause of our remission standeth ever one and perpetual; neither is the same to be repeated any more, nor any other cause to be sought besides that alone. This cause is the body of Christ sacrificed once upon the cross for all sins that either have been or shall be committed. Besides this cause there is no other, neither confession, nor men’s pardons, that remitteth sins.

Furthermore, as the cause is one and ever perpetual which worketh remission of sins unto us, so is the promise of God ever one, once made, and standeth perpetual, that offereth the same to the faith of the repenting sinner. And because the said promise of God is always sure and cannot fail, which offereth remission to all them that believe in Christ, being limited neither to time nor number, therefore we may boldly conclude, that what time soever a repenting sinner believeth, and by faith applieth to himself the sacrifice of Christ, he hath, by God’s own promise, remission of his sins, whether they were done before, or after, baptism.

And moreover, forsomuch as the said promise of God offereth remission to the repentant sinner by no other means nor condition, but only one, that is, by faith in Christ, therefore, excluding all other means and conditions of man’s working, we say, that what repenting sinner soever believeth in Christ, hath already in himself (and needeth not to seek to any priest) perpetual assurance of remission, not for this time or that time only, but for ever and a day. For the promise saith not, He that believeth in Christ

shall be pardoned this time, so he sin no more; neither doth it say, that the law is stayed, or the sentence reprieved, but saith plainly, that the law, with her condemnation and sentence itself, is condemned and hanged up, and shall never rise again to them that be in Christ Jesus; and promiseth indeterminately, without limitation, remission of sins, “to all that believe in his name” (Acts 10:35). And likewise in another place, the scripture, speaking absolutely, saith, “Sin shall not prevail over you,” and addeth the reason why, saying, “Because ye are not under the law, but under grace.” (Romans 6:14) Adding this lesson withal (as followeth in the same place), not that sinners should sin more therefor, because they are under grace, but only that weak infirmities might be relieved, broken consciences comforted, and repenting sinners holpen from desperation, to the praise of God’s glory. For, as God forgiveth not sinners because they should sin, so neither doth infirmity of falling diminish the grace of Christ, but rather doth illustrate the same, as it is written, “My strength is made perfect in infirmity.” (2 Corinthians 12:9) And again, “Where sin aboundeth, there grace super-aboundeth also.” (Romans 5:20)

In remission of sins therefore, these four things must concur together: first, the cause that worketh, which is the sacrifice of Christ’s body; secondly, the promise that offereth; thirdly, faith that apprehendeth; fourthly, the repenting sinner that receiveth. And, although sins daily do grow, which daily provoke us to crave remission, yet as touching the cause that worketh remission of our daily sins, and the means which apprehend and apply the said cause unto us, they remain always one and perpetual; besides which no other cause nor means is to be sought of man. So that to them that be repenting sinners, and be in Christ Jesus, there is no law to condemn them, though they have deserved condemnation: but they are under a perpetual kingdom, and a heaven, full of grace and remission, to cover their sins and not to impute their iniquities, through the promise of God in Christ Jesus our Lord.

And therefore wicked and impious is the doctrine of them, first, which seek any other cause of remission, than only the blood of our Savior; secondly, which assign any other means to apply the blood-shedding of Christ unto us, besides only faith; thirdly and especially, which so limit and restrain the eternal privilege of Christ’s passion, as though it served but only for sins done without and before faith, and that the rest, after

baptism committed, must be done away by confession, pardons, and satisfactory deeds. And all this riseth because the true nature of the law and the gospel is not known, nor the difference rightly considered between the times of the one and of the other. Neither again do they make any distinction between the malediction of the law, and use of the law. And therefore, whensoever they hear us speak of the law (meaning the malediction of the law) to be abolished, thereupon they maliciously slander us, as though we spake against the good exercises of the law, and gave liberty of flesh to carnal men to live as they list: whereof more shall be said (by the Lord's grace) as place and time shall hereafter require.

### **OF FREE-WILL.**

Concerning free-will, as it may peradventure in some case be admitted, that men without grace may do some outward functions of the law, and keep some outward observances or traditions, so, as touching things spiritual and appertaining to salvation, the strength of man, being not regenerate by grace, is so infirm and impotent, that he can perform nothing, neither in doing well, nor willing well; who, after he be regenerated by grace, may work and do well, but yet in such sort that still remaineth, notwithstanding, a great imperfection of flesh, and a perpetual repugnance between the flesh and spirit. And thus was the original church of the ancient Romans first instructed. From whom see now how far this latter church of Rome hath degenerated, which holdeth and affirmeth, that men without grace may perform the obedience of the law, and prepare themselves to receive grace by working, so that those works may be meritorious, and, of congruity, obtain grace. Which grace once obtained, then men may (say they) perfectly perform the full obedience of the law, and accomplish those spiritual actions and works which God requireth: and so those works of condignity deserve everlasting life. As for the infirmity which still remaineth in nature, *that* they nothing regard nor once speak of.

### **OF INVOCATION AND ADORATION.**

Over and besides these uncatholic and almost unchristian absurdities and defections from the apostolical faith, above specified, let us consider the manner of their invocation, not to God alone, as they should, but to dead

men; saying that saints are to be called upon, “tanquam mediatores intercessionis,” “as mediator of intercession:” “Christum vero tanquam mediatorem salutis;” “and Christ as the mediator of salvation.” And affirm moreover, that Christ was a mediator only in time of his passion: which is repugnant to the words of St. Paul, writing to the old Romans, where he speaking of the intercession of Christ: (Romans 8:34) “which is,” saith he, “on the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.” And if Christ be a mediator of salvation, what needeth then any other intercession of the saints for our suits? for salvation being once had, what can we require more? or what lacketh he more to be obtained of the saints, who is sure to be saved only by Christ? And then, in their catholic devotions, why do they teach us thus to pray to the blessed virgin, “Save all them that glorify thee,” etc.; <sup>f840</sup> if salvation belong only to Christ? unless they study of purpose to seem contrary to themselves.

Hitherto also pertaineth the worshipping of relics, and the false adoration of sacraments; that is, the outward signs for the things signified, contrary to the seventh principle before. Add to this also the profanation of the Lord’s supper, contrary to the use for which it was ordained, in reserving it after the communion ministered, in setting it to sale for money, and falsely persuading both themselves and others, that the priest doth merit both to himself that saith, and to him that heareth, “Ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis,” that is, “Only by the mere doing of the work, though the party that useth the same hath no motion in him.”

### **OF SACRAMENTS, BAPTISM, AND THE LORD’S SUPPER.**

As touching sacraments, their doctrine likewise is corrupt and erroneous.

**First**, They err falsely in the number: for where the institution of Christ ordaineth but two, they (contrary to the fourth principle above prefixed) have added to the prescription of the Lord’s word, five other sacraments.

**Secondly**, In the cause final they err: for where the word hath ordained those sacraments to excite our faith, and to give us admonitions of spiritual things, they, contrariwise, do teach that the sacraments do not only stir up faith, but also that they avail and are effectual without

faith; “Ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis.” As is to be found in Thomas Aquinas, Scotus, Catharinus, and others more.

**Thirdly**, In the operation and effect of the sacraments they fail, where they, contrary to the mind of the Scriptures, do say that they give grace, and not only do signify, but also contain and exhibit that which they signify; to wit, grace and salvation.

**Fourthly**, They err also in application, applying their sacraments both to the quick and the dead; to them also that be absent; to remission of sins, and releasing of pain, etc.

In the sacrament of baptism they are to be reprov'd, not only for adding to the simple words of Christ's institution divers other newfound rites and fantasies of men; but also, where the use of the old church of Rome was only to baptize men, they baptize also bells; and apply the words of baptism to water, <sup>f841</sup> fire, candles, stocks, and stones, etc. But especially in the supper of the Lord their doctrine most filthily swerveth from the right mind of the Scripture, all order, reason, and fashion; most worthy to be exploded out of all christian churches. Touching which sacrament, the first error is their idolatrous abuse by worshipping, adoring, censing, knocking, and kneeling unto it; in reserving also and carrying the same about in pomp and procession in towns and fields. Secondly, also in the substance thereof their teaching is monstrous, leaving there no substance of bread and wine to remain, but only the real body and blood of Christ, putting no difference between calling and making. Because Christ called bread his body, therefore (say they) he made it his body, and so, of a wholesome sacrament, make a perilous idol: and that which the old church of Rome did ever take to be a mystery, <sup>f842</sup> they turn into a blind mist of mere accidents, to blear the people's eyes, making them believe they see that they see not, and not to see that which they see: and to worship a thing made, for their Maker, a creature for their Creator: and that which was threshed out of a wheaten sheaf, they set up in the church, and worship for a Savior: and when they have worshipped him, then they offer him to his Father: and when they have offered him, then they eat him up, or else close him fast in a pix, where, if he corrupt and putrefy before he be eaten, then they burn him to powder and ashes. And notwithstanding they know well, by the Scriptures, that the body of Christ can never corrupt

and putrefy, yet, for all this corruption, will they needs make it the body of Christ, and burn all them which believe not that which is against true christian belief.

### OF MATRIMONY.

What order and rule St. Paul hath set for marriage in his epistle to the Corinthians it is manifest; where, as he preferreth single life, in such as have the gift of continence, before the married estate, so again, in such as have not the gift, he preferreth the coupled life before the other; willing every such one to have his wife, "because of fornication." (1 Corinthians 7:2) Furthermore, how the said apostle alloweth a bishop to be the husband of one wife (so he exceed not, after the manner of the Jews, who were permitted to have many), and how vehemently he reproveth them that restrain marriage, his letters to Timothy do record (1 Timothy 3:12; 4:3). Moreover, what degrees be permitted by the law of God to marry, in the book of Leviticus is to be seen, chap. 18:3-20. Also how children ought not to marry without consent of their parents, by manifest examples of the Scriptures it is notorious.

Contrary to these ordinances of the Scripture, the new catholics of the pope's church, first do repute and call marriage a state of imperfection, and prefer single life, be it never so impure, before the same; pretending that where the one replenisheth the earth, the other filleth heaven. Furthermore, as good as the third part of Christendom, if it be not more, both men and women, they keep through co-acted vows from marriage, having no respect whether they have the gift or no. Ministers and priests, such as are found to have wives, not only they remove out of place, but also pronounce sentence of death upon them, and account their children for bastards and illegitimate. Again, as good as the third part of the year they exempt and suspend from liberty of marriage. Degrees of copulation forbidden they extend further than ever did the law of God, even to the fifth or sixth degree; which degree notwithstanding they release again, when they list, for money. Over and besides all this, they have added a new-found prohibition of spiritual kindred, that is, that such as have been gossips (or godfathers and godmothers) together, in christening another man's child, must not by their law marry together. Briefly and finally in this doctrine and cases of matrimony, they gain and rake to themselves much money

from the people, they augment horrible sodomitry, they nourish wicked adultery and much fornication, they fill the world with offenses and bastards, and give great occasion of murdering infants. <sup>F843</sup>

## OF MAGISTRATES AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Ye heard before what rules and lessons St. Paul gave to the old Romans concerning magistrates, to whose authority he would have all human creatures to be subjected; and how they are the ministers of God, having the sword given unto them, wherewith they ought to repress false doctrine and idolatry, and maintain that which is true and right (Romans 13:4). Now let us survey, a little, the pope's proceedings, and mark how far he transgresseth in this, as he doth in all other points, almost, from true christianity.

**First**, the pope with all his clergy exempt themselves from all obedience civil.

**Secondly**, they arrogate to themselves authority to ordain and constitute, without all leave or knowledge of the ordinary magistrate.

**Thirdly**, yea they take upon them to depose and set up rulers and magistrates, whom they list.

## OF PURGATORY.

The paradoxes, or rather the fantasies of the latter church of Rome concerning purgatory, be monstrous; neither old nor apostolical.

1. First (say they), there is a purgatory, where souls do burn in fire after this life.
2. The pain of purgatory differeth nothing from the pains of hell, but only that it hath an end: the pains of hell have none.
3. The painful suffering of this fire fretteth and scoureth away the sins before committed in the body.
4. The time of these pains endureth in some longer, in some less, according as their sins deserve.

5. After which time of their pains being expired, then the mercy of God doth translate them to heavenly bliss, which the body of Christ hath bought for them.
6. The pains of purgatory be so great, that if all the beggars of the world were seen on the one side, and but one soul of purgatory on the other side, the whole world would pity more that one, than all the others.
7. The whole time of punishment in this purgatory must continue so long, till the fire have clean fretted and scoured away the rusty spots of every sinful soul there burning, unless there come some release.
8. Helps and releases that may shorten the time of their purgation, by the pope's pardons and indulgences, sacrifice of the altar, diriges and trentals, <sup>f844</sup> prayer, fasting, meritorious deeds out of the treasure-house of the church, alms and charitable deeds of the living, in satisfying God's justice for them, etc.
9. Lack of belief of purgatory bringeth to hell. <sup>F845</sup>

Many other false errors and great deformities, heresies, absurdities, vanities, and follies, besides their blasphemous railings and contumelies, may be noted in the said latter church of Rome, wherein they have made manifest defection from the old faith of Rome, as in depriving the church of one kind of the sacrament; in taking from the people the knowledge and reading of God's word; in praying and speaking to the people, and administering sacraments in a tongue unknown; in mistaking the authority of the keys, in their unwritten verities; in making the authority of the Scripture insufficient; in untrue judgment of the church, and their wrong notes of the same; in the supremacy of the see of Rome; in their wrong opinion of Antichrist.

But because these, with all other parts of doctrine, are more copiously and at large comprehended in other books, both in Latin and English, set forth in these our days, I shall not need further herein to travail; especially seeing the contrariety between the pope's church and the church of Christ; between the doctrine of the one, and the doctrine of the other, is so evident, that he is blind that seeth it not, and hath no hands almost that feeleth it not.

For (briefly in one note to comprehend that which may suffice for all), whereas the doctrine of Christ is altogether spiritual, consisting wholly in spirit and verity, and requireth no outward thing to make a true christian man, but only baptism (which is the outward profession of faith), and receiving of the Lord's supper; let us now examine the whole religion of this latter church of Rome, and we shall find it, wholly from top to toe, to consist in nothing else but altogether in outward and ceremonial exercises; as outward confession, absolution at the priest's hand, outward sacrifice of the mass, buying of pardons, purchasing of obits, extern worshipping of images and relics, pilgrimage to this place or that, building of churches, founding of monasteries, outward works of the law, outward gestures, garments, colors, choice of meats, difference of times and places, peculiar rites and observances, set prayers, and number of prayers prescribed, fasting of vigils, keeping of holidays, coming to church, hearing of service, external succession of bishops and of Peter's see, external form and notes of the church, etc. So that by this religion to make a true christian and a good catholic, there is no working of the Holy Ghost almost required; as for example, to make this matter more demonstrable, let us here define a christian man after the pope's making: whereby we may see the better what is to be judged of the scope of his doctrine.

### **A CHRISTIAN MAN AFTER THE POPE'S MAKING, DEFINED.**

After the pope's catholic religion, a true christian man is thus defined: first, to be baptized in the Latin tongue (where the godfathers profess they cannot tell what); then confirmed by the bishop; the mother of the child to be purified; after he be grown in years, then to come to the church; to keep his fasting-days; to fast the Lent; to come under *Benedicite* (that is, to be confessed of the priest); to do his penance; at Easter to take his rites; to hear mass and divine service; to set up candles before images; to creep to the cross; to take holy bread and holy water; to go on procession; to carry his palms and candle, and to take ashes; to fast the ember-days, rogation-days, and vigils; to keep the holidays; to pay his tithes and offering-days; to go on pilgrimage; to buy pardons; to worship his Maker over the priest's head; to receive the pope for his supreme head, and to obey his laws; to receive St. Nicholas' clerks; to have his beads, and to give to the high altar; to take orders, if he will be a priest; to say his matins; to sing his

mass; to lift up fair; to keep his vow, and not to marry; when he is sick to be annealed, and take the rites of the holy church; to be buried in the church-yard; to be rung for; to be sung for; to be buried in a friar's cowl; to find a soul-priest, etc.

All which points being observed, who can deny but this is a devout man, and a perfect christian catholic; and sure to be saved, as a true faithful child of the holy mother-church?

Now look upon this definition, and tell me, good reader, what faith or spirit, or what working of the Holy Ghost, in all this doctrine, is to be required. The grace of our Lord Jesus give the true light of his gospel to shine in our hearts. Amen!

Σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ

# ACTS AND MONUMENTS.

## BOOK 1.

*Containing*

### THE THREE HUNDRED YEARS NEXT AFTER CHRIST, WITH THE TEN PERSECUTIONS OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

THESE things before premised, having thus hitherto prepared the way unto our story, let us now (by the grace and speed of Christ our Lord) enter into the matter: that as we have heretofore set forth, in a general description, the whole state as well of the primitive as of the latter times of this church of Rome, so now consequently, we may discourse, in particular sort, the acts and doings of every age, by itself, in such order as is before prefixed: **declaring** <sup>a22</sup> —

**First,** <sup>a22</sup> of the suffering time of the church, which containeth about the time of three hundred years after Christ.

**Secondly,** <sup>a22</sup> of the flourishing and growing time of the same, containing other three hundred years.

**Thirdly,** of the declining time of the church and of true religion, other three hundred years.

**Fourthly,** of. the time of Antichrist, reigning and raging in the church, since the loosing of Satan.

**Lastly,** of the reforming time of Christ's church, in these latter three hundred years.

In the tractation of all which things our chief purpose and endeavour shall be (so near as the Lord will give us grace), not so much to intermeddle with outward affairs of princes or matters civil (except sometimes for example of life), as specially minding, by the help of the Lord, to prosecute such things as to the ecclesiastical state of the church are appertaining: as first,

to treat of the establishing of christian faith: then, of the persecutions of tyrants; the constancy and patience of God's saints; the first conversion of christian realms to the faith of Christ (namely of this realm of England and Scotland, first beginning with king Lucius; and so forward, following the order of our English kings here in this land): lastly, to declare the maintenance of true doctrine, the false practice of prelates, the creeping in of superstition and hypocrisy, the manifold assaults, wars, and tumults of the princes of this world against the people of God. Wherein may appear the wonderful operation of Christ's mighty hand, ever working in his church, and never ceasing to defend the same against his enemies, according to the verity of his own word, wherein he promised to be with his church while the world shall stand, as, by the process of this story, may well be proved, and will be testified in the sequel thereof.

In the tractation of all which things two special points I chiefly commend to the reader, as most requisite and necessary for every christian man to observe and to note, for his own experience and profit; as, first, the disposition and nature of this world; secondly, the nature and condition of the kingdom of Christ; the vanity of the one, and stableness of the other; the unprosperous and unquiet state of the one, ruled by man's violence and wisdom, and the happy success of the other, ever ruled by God's blessing and providence; the wrath and revenging hand of God on the one, and his mercy on the other. The world, I call all such as be without or against Christ, either by ignorance not knowing him, or by heathenish life not following him, or by violence resisting him. On the other side, the kingdom of Christ in this world, I take to be all them which belong to the faith of Christ, and here take his part in this world against the world; the number of whom although it be much smaller than the other, and always, lightly, is hated and molested of the world, yet it is the number which the Lord peculiarly doth bless and prosper, and ever will. And this number of Christ's subjects is it, which we call the visible church here in earth; which visible church, having in itself a difference of two sorts of people, so is it to be divided into two parts, of which the one standeth of such as be of outward profession only, the other of such as by election inwardly are joined to Christ: the first in words and lips seem to honor Christ, and are in the visible church only, but not in the church invisible, and partake the outward sacraments of Christ, but not the inward blessing of Christ. The

other are both in the visible, and also in the invisible church of Christ, which not in words only and outward profession, but also in heart do truly serve and honor Christ, partaking not only the sacraments, but also the heavenly blessings and grace of Christ.

And many times it happeneth, that as between the world and the kingdom of Christ there is a continual repugnance, so between these two parts of this visible church aforesaid oftentimes groweth great variance and mortal persecution, insomuch that sometimes the true church of Christ hath no greater enemies than those of their own profession and company; as happened not only in the time of Christ and his apostles, but also from time to time almost ever since; <sup>f846</sup> but especially in these latter days of the church under the persecution of Antichrist and his retinue; as by the reading of these volumes more manifestly hereafter may appear.

At the first preaching of Christ, and coming of the gospel, who should rather have known and received him than the Pharisees and Scribes of that people which had his law? and yet who persecuted and rejected him more than they themselves? What followed? They, in refusing Christ to be their king, and choosing rather to be subject unto Caesar, were by the said their own Caesar at length destroyed; whereas Christ's subjects the same time escaped the danger. Whereby it is to be learned, what a dangerous thing, it is to refuse the gospel of God, when it is so gently offered.

The like example of God's wrathful punishment is to be noted no less in the Romans also themselves. For when Tiberius Caesar, having learnt by letters from Pontius Pilate of the doings of Christ, of his miracles, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, and how he was received as God of many, was himself also moved with belief of the same, and did confer thereon with the whole senate of Rome, [and proposed] to have Christ adored as God; they, not agreeing thereunto, refused him, because that, contrary to the law of the Romans, he was consecrated (said they) for God, before the senate of Rome had so decreed and approved him. <sup>F847</sup> Thus the vain senate (following rather the law of man than of God, and being contented with the emperor to reign over them, and not contented with the meek King of glory, the Son of God, to be their king) were, after much like sort with the Jews, scourged and entrapped for their unjust refusing, by the same way which they themselves did prefer. For as they

preferred the emperor, and rejected Christ, so the just permission of God did stir up their own emperors against them in such sort, that both the senators themselves were almost all destroyed, and the whole city most horribly afflicted for the space almost of three hundred years together. For first, the same Tiberius, who, for a great part of his reign, was a moderate and a tolerable prince, afterward was to them a sharp and heavy tyrant, who neither favored his own mother [Livia], nor spared his nephews <sup>f848</sup> [Drusus and Nero], nor the princes of the city, such as were his own counsellors, of whom, being of the number of twenty, he left not past two or three alive; and so cruel was he to the citizens, that, as the story <sup>f849</sup> recordeth, “Nullus a poena hominum cessabat dies, ne religiosus quidem ac sacer.” Suetonius reporteth him to be so stern of nature, and tyrannical, that, in time of his reign, very many were accused, and condemned, with their wives and children; maids also first deflowered, then put to death. In one day he recordeth twenty persons to be drawn to the place of execution. <sup>f850</sup> By whom <sup>f851</sup> also, through the just punishment of God, Pilate, under whom Christ was crucified, was apprehended and sent to Rome, [where he was accused before Caligula,] deposed, then banished to the town of Vienne in Dauphiny, <sup>f852</sup> and at length did slay himself. <sup>f853</sup> Neither did Herod and Caiaphas long escape, of whom more followeth hereafter. Agrippa the elder, also, by him was cast into prison, albeit afterward he was restored. <sup>f854</sup> In the reign of Tiberius, the Lord Jesus, the Son of God, in the four-and-thirtieth year of his age, which was the sixteenth of this emperor, by the malice of the Jews suffered his blessed passion for the conquering of sin, death, and Satan the prince of this world, and rose again the third day. After whose blessed passion and resurrection, this aforesaid Tiberius Claudius Nero (otherwise [for his wine-bibbing], called Biberius Caldius Mero <sup>f855</sup>) lived seven years, during which time no persecution was yet stirring in Rome against the christians, through the commandment of the emperor.

In the reign also of this emperor, and the year which was the next after the passion of our Savior, or somewhat more, <sup>f856</sup> St. Paul was converted to the faith.

After the death of Tiberius, when he had reigned three-and-twenty years, <sup>f856</sup> succeeded C. Caesar Caligula, Claudius Nero, and Domitius Nero: which three were likewise such scourges to the senate and people of Rome,

that the first not only took other men's wives violently from them, but also deflowered three of his own sisters, and afterward banished them. So wicked he was, that he commanded himself to be worshipped as god, and temples to be erected in his name, and used to sit in the temple among the gods, requiring his images to be set up in all temples, and also in the temple of Jerusalem; which caused great disturbance among the Jews, and then began the abomination of desolation spoken of in the gospel to be set up in the holy place. His cruelty of disposition, or else displeasure towards the Romans, was such that he wished that all the people of Rome had but one neck, that he, at his pleasure, might destroy such a multitude. By this said Caligula, Herod Antipas, the murderer of John Baptist and condemner of Christ, was condemned to perpetual banishment, where he died miserably.

<sup>F857</sup> Caiaphas also, who wickedly sat upon Christ, was the same time removed from the high priest's room, and Jonathan set in his place. The raging fierceness of this Caligula, incensed against the Romans, had not thus ceased, had not he been cut off by the hands of a tribune and other gentlemen, who slew him in the fourth year of his reign. After whose death were found in his closet two small books, one called the Sword, the other the Dagger: in which books or libels were contained the names of those senators and noblemen of Rome, whom he had purposed to put to death. Besides this Sword and Dagger, there was found also a coffer, wherein divers kinds of poisons were kept in glasses and vessels, for the purpose of destroying a wonderful number of people; which poisons, afterward being thrown into the sea, destroyed a great number of fish. <sup>F858</sup>

But that which this Caligula had only conceived, the same did the other two, which came after, bring to pass; namely, Claudius Nero, who reigned thirteen years with no little cruelty; but especially the third of these Neros, called Domitius Nero, who, succeeding after Claudius, reigned fourteen years, with such fury and tyranny, that he slew the most part of the senators, and destroyed the whole order of knighthood in Rome. <sup>F859</sup> So prodigious a monster of nature was he (more like a beast, yea rather a devil, than a man), that he seemed to be born to the destruction of men. Such was his monstrous uncleanness, that he abstained not from his own mother, his natural sister, nor from any degree of kindred. Such was his wretched cruelty, that he caused to be put to death his mother, his brother-in-law, his sister, his wife great with child, all his instructors, Seneca and

Lucan, with divers more of his own kindred and consanguinity. Moreover, he commanded Rome to be set on fire in twelve places, and so continued it six days and seven nights in burning, <sup>f860</sup> while that he, to see the example how Troy burned, sung the verses of Homer. And to avoid the infamy thereof, he laid the fault upon the christian men, and caused them to be persecuted. And so continued this miserable emperor in his reign fourteen years, till at last the senate, proclaiming him a public enemy unto mankind, condemned him to be drawn through the city, and to be whipped to death; for the fear whereof, he, flying the hands of his enemies, in the night fled to a manor of his servant's in the country, where he was forced to slay himself, complaining that he had then neither friend nor enemy left, that would do so much for him. In the latter end of this Domitius Nero, Peter and Paul were put to death for the testimony and faith of Christ, A.D. 67.

<sup>F861</sup>

Thus ye see, which is worthy to be marked, how the just scourge and heavy indignation of God from time to time ever follow, and how all things there go to ruin, neither doth any thing well prosper, where Christ Jesus, the Son of God, is contemned, and not received; as may appear, both by these examples of the Romans — who not only were thus consumed and plagued by their own emperors, but also by civil wars (whereof three happened in two years at Rome, after the death of Nero) and other casualties (as in Suetonius is testified); so that in the days of Tiberius aforesaid, five thousand Romans were hurt and slain at one time by the fall of a theater — and also most especially by the destruction of the Jews, who about this same time in the year threescore and ten, and about forty years after the passion of Christ, and the third year after the suffering of St. Peter and Paul, were destroyed by Titus, and Vespasian his father, (who succeeded after Nero in the empire) to the number of eleven hundred thousand, besides those which Vespasian slew in subduing the country of Galilee; over and beside them also which were sold and sent into Egypt and other provinces to vile slavery, to the number of seventeen thousand; two thousand were brought with Titus in his triumph; of whom, part he gave to be devoured of the wild beasts, part otherwise most cruelly were slain. By whose case all nations and realms may take example, what it is to reject the visitation of God's verity being sent, and much more to persecute them which be sent of God for their salvation.

And as this wrathful vengeance of God thus hath been showed upon this rebellious people, both of the Jews and of the Romans, for their contempt of Christ, whom God so punished by their own emperors, so neither the emperors themselves, for persecuting Christ in his members, escaped without their just reward. For among so many emperors who put so many christian martyrs to death, during the space of these first three hundred years, few or none of them escaped either being slain themselves, or dying by some miserable end; or otherwise worthily revenged.

First, of the poisoning of Tiberius, and of the slaughter of the other three Neros after him, sufficiently is declared before. After Nero Domitius, Galba, within ten months, was slain by Otho. And so did Otho afterward slay himself, being overcome by Vitellius. And was not Vitellius, shortly after drawn through the city of Rome, and, after he was tormented, thrown into the Tiber? Titus, a good emperor, is thought to be poisoned of Domitian his brother. <sup>f862</sup>

The said Domitian, after he had been a persecutor of the Christians, was slain in his chamber, not without the consent of his wife.

Likewise Commodus was murdered of Narcissus. The like end was of Pertinax and Julian. Moreover, after that Severus was slain here in England (who lieth at York), did not his son Bassianus <sup>f863</sup> slay his brother Geta, and was not he, after, slain of Martialis?

Macrinus with his son Diadumenus were both slain of their own soldiers. After whom Heliogabalus, that monstrous belly-paunch, was of his own people slain, drawn through the city, and cast into the Tiber. Alexander Severus, that worthy and learned emperor, who said he would not feed his servants, doing nothing, with the bowels of the commonwealth, although in life and virtues he was much unlike other emperors, yet proved the like end, being slain at Mentz with his godly mother Mammaea, by Maximin, whom the emperor before, of a muleteer, had advanced to great dignities: the which Maximin also, after three years, was slain himself of his soldiers. What should I speak of Maximus and Balbinus, in like sort both slain in Rome? Of Gordian slain by Philip; of Philip, the first christened emperor, <sup>f864</sup> slain, or rather martyred, for the same cause; of wicked Decius drowned, and his son slain the same time in battle; of Gallus, and Volusian his son, emperors after Decius,

both slain by conspiracy of AEmilianus, who rose against them both in war, and within three months after, was slain himself? Next to AEmilian succeeded Valerian, and Galienus his son, of whom Valerian (who was a persecutor of the Christians) was taken prisoner of the Persians, and there made a riding fool of Sapor their king, who used him for a stool to leap upon his horse; while his son Galienus, sleeping at Rome, either would not, or could not, once proffer to revenge his father's ignominy; for, after the taking of Valerian, as many emperors rose up as there were provinces in the Roman monarchy. At length Galienus also was killed by Aureolus, who warred against him.

It were too long here to speak of Aurelian, another persecutor, slain of his secretary; of Tacitus, and Florianus his brother, of whom the first reigned six months, and was slain at Pontus; the other reigned two months, and was murdered at Tarsus; of Probus, who, although a good civil emperor, yet was destroyed by his soldiers. After whom Carus, the next emperor, was slain by lightning. Next to Carus followed the impious and wicked persecutor Dioclesian, with his fellows Maximian, Galerius, Maximinus, Maxentius, and Licinius, under whom all, at one time (during the time of Dioclesian), the greatest and most grievous persecution was moved against the Christians ten years together. Of whom, Dioclesian and Maximian deposed themselves from the empire. Galerius the chiefest minister of the persecution, after his terrible persecutions, fell into a wonderful sickness, having such a sore risen in the nether part of his belly, which consumed his privy-members, and so did swarm with worms, that, being curable neither by surgery nor physic, he confessed that it happened for his cruelty towards the Christians; and so called in his proclamations against them. Notwithstanding he, not able to sustain, as some say, the stink of his sore, slew himself. Maximinus, in his war, being tormented with pain in his guts, thereof died. Maxentius was vanquished by Constantine, and drowned in the Tiber. Licinius likewise, being overcome by the said Constantine the Great, was deposed from his empire, and afterward slain by his soldiers. But, on the other side, after the time of Constantine, when the faith of Christ was received

into the imperial seat, we read of no emperor after the like sort destroyed or molested, except it were Julian, or Valens, or Basiliscus, (who expelled one Zeno, and was afterward expelled himself); beside these, we read of no emperor to come to ruin and decay, as the others before mentioned. <sup>f865</sup>

And thus have we, in brief sum, collected out of the chronicles the unquiet and miserable state of the emperors of Rome, until the time of Christian Constantine; with the examples, no less terrible than manifest, of God's severe justice upon them, for their contemptuous refusing and persecuting the faith and name of Christ their Lord.

Moreover, in much like sort and condition, if leisure of time or haste of matter would suffer me a little to digress unto more lower times, and to come more near home, the like examples I could also infer of this our country of England, concerning the terrible plagues of God against the churlish and unthankful refusing or abusing the benefit of his truth. First, we read how that God stirred up Gildas to preach to the old Britons, and to exhort them unto repentance and amendment of life, and to warn them afore of plagues to come, if they repented not. What availed it? Gildas was laughed to scorn, and taken for a false prophet, and a malicious preacher. The Britons, with lusty courages, whorish faces, and unrepentant hearts, went forth to sin, and to offend the Lord their God. What followed? God sent in their enemies on every side, and destroyed them, and gave the land to other nations.

Not many years past, God, seeing idolatry, superstition, hypocrisy, and wicked living, used in this realm, raised up that godly-learned man John Wickliff, to preach unto our fathers repentance; and to exhort them to amend their lives, to forsake their papistry and idolatry, their hypocrisy and superstition, and to walk in the fear of God. His exhortations were not regarded, he, with his sermons, was despised, his books, and he himself after his death, were burnt. What followed? They slew their right king, and set up three wrong kings on a row, under whom all the noble blood was slain up, and half the commons [in addition] thereto. What in France, with their own sword in fighting among themselves for the crown; while the cities and towns were decayed, and the land brought half to a wilderness, in respect of what it was before. O extreme plagues of God's vengeance!

Since that time, even of late years, God, once again having pity of this realm of England, raised up his prophets; namely, William Tyndale, Thomas Bilney, John Frith, doctor Barnes, Jerome, Garret, Anthony Peerson, with divers others, who, both with their writings and sermons, earnestly labored to call us unto repentance; that, by this means, the fierce wrath of God might be turned away from us. But how were they treated? How were their painful labors regarded? They themselves were condemned and burnt as heretics, and their books condemned and burnt as heretical. "The time shall come," saith Christ, "that whosoever killeth you, will think that he doth God high good service." (John 16:2)

Whether any thing since that time hath chanced to this realm worthy the name of a plague, let the godly-wise judge. If God hath deferred his punishment, or forgiven us these our wicked deeds, as I trust he hath, let us not therefore be proud and high-minded, but most humbly thank him for his tender mercies, and beware of the like ungodly enterprises hereafter. Neither is there here any need to speak of these our lower and latter times, which have been in king Henry's and king Edward's days, seeing the memory thereof is yet fresh, and cannot be forgotten. But let this pass; of this I am sure, that God, yet once again, is come on visitation to this church of England, yea, and that more lovingly and beneficially than ever he did before. For in this visitation he hath redressed many abuses, and cleansed his church of much ungodliness and superstition, and made it a glorious church, if it be compared to the old form and state. And now how grateful receivers we be, with what heart, study, and reverence, we embrace that which he hath given, that I refer either to them that see our fruits, or to the sequel, which, peradventure, will declare it. But this by the way of digression.

Now to regress again to the state of the first former times. It remaineth, that as I have set forth the justice of God upon these Roman persecutors, so now we declare their persecutions raised up against the people and servants of Christ, within the space of three hundred years after Christ; which persecutions in number commonly are counted to be ten, besides the persecutions first moved by the Jews, in Jerusalem and other places, against the apostles. In the which, first St. Stephen the deacon was put to death; with divers others more, in the same rage of time either slain or cast into prison. At the doing whereof, Saul the same time played the doughty

pharisee, being not yet converted to the faith of Christ, whereof the history is plain, set forth at large by St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles.

After the martyrdom of this blessed Stephen, suffered next James the holy apostle of Christ, and brother of John. Of which James mention is made in the twelfth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where is declared, how that not long after the stoning of Stephen, king Herod stretched forth his hand, to take and afflict certain of the congregation, among whom James was one, whom he slew with the sword. Of this James, Eusebius <sup>f866</sup> also inferreth mention, alleging Clement, thus writing a memorable story of him.

“This James,” saith Clement, “when he was brought to the tribunal seat, he that brought him and was the cause of his trouble, seeing him to be condemned and that he should suffer death, as he went to the execution, being moved therewith in heart and conscience, confessed himself also, of his own accord, to be a christian. And so were they led forth together, where in the way he desired of James to forgive him what he had done. After that James had a little paused with himself upon the matter, turning to him, ‘Peace,’ saith he, ‘be to thee, brother;’ and kissed him. And both were beheaded together, A.D. 36.”

Dorotheus in his book named “Synopsis,” <sup>f867</sup> testifieth, that Nicanor, one of the seven deacons, with two thousand others which believed in Christ, suffered also the same day, when Stephen did suffer. The said Dorotheus witnesseth also, that Timon, another of the deacons, bishop afterward of Bostra <sup>f868</sup> in Arabia, was there burned. Parmenas also, another of the deacons, suffered. <sup>F869</sup> Thomas preached to the Parthians, <sup>f870</sup> Medes, and Persians, also to the Carmanians, Hyrcanians, Bactrians, and Magians. He suffered in Calamina, <sup>f871</sup> a city of India, <sup>f872</sup> being slain with a dart. Jude, brother of James the younger, called also Thaddaeus, and Lebbeus, preached to the Edessenens, and to all Mesopotamia: he was slain under Abgarus, king of the Edessenens, in Berytus. <sup>F873</sup>

Simon, who was brother to Jude above mentioned, and to James the younger, who all were the sons of Mary Cleophas and of Alpheus, was bishop of Jerusalem after James, and was crucified in a city of Egypt in the time of Trajan the emperor, as Dorotheus recordeth. Simon the apostle, called Cananeus and Zelotes, preached in Mauritania, and in the country of

Africa, and in Britain: he was likewise crucified. But Abdias writeth, that he and the apostle Jude were both slain by a tumult of the people in Suanir a city of Persia. <sup>F874</sup>

Mark, the evangelist and first bishop of Alexandria, preached the gospel in Egypt, and there, drawn with ropes unto the fire, was burnt, and afterward buried in a place called there “Bucolus,” under the reign of Trajan the emperor. <sup>F875</sup> Bartholomew is said also to have preached to the Indians, and to have converted the gospel of St. Matthew into their tongue; where he continued a great space, doing many miracles. At last in Albinopolis, a city of greater Armenia, after divers persecutions, he was beaten down with staves, then crucified; and after, being excoriate, he was at length beheaded. <sup>F876</sup>

Of Andrew the apostle and brother to Peter, thus writeth Jerome in his book <sup>f877</sup> “Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.” “Andrew the brother of Peter (in the time and reign of Vespasian, as our ancestors have reported) did preach, in the year fourscore of our Lord Jesus Christ, to the Scythians, Sogdians, to the Sacae, and in a city which is called Sebastopolis, where the Ethiopians do now inhabit. He was buried in Patrae, a city of Achaia, being crucified by AEgeas, the governor of the Edessenes.” Hitherto writeth Jerome, although in the number of years he seemeth a little to miss: <sup>f878</sup> for Vespasian reached not to the year fourscore after Christ. But Bernard, in his second sermon, and St. Cyprian, in his book “De duplici Martyrio,” do make mention of the confession and martyrdom of this blessed apostle; whereof partly out of these, partly out of other credible writers, we have collected after this manner:

That when Andrew, being conversant in a city of Achaia called Patrae, through his diligent preaching, had brought many to the faith of Christ, AEgeas the governor, knowing this, resorted thither, to the intent he might constrain as many as did believe Christ to be God, by the whole consent of the senate, to do sacrifice unto the idols, and so give divine honor unto them. Andrew, thinking good at the beginning to resist the wicked counsel and the doings of AEgeas, went unto him, saying to this effect unto him: “that it behoved him who was judge of men, first to know his Judge which dwelleth in heaven, and then to worship him being known; and so,

in worshipping the true God, to revoke his mind from false gods and blind idols.” These words spake Andrew to the proconsul. But he, greatly therewith discontented, demanded of him, whether he was the same Andrew that did overthrow the temple of the gods, and persuade men to be of that superstitious sect, which the Romans of late had commanded to be abolished and rejected. Andrew did plainly affirm, that the princes of the Romans did not understand the truth, and that the Son of God coming from heaven into the world for man’s sake, hath taught and declared how those idols, whom they so honored as gods, were not only not *gods*, but also most cruel *devils*; enemies to mankind, teaching the people nothing else but that wherewith God is offended, and, being offended, turneth away and regardeth them not; and so by the wicked service of the devil, they do fall headlong into all wickedness, and, after their departing, nothing remaineth unto them, but their evil deeds. But the proconsul esteeming these things to be as vain, especially seeing the Jews (as he said) had crucified Christ before, therefore charged and commanded Andrew not to teach and preach such things any more; or, if he did, that he should be fastened to the cross with all speed.

Andrew, abiding in his former mind very constant, answered thus concerning the punishment which he threatened: “He would not have preached the honor and glory of the cross, if he had feared the death of the cross.” Whereupon sentence of condemnation was pronounced; that Andrew, teaching and enterprising a new sect, and taking away the religion of their gods, ought to be crucified. <sup>F879</sup> Andrew, going toward the place, and seeing afar off the cross prepared, did change neither countenance nor color, as the imbecility of mortal men is wont to do, neither did his blood shrink, neither did he fail in his speech, his body fainted not, neither was his mind molested, nor did his understanding fail him, as it is the manner of men to do, but out of the abundance of his heart his mouth did speak, and fervent charity did appear in his words as kindled sparks; he said, “O cross, <sup>f880</sup> most welcome and long looked for! with a willing mind, joyfully and desirously, I come to thee, being the scholar of him which did hang on thee:

because I have been always thy lover, and have coveted to embrace thee.”<sup>F881</sup> So, being crucified, he yielded up the ghost and fell on sleep, the day before the Kalends of December.

Matthew, otherwise named Levi, first of a publican made an apostle, wrote his gospel to the Jews in the Hebrew tongue.<sup>F882</sup> After he had converted to the faith AETHiopia and all Egypt, Hireanus, their king, sent one to run him through with a spear, as writeth the aforementioned Johannes de Monte Regali. Concerning the doings and decrements of this blessed apostle and evangelist, divers things are recorded by Julius Africanus,<sup>f883</sup> under the pretended name of Abdias; also by Vincentius, Perionius, and others; but in such sort, as, by the contents, the matter may greatly be suspected not to lack some crafty forgery, for the more establishment of later decretals and Romish doctrine; as touching merits, consecration of nuns, the superstitious prescription of Lent-fast, not only in abstaining from all flesh meats, but also from all matrimonial intercourse between man and wife, during the said time of holy Lent: *Item*, the strict prohibition not to taste any bodily sustenance, before receiving of the Lord’s supper: in ordaining of mass; and that no nun must marry after the vow of her profession, with other such-like.

Johannes de Monte Regali,<sup>f884</sup> testifieth of Matthias, after he had preached to the Jews, at length he was stoned and beheaded. Some others record that he died in AETHiopia.

Philip, the holy apostle, after he had much labored among the barbarous nations in preaching the word of salvation to them, at length suffered, as the other apostles did, in Hierapolis, a city of Phrygia, being there crucified and stoned to death; where also he was buried, and his daughters also with him.<sup>F885</sup>

**OF JAMES, THE BROTHER<sup>a23</sup> OF THE LORD,  
THUS WE READ IN EUSEBIUS.<sup>F886</sup>**

After that Festus had sent the apostle Paul to Rome after his appellation made at Cesarea, and that the Jews, by the means thereof, had lost their hope of performing their malicious vow against him conceived, they fell upon James, the brother of our Lord, who was bishop at Jerusalem, against whom they were bent

with like malice, and brought him forth before them, and required him to deny, before all the people, the faith of Christ. But he, otherwise than they all looked for, freely and with a greater constancy, before all the multitude confessed Jesus to be the Son of God, our Savior and our Lord. Whereupon they, not being able to abide the testimony of this man any longer, because he was thought to be the justest of all men, for the divine wisdom and godliness which he exhibited in his life, they killed him; finding the more opportunity to accomplish their mischief, because the government at that time was vacant. For, Festus being dead in Jewry, the administration of that province was destitute of a ruler, and a deputy. But after what manner James was killed, the words of Clement do declare, who writeth that he was cast down from the pinnacle of the temple, and being smitten with a club, was slain. But Hegesippus,<sup>f887</sup> who lived in the time next after the apostles, in the fifth book of his Commentaries, writeth most accurately about him, as followeth: —

James, the brother of our Lord, took in hand to govern the church with the apostles, being counted of all men, from the time of our Lord, to be a just and perfect man. Many and divers other Jameses there were beside him, but this was born holy from his mother's womb. He drank no wine nor any strong drink, neither did he eat any animal food; the razor never came upon his head; he was not anointed with oil, neither did he use the bath; to him only was it lawfull to enter into the holy place, for he was not clothed with woollen, but with linen only; (See Leviticus 16:2-4. — ED.) and he used to enter into the temple alone, and there, falling upon his knees, ask remission for the people; so that his knees, by oft kneeling (for worshipping God, and craving forgiveness for the people), lost the sense of feeling, being benumbed and hardened like the knees of a camel. He was, for the excellency of his just life, called "The Just," and, "Oblias," which means in Hebrew "the safeguard of the people" and "justice," as the prophets declare of him: therefore, when many belonging to the seven sects of the Jews<sup>f888</sup> asked him what the door of Jesus was, he answered, that he was the Savior. Whereupon some believed Jesus to be Christ; but

the aforesaid sects neither believe the resurrection, neither that any shall come, who shall render unto every man according to his works; but as many of them as believed, believed for James's preaching. When many therefore of their chief men did believe, there was a tumult made of the Jews, scribes, and pharisees, saying; There is danger, lest all the people should look for this Jesus, as the Christ. Therefore they gathered themselves together, and said to James, "We beseech thee restrain the people, for they believe in Jesus, as though he were Christ; we pray thee persuade all them which come unto the feast of the passover to think rightly of Jesus; for we all give heed to thee, and all the people do testify of thee that thou art just, and that thou dost not accept the person of any man. Therefore persuade the people that they be not deceived about Jesus, for all the people and we ourselves are ready to obey thee. Therefore stand upon the pinnacle of the temple, that thou mayest be seen above, and that thy words may be heard of all the people; for all the tribes with many gentiles are come together for the passover." And thus the forenamed scribes and pharisees did set James upon the battlements of the temple, and they cried unto him, and said, "Thou just man, whom all we ought to obey, because this people is going astray after Jesus which is crucified, tell what is the door of Jesus crucified." <sup>F889</sup> And he answered with a loud voice, "Why do you ask me of Jesus the Son of man? He sitteth on the right hand of the Most High, and shall come in the clouds of heaven." Whereupon many were persuaded and glorified God, upon this witness of James, and said, "Hosannah, to the Son of David." Then the scribes and the pharisees said among themselves, "We have done evil, that we have caused such a testimony of Jesus; let us go up, and throw him down, that others, being moved with fear, may deny that faith." And they cried out, saying, "Oh, oh, this just man also is seduced" and they fulfilled that scripture which is written in Isaiah, "Let us take away the just man, because he is not profitable for us, wherefore let them eat the fruits of their works." <sup>F890</sup> Therefore they went up to throw down the just man. Yet he was not killed by the fall, but, turning, fell down upon his knees, saying, "O Lord God, Father, I beseech thee to forgive them, for they know not what they do." (Luke 23:34)

And they said among themselves, "Let us stone the just man, James;" and they took him to smite him with stones. But while they were smiting him with stones, a priest, one of the children of Rechab, a descendant of the Rechabites mentioned in Jeremiah the prophet, said to them, "Leave off what do ye? The just man prayeth for you." And one of those who were present, a fuller, took an instrument, wherewith they did use to beat and purge cloth, and smote the just man on his head, and so he finished his testimony. And they buried him in the same place, and his pillar abideth still by the temple. He was a true witness for Christ to the Jews and the Gentiles. And shortly after, Vespasian the emperor, destroying the land of Jewry, brought them into captivity.

These things thus written at large by Hegesippus, do well agree with those which Clement did write of him. <sup>F891</sup> This James was so notable a man for his justice, that he was had in honor of all men; insomuch that the wise men of the Jews, shortly after his martyrdom, did impute the besieging of Jerusalem, and other calamities which happened unto them, to no other cause, but unto the violence and injury done to this man. Also Josephus hath not left this out of his history, where he speaketh of him after this manner: "These things so chanced unto the Jews in revenge of that just man James, the brother of Jesus whom they called Christ, for the Jews killed him, although he was a righteous man." <sup>F892</sup>

The same Josephus declareth his death in the twentieth book of his Antiquities, <sup>f893</sup> saying, "Caesar, hearing of the death of Festus, sent Albinus, as procurator, into Jewry: but Ananus the younger, of the sect of the Sadducees, being high-priest, and trusting that he had obtained a convenient time [to shew his authority], seeing that Festus was dead, and Albinus yet on the road, assembled the Sanhedrim, and, calling many unto him, among whom was James, the brother of Jesus who is called Christ, he delivered them to be stoned, accusing them as breakers of the law."

Whereby it appeareth, that many others also, besides James, at the same time were martyred and put to death among the Jews, for the faith of Christ.

## A DESCRIPTION OF THE TEN FIRST PERSECUTIONS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH, WITH THE VARIETY OF THEIR TORMENTS.

These things being thus declared for the martyrdom of the apostles, and the **persecution of the Jews:** <sup>a24</sup> now let us (by the grace of Christ our Lord) comprehend with like brevity, the persecutions raised by the Romans against the Christians in the primitive age of the church, during the space of three hundred years, till the coming of godly Constantine, which persecutions are reckoned by Eusebius, and by the most part of writers, to the number of ten most special. <sup>F894</sup> Wherein marvellous it is to see and read the numbers incredible of christian innocents that were slain and tormented, some one way, some another, as Rabanus saith, and saith truly, “Some slain with sword; some burnt with fire; some with whips scourged; some stabbed with forks of iron; some fastened to the cross or gibbet; some drowned in the sea; some their skins plucked off; some their tongues cut off; some stoned to death; some killed with cold; some starved with hunger; some their hands cut off alive, or otherwise dismembered, have been so left naked to the open shame of the world,” etc. <sup>f895</sup> Whereof Augustine also thus saith, “Ligabantur, includebantur, caedebantur, torquebantur, urebantur laniabantur, trucidabantur, multiplicabantur, non pugnantes pro salute, sed salutem contemnentis pro servatore.” <sup>F896</sup> Whose kinds of punishments, although they were divers, yet the manner of constancy in all these martyrs was one. And yet, notwithstanding the sharpness of these so many and sundry torments, and also the like cruelty of the tormentors, yet such was the number of these constant saints that suffered, or rather such was the power of the Lord in his saints, that, **as Jerome, in his epistle** <sup>a25</sup> to Chromatius and Heliodorus, saith, “There is no day in the whole year, unto which the number of five thousand martyrs cannot be ascribed, except only the first day of January.” <sup>F897</sup>

### THE FIRST PERSECUTION.

The first of these ten persecutions was stirred up by Nero Domitius before mentioned, the sixth emperor, about the year of our Lord threescore

and four. The tyrannous rage of which emperor was very fierce against the Christians, “Insomuch that (as Eusebius recordeth) a man might then see cities full of men’s bodies, the old there lying together with the young, and the dead bodies of women cast out naked, without all reverence of that sex, in the open streets,” etc. <sup>f898</sup> Likewise Orosius, writing of the said Nero, saith, “that he was the first who in Rome did raise up persecution against the Christians; and not only in Rome, but also through all the provinces thereof; thinking to abolish and to destroy the very name of Christians in all places,” etc. <sup>f899</sup> Whereunto accordeth, moreover, the testimony of Jerome upon Daniel, saying, that many there were of the Christians in those days, who, seeing the filthy abominations and intolerable cruelty of Nero, thought that he was Antichrist.

In this persecution, among many other saints, the blessed apostle Peter was condemned to death, and crucified, as some do write, at Rome; albeit some others, and not without cause, do doubt thereof: concerning whose life and history, because it is sufficiently described in the text of the Gospel, and in the Acts of St. Luke, I need not here to make any great repetition thereof. As touching the cause and manner of his death, divers there be which make relation, as Jerome, Hegesippus, Eusebius, Abdias, and others, although they do not all precisely agree in the time. The words of Jerome be these:

“Simon Peter, the son of Jonas, of the province of Galilee, and of the town of Bethsaida, the brother of Andrew, after he had been bishop of the church of Antioch, and had preached to them of the circumcision that believed, dispersed in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, in the second year of Claudius the emperor [which was about the year of our Lord 42] <sup>f900</sup> came to Rome to withstand Simon Magus, and there kept the priestly chair the space of five and twenty years, <sup>f901</sup> until the last year of the aforesaid Nero, which was the fourteenth year of his reign, of whom he was crucified, his head being down and his feet upward, himself so requiring, because he was (he said) unworthy to be crucified after the same form and manner as the Lord was.” <sup>F902</sup>

Hegesippus, prosecuting this matter something more at large, and Abdias <sup>f903</sup> also (if any authority is to be given to his book, <sup>f904</sup> which, following

not only the sense, but also the very form of words, of Hegesippus in this history, seemeth to be extracted out of him and of other authors), saith, <sup>f905</sup>

Simon Magus, being then a great man with Nero, and his president and keeper of his life, <sup>f906</sup> was required upon a time to be present at the raising up of a certain noble young man in Rome, of Nero's kindred, lately departed; where Peter, also, was desired to come to the reviving of the said personage. But when Magus, in the presence of Peter, could not do it, then Peter, calling upon the name of the Lord Jesus, did raise him up, and restored him to his mother: whereby the estimation of Simon Magus began greatly to decay and to be detested in Rome. Not long after, the said Magus threatened the Romans that he would leave the city, and, in their sight, fly away from them into heaven. So, the day being appointed, Magus taking his wings in the mount Capitolinus began to fly in the air: but Peter, by the power of the Lord Jesus, brought him down with his wings headlong to the ground; by the which fall his legs and joints were broken, and he thereupon died. Then Nero, sorrowing for the death of him, sought matter against Peter to put him to death; which, when the people perceived, they entreated Peter with much ado that he would fly the city. Peter, through their importunity at length persuaded, prepared himself to avoid. But, coming to the gate, he saw the Lord Christ come to meet him, to whom he, worshipping, said, "Lord, whither dost thou go?" To whom he answered and said, "I am come again to be crucified." By this, Peter, perceiving his suffering to be understood, returned back into the city again, and so was he crucified in manner as is before declared.

This is out of Hegesippus. Eusebius, moreover, writing of the death not only of Peter, but also of his wife, affirmeth, that Peter, seeing his wife going to her martyrdom (belike as he was yet hanging upon the cross), was greatly joyous and glad thereof, who, crying unto her with a loud voice, and calling her by her name, bade her "remember the Lord Jesus." Such was then (saith Eusebius) the blessed bond of marriage among the saints of God. <sup>F907</sup> And thus much of Peter.

Paul, the apostle, who before was called Saul, after his great travail and unspeakable labors in promoting the gospel of Christ, suffered also in this first persecution under Nero, and was beheaded. Of whom thus writeth Jerome in his “Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum:”

Paul, otherwise called Saul, one of the apostles, yet out of the number of the twelve, was of the tribe of Benjamin, and of a town of Jewry called Giscala; which town being taken of the Romans, he with his parents fled to Tarsus, a town of Cilicia; afterward was sent up by his parents to Jerusalem, and there brought up in the knowledge of the law, at the feet of Gamaliel, and was a doer of the death of Stephen. And when he had received letters from the high priest to persecute the Christians, by the way, going to Damascus, he was stricken down of the Lord’s glory; and, of a persecutor, was made a professor, an apostle, a martyr, a witness of the gospel, and a vessel of election.

Among his other manifold labors and travails in spreading the doctrine of Christ, he first won Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus, to the faith of Christ, whereupon he took his name, as some suppose, turned from Saul to Paul. After he had passed through divers places and countries in his laborious peregrinations, in company with Barnabas, he went up to Jerusalem, to Peter, James, and John, where he was ordained and sent out with Barnabas to preach unto the Gentiles. And because it is in the Acts of the Apostles sufficiently comprehended concerning the admirable conversion and conversation of this most worthy apostle, that which remaineth of the rest of his history I will here add, how the said apostle Paul, the five and twentieth year after the passion of the Lord, in the second year of Nero, at what time Festus ruled in Jewry, was sent up in bonds to Rome, where he, dwelling in his free hostery two years together, disputed daily against the Jews, proving Christ to be come (Acts 28:30). And here is to be noted, that, after his first answer or purgation there made at Rome, the emperor Nero not yet fully confirmed in his empire and not yet bursting out into those mischiefs which histories report of him, he was at that time by Nero discharged, and dismissed to preach the gospel in the west parts, [and about the coasts of Italy]

<sup>f908</sup> ; as he himself afterward, in his second epistle to Timothy, (2 Timothy 4:16 [This passage proves that Peter was not then at Rome: see “Essays on Romanism,” Seeley and Burnside, London 1839, p. 175. — ED.] written in his second apprehension (in which also he suffered), witnesseth, saying, “In my first purgation no man stood with me, but all did forsake me: the Lord lay it not to their charge! But the Lord stood with me, and did comfort me, that the preaching of his word might proceed by me, and that all the Gentiles might hear and be taught. And I was delivered out of the lion’s mouth.” In which place, by the lion he plainly meaneth Nero. [And afterwards likewise he saith, “I was delivered from the mouth of the lion.” And again, “The Lord hath delivered me out from all evil works, and hath saved me unto his heavenly kingdom.”] <sup>f909</sup> Speaking this, because he perceived then the time of his martyrdom to be near at hand. For in the same epistle before, he saith, “I am now ready to be offered up, and the time of my dissolution draweth on.”

Thus, then, this worthy preacher and messenger of the Lord, in the fourteenth year of Nero, and the same day on which Peter was crucified [although not in the same year, as some write, but in the next year following], <sup>f908</sup> was beheaded at Rome for the testimony of Christ, and was buried in the way of Ostia, the seven and thirtieth year after the passion of the Lord. He wrote nine epistles to Seven churches; to the Romans one, to the Corinthians two, to the Galatians one, to the Ephesians one, to the Philippians one, to the Colossians one, to the Thessalonians two. Moreover he wrote to his disciples, to Timothy two, to Titus one, to Philemon one.

The epistle which beareth the title to the Hebrews, some think not to be his, for the difference of the style and phrase, but either judged to be written of Barnabas, as Tertullian supposeth, or of St. Luke, as others think; or else of Clement, afterward bishop of Rome, who, as they say, compiling together the sayings and sentences of Paul, did phrase them in his own style and manner. Or rather, as some do judge, because St. Paul wrote unto the Hebrews, for the odiousness of his name among that people he dissembled, and confessed not, his name in the first entry of his salutation,

contrary to his accustomed condition. And as he wrote to the Hebrews, being himself a Hebrew, so he wrote in Hebrew, that is, his own tongue, the more eloquently; and this, afterward, was after a more eloquent manner translated into the Greek, than his other epistles be written in. And that is thought to be the cause why it differeth from his other epistles. Some also acknowledge as his the epistle to Laodicea, but that is rejected of most men. <sup>F910</sup>

As touching the time and order of the death and martyrdom of St. Paul, as Eusebius, Jerome, Maximus, and other authors do but briefly pass it over, so Abdias (if his book be of any substantial authority), speaking more largely of the same, doth say, “that after the crucifying of Peter, and the ruin of Simon Magus, Paul, yet remaining in free custody, was dismissed and delivered at that time from martyrdom by God’s permission, that all the Gentiles might be replenished with preaching of the gospel by him. And the same Abdias, proceeding in his story, <sup>f911</sup> declareth moreover,

That as Paul was thus occupied at Rome, he was accused to the emperor, not only for teaching new doctrine, but also for stirring up sedition against the empire. For this he, being called before Nero, and demanded to show the order and manner of his doctrine, there declared what his doctrine was: to teach all men peace and charity; how to love one another; how to prevent one another in honor; rich men not to be puffed up in pride, nor to put their trust in their treasures, but in the living God; mean men to be contented with food and raiment, and with their present state; poor men to rejoice in their poverty with hope; fathers to bring up their children in the fear of God; children to obey their parents; husbands to love their wives; wives to be subject to their husbands; citizens and subjects to give their tribute unto Caesar, and to be subject to their magistrates; masters to be courteous, not churlish to their servants; servants to deal faithfully with their masters: and this to be the sum of his teaching. Which his doctrine “he received not of men, nor by men, but by Jesus Christ, and the Father of glory,” which spake to him from heaven, the Lord Jesus saying to him, “That he should go and preach his name, and that he would be with him, and would be the Spirit of life to all that believed in him; and that whatsoever he did or said, he would, justify it,” etc. After that Paul

had thus declared unto the emperor, shortly after sentence of death was pronounced against him, that he should be beheaded. Unto whose execution then Nero sent two of his esquires, Ferega and Parthemius, to bring him word of his death. They, coming to Paul, instructing then the people, desired him to pray for them, that they might believe; who told them, that shortly after they should believe, and be baptized at his sepulcher. This done, the soldiers came and led him out of the city to the place of execution, where he, after his prayers made, gave his neck to the sword.

Abdias reporteth <sup>f912</sup> that as his head was stricken off, instead of blood issued out white milk; and that at laying down his head, he signed himself with the sign of a cross in his forehead: but this being found in no other history, Abdias seemeth either to add it of his own, or else to borrow out of the legend, as he doth many other things beside, whereof more shall be said (Christ willing) hereafter. Although the same miracle of milk flowing out of his neck, is referred also unto Ambrose, who in his threescore-and-eighth sermon (if it be not counterfeited) seemeth to affirm the same. Of the time and year when these blessed apostles did suffer, histories do not all agree. They that follow the common opinion, and the pope's decrees, say, that Peter and Paul both suffered in one day, and in one year; which opinion seemeth to be taken out of Dionysius, bishop of Corinth. Jerome in his "Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum" affirmeth, that they both suffered in one day, but he expresseth not the year. <sup>F913</sup> So do Isidore and Eusebius. Simon Metaphrastes bringeth in the opinion of some which think that Paul suffered not with Peter, but after Peter. Prudentius in his "Περὶ στεφάνων" noteth, that they both were put to death upon the same day, but not in the same year, and saith, that Paul followed Peter a year after. <sup>F914</sup>

Abdias, above mentioned, recordeth that Paul suffered two years after Peter. But, if it be true which Abdias also saith, that after the crucifying of Peter, Paul remained in free custody at Rome (as mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles), which was, as Jerome witnesseth, <sup>f915</sup> the third or fourth year of Nero, then must it be ten years betwixt the martyrdom of Peter and of Paul, forasmuch as it is by all writers confessed, that Paul suffered the fourteenth year, which was the last year of Nero. And so Abdias

seemeth neither to agree with other authors, nor with himself. And thus much of the first persecution.

### THE SECOND PERSECUTION.

The first Roman persecution beginning under Nero, as is aforesaid, ceased under Vespasian, who gave some rest to the poor Christians. After whose reign was moved, not long after, the second persecution, by the emperor Domitian, brother of Titus. Of whom Eusebius and Orosius so write, that he, first beginning mildly and modestly, afterward did so far outrage in pride intolerable, that he commanded himself to be worshipped as god, and that images of gold and silver in his honor should be set up in the capitol. The chiefest nobles of the senators, either upon envy, or for their goods, he caused to be put to death, some openly, and some he sent into banishment, there causing them to be slain privily. And as his tyranny was unmeasurable, so the intemperance of his life was no less. <sup>F916</sup> He put to death <sup>f917</sup> all the nephews of Judas, called the Lord's brother, and caused to be sought out and to be slain all that could be found of the stock of David (as Vespasian also did before him), for fear lest he were yet to come of the house of David, who should enjoy the kingdom. In the time of this persecutor, Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, after other torments, was crucified to death, whom Justus afterward succeeded in that bishopric. <sup>F918</sup>

In this persecution, John, the apostle and evangelist, was exiled by the said Domitian into Patmos. Of whom divers and sundry memorable acts be reported in sundry chronicles. As first, how he was put in a vessel of boiling oil, by the proconsul of Ephesus. The legend and Perionius <sup>f919</sup> say, It was done at Rome. Isidore also writing of him, and comprehending many things in few words, declareth, that he turned boughs of trees into gold, and stones by the sea side into jewels, to satisfy the desire of two, whom he had before persuaded to renounce their riches: and afterward they, repenting that for worldly treasure they had lost heaven, for their sakes again he changed the same into their former substance. Also, how he raised up a widow, and a certain young man, from death to life. How he drank poison, and it hurt him not; raising also to life two which had drank the same before. <sup>F920</sup> These and such other miracles, although they may be true, and are found in Isidore and other writers more, yet because they are no articles of our christian belief, I let them pass, and only content myself

with that which I read in Jerome, <sup>f921</sup> declaring of him in this wise: that after Nero, in the second persecution, raised by Domitian in his fourteenth year, John was banished into Patmos for the testimony of the word, in the year fourscore and fifteen. And after the death of the aforesaid Domitian, he being slain and his acts repealed by the senate, John was again released under Nerva, <sup>f922</sup> the emperor, and came to Ephesus in the year fourscore and seventeen; where he continued until the time of Trajan, and there governed the churches in Asia, where also he wrote his gospel; and so lived till the year after the passion of our Lord, threescore and eight, which was the year of his age, about one hundred. <sup>F923</sup>

Moreover, in the aforesaid ecclesiastical history of Eusebius we read, that John the apostle and evangelist, whom the Lord did love, was in Asia, where he, having returned out of Patmos after the death of Domitian, governed the churches and congregations. <sup>F924</sup> Irenaeus, in his second book, thus writeth: “And of him all the elders do witness, which were with John, the disciple of the Lord, in Asia, that he told them these things, for he continued there with them unto the time of Trajan.” Also, the said Irenaeus in like words declareth, saying, “The church of the Ephesians, being first founded by Paul, afterward being presided over by John (who continued in the same city unto the time of Trajan the emperor), is a true witness of this apostolical tradition,” etc. <sup>f925</sup> **Clement of Alexandria, moreover,** <sup>a26</sup> in his book intituled *Τὴς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος* both noteth the time of this holy apostle, and also addeth to the same a certain history of him, not unworthy to be remembered of such as delight in things honest and profitable. The words of the author <sup>f926</sup> setting forth this history be these:

Hear a fable, and yet not a fable, but a true report which was told us of John the apostle, and has been ever since kept in our remembrance. After the death of the tyrant, when John was returned to Ephesus from the isle of Patmos, he was requested to resort to the places bordering near unto him, partly to constitute bishops, partly to dispose the causes and matters of the church, partly to ordain to the clerical office such as the Holy Ghost should elect. Whereupon, when he was come to a certain city not far off, (the name of which also some do mention) <sup>f927</sup> and had comforted the brethren as usual, he beheld a young man robust in body, and of a beautiful countenance, and of a fervent mind, when,

looking earnestly at the newly-appointed bishop: "I most solemnly commend this man (saith he) to thee, in presence here of Christ and of the church."

When the bishop had received of him this charge, and had promised his faithful diligence therein, again the second time John spake unto him, and charged him with like manner and contestation as before. This done, John returned again to Ephesus. The bishop, receiving the young man commended and committed to his charge, brought him home, kept him, and nourished him, and at length also did illuminate, that is, baptized him; and after that, he gradually relaxed his care and oversight of him, trusting that he had given him the best safeguard possible in putting the Lord's seal upon him. The young man thus having his liberty more, it chanced that certain of his old companions and acquaintances, being idle, dissolute, and hardened in wickedness, did join in company with him, who first invited him to sumptuous and riotous banquets; then enticed him to go forth with them in the night to rob and steal; after that he was allured by them unto greater mischief and wickedness. Wherein, by custom of time, and by little and little, he becoming more expert, and being of a good wit, and a stout courage, like unto a wild or unbroken horse, leaving the right way and running at large without bridle, was carried headlong to the profundity of all disorder and outrage. And thus, being past all hope of grace, utterly forgetting and rejecting the wholesome doctrine of salvation which he had learned before, he began to set his mind upon no small matters. And forasmuch as he was entered so far in the way of perdition, he cared not how much further he proceeded in the same. And so, associating unto him a band of companions and fellow thieves, he took upon himself to be as head and captain among them, in committing all kind of murder and felony.

In the mean time it chanced that of necessity John was sent for to those quarters again, and came. The causes being decided and his business ended for the which he came, by the way meeting with the bishop afore specified, he requireth of him the pledge, which, in the presence of Christ and of the congregation then present, he left in his hands to keep. The bishop, something amazed at the words of

John, supposing he had meant them of some money committed to his custody, which he had not received (and yet durst not mistrust John, nor contrary his words), could not tell what to answer. Then John, perceiving his perplexity, and uttering his meaning more plainly: "The young man," saith he, "and the soul of our brother committed to your custody, I do require." Then the bishop, with a loud voice sorrowing and weeping, said, "He is dead." To whom John said, "How, and by what death?" The other said, "He is dead to God, for he became an evil and abandoned man, and at length a robber. And now he doth frequent the mountain instead of the church, with a company of villains and thieves, like unto himself." Here the apostle rent his garments, and, with a great lamentation, said, "A fine keeper of his brother's soul I left here! get me a horse, and let me have a guide with me:" which being done, his horse and man procured, he hasted from the church as much as he could, and coming to the place, was taken of thieves that lay on the watch. But he, neither flying nor refusing, said, "I came hither for the purpose: lead me," said he, "to your captain." So he being brought, the captain all armed fiercely began to look upon him; and eftsoons coming to the knowledge of him, was stricken with confusion and shame, and began to fly. But the old man followed him as much as he might, forgetting his age, and crying, "My son, why dost thou fly from thy father? an armed man from one naked, a young man from an old man? Have pity on me, my son, and fear not, for there is yet hope of salvation. I will make answer for thee unto Christ; I will die for thee, if need be; as Christ hath died for us, I will give my life for thee; believe me, Christ hath sent me." He, hearing these things, first, as in a maze, stood still, and therewith his courage was abated. After that he had cast down his weapons, by and by he trembled, yea, and wept bitterly; and, coming to the old man, embraced him, and spake unto him with weeping (as well as he could), being even then baptized afresh with tears, only his right hand being hid and covered. Then the apostle, after that he had promised and firmly ascertained him that he should obtain remission of our Savior, and also prayed, falling down upon his knees, and kissing his murderous right hand (which for shame he durst not show before) as now purged through repentance, he

brought him back to the church. And when he had prayed for him with continual prayer and daily fastings, and had comforted and confirmed his mind with many sentences, he left him not (as the author reporteth) before he had restored him to the church again; and made him a great example of sincere penitence and proof of regeneration, and a trophy of the future <sup>f928</sup> resurrection.

Moreover, the aforesaid Irenaeus <sup>f929</sup> and Eusebius, <sup>f930</sup> prosecuting the history of John, declare in these words, saying, “There were certain which heard Polycarp say, that John, the disciple of our Lord, going into Ephesus to be washed, seeing Cerinthus within, he leaped out of the bath unbathed, because he feared the bath should have fallen, seeing that Cerinthus, an enemy to the truth, was within. Such fear had the apostles,” saith Irenaeus, “that they would not communicate a word with them that adulterated the truth.”

And forasmuch as we are here in hand with the story of John, the blessed evangelist, here cometh in matter and occasion not given by him, but taken of others, of a great doubt and difficulty, such as hath occupied all the catholic, subtle, illuminate, and seraphical doctors of the pope’s catholic church, these five hundred years. The difficulty is this: that forso much as auricular confession hath been, and is yet, received in the pope’s catholic church for a holy and necessary sacrament, extending universally to all and singular creatures christian, here then ariseth a question, Who was our Lady’s confessor, or ghostly father? But that is decreed and confessed with full consent of all the catholics to be St. John. Whosoever denieth, or doubteth of this, is straightways, *ipso facto*, a heretic. This then so determined, ariseth another question or doubt; that seeing our Lady was without all original sin, and also actual or mortal, what need then had she of any confessor? or what should she confess unto him? for, if she had confessed any sin, when she had none, then had she made herself a liar, and so had sinned indeed. Here, therefore, gentle reader, in this perplexity these our illuminate doctors stand in need of thine aid to help at a pinch. Magnus Albertus, the great divine, <sup>f931</sup> denieth not, but that she indeed, although most pure, yet was confessed to her ghostly father, to keep the observance of the law, appointed for such as had that need, which she had not. And therefore (saith he) necessary it was that she should confess with mouth. But then here is to be asked, What did she say in her confession, when she

had nothing to confess? To this Albert answereth again, and telleth us plainly what she said in her confession, which was this: That she had received that great grace, not *ex condigno*, that is, not of any dignity of her own, but yet notwithstanding of congruity. And this was it, saith Albert, that she said in her confession. <sup>F932</sup>

Moreover, to help this case out of all doubt, cometh in famous Thomas of Watring, <sup>f933</sup> and thus looseth the knot, much after like effect, saying, “that as Christ, although he did owe nothing to the law, yet notwithstanding received circumcision, to give to others example of humility and obedience, in like manner would our Lady show herself obedient to the observance of the law, albeit there was no cause why she had any need thereof.” <sup>f934</sup> And thus hast thou (gentle reader) this doubtful question moved and solved, to the intent I might reveal to thee some part of the deep divinity of our catholic masters, that have ruled and governed the church in these their late popish days.

But, breaking off this matter, I return again where we left; that is, to this aforesaid second persecution under Domitian. In which persecution, besides these aforementioned, and many other innumerable godly martyrs, suffering for the like testimony of the Lord Jesus, was Flavia, the daughter of Flavius Clemens, one of the Roman consuls; which Flavia, with many others, was banished out of Rome, into the isle of Pontia, for the testimony of the Lord Jesus, by the emperor Domitian. <sup>F935</sup>

This Domitian feared the coming of Christ, as Herod did, and therefore commanded them to be killed, which were of the stock of David in Jewry. There were remaining alive at that time certain of the Lord’s kindred, which were the nephews of Jude that was called the Lord’s brother after the flesh. When the commissary had brought these up before Domitian, the emperor demanded of them, Whether they were of the stock of David? Which when they had granted, he asked again, What possessions and what substance they had? They answered, that they both had no more between them, in all, but nine and thirty acres of ground, and how they got their living, and sustained their families with the hard labors of their hands; showing forth their hands unto the emperor, being hard and rough, worn with labors, to witness that to be true which they had

spoken. Then the emperor, inquired of them concerning the kingdom of Christ, what manner of kingdom it was, how and when it should appear? They answered, that his kingdom was no worldly nor terrene thing, but an heavenly and angelical kingdom, and that it should appear in the consummation and end of the world, what time He, coming in glory, should judge the quick and the dead, and render to every one according to his deservings. Domitian the emperor, hearing this (as the saying is), did not condemn them; but, despising them as vile persons, let them go, and also stayed the persecution then moved against the Christians. They, being thus discharged and dismissed, afterward had the government of churches, being taken for martyrs, and as of the Lord's stock; and so continued in good peace till the time of Trajan. <sup>f936</sup>

By this story here cited, may appear what were the causes why the emperors of the Roman monarchy did so persecute the Christians which causes were chiefly these — fear and hatred. First, fear, for that the emperors and senate, of blind ignorance, not knowing the manner of Christ's kingdom, feared and misdoubted lest the same would subvert their empery (like as the pope thinketh now that this gospel will overthrow his kingdom of majesty); and therefore sought they all means possible, how, by death and all kinds of torments, utterly to extinguish the name and memory of the Christians. And thereupon seemeth to spring the old law of the Roman senate: that the Christians should not be let go, which were once brought to the judgment-seat, except they changed their purpose, etc. <sup>f937</sup> Secondly, hatred, partly for that this world, of its own natural condition, hath ever hated and maliced the people of God, from the first beginning of the world. Partly again, for that the Christians being of a contrary nature and religion, serving only the true living God, despised their false gods, spake against their idolatrous worshippings, and many times stopped the power of Satan working in their idols: and therefore Satan, the prince of this world, stirred up the Roman princes and blind idolaters to bear the more hatred and spite against them.

Upon these causes, and such like, rose up these malicious slanders, false surmises, infamous lies, and slanderous accusations of the heathen idolaters against the christian servants of God, which incited the princes of this world the more to persecute them: for what crimes soever malice could

invent, or rash suspicion could minister, that was imputed to the Christians; as, that they were a people incestuous; that in the night, in their concourses, putting out their candles, they ran together in all filthy manner; that they killed their own children; that they used to eat man's flesh; that they were seditious and rebellious; that they would not swear by the fortune and prosperity of Caesar; that they would not adore the image of Caesar in the market-place; that they were pernicious to the empery of Rome. Briefly, whatsoever mishappened to the city or provinces of Rome, either famine, pestilence, earthquake, wars, wonders, unseasonableness of weather, or what other evils soever happened, it was imputed to the Christians, as Justin recordeth. Over and beside all these, a great occasion that stirred up the emperors against the Christians, came by one Publius Tarquin, the chief priest of the idolatrous sacrifices, and Mamertinus, the prefect of the city in the time of Trajan; who, partly with money, partly with sinister and pestilent counsel, partly with infamous accusations (as witnesseth Nauclerus), incensed the mind of the emperor so much against God's people.

Also, among these other causes abovesaid, crept in some piece of covetousness withal (as in all other things it doth), in that the wicked promoters and accusers for lucre-sake, to have the possessions of the Christians, were the more ready to accuse them, to have the spoil of their goods.

Thus hast thou, christian reader, first, the causes declared of these persecutions; secondly, the cruel law of their condemnation; thirdly, now hear more what was the form of inquisition, which was (as is witnessed in the first apology of Justin) to this effect: That they should swear to declare the truth, whether they were in very deed Christians, or not: and if they confessed, then by the law the sentence of death proceeded. <sup>f938</sup>

Neither yet were these tyrants and organs of Satan thus contented with death only, to bereave the life from the body. The kinds of death were divers, and no less horrible than divers. Whatsoever the cruelty of man's invention could devise for the punishment of man's body, was practiced against the Christians, as partly I have mentioned before; and more appeareth by the epistle sent from the brethren of France, hereafter following. Crafty trains, outcries of enemies, imprisonment, stripes and

scourgings, drawings, tearings, stonings, plates of iron laid unto them burning hot, deep dungeons, racks, strangling in prisons, the teeth of wild beasts, gridirons, gibbets and gallows, tossing upon the horns of bulls. Moreover, when they were thus killed, their bodies were laid in heaps, and dogs there left to keep them, that no man might come to bury them, neither would any prayer obtain them to be interred and buried. <sup>f939</sup>

And yet, notwithstanding for all these continual persecutions and horrible punishments, the church of the Christians daily increased, deeply rooted in the doctrine of the apostles and of men apostolical, and watered plenteously with the blood of saints; as saith Nicephorus. <sup>F940</sup> Whereof let us hear the worthy testimony of Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho: —

“And that none can terrify or remove us who believe in Jesus, by this it daily appeareth, for when we are slain, crucified, east to wild beasts, into the fire, or given to other torments, yet we go not from our confession: but contrary, the more cruelty and slaughter is wrought against us, the more they be that come to piety and faith by the name of Jesus; no otherwise than if a man cut the vine-tree, the better the branches grow. For the vine-tree, planted by God and Christ our Savior, is his people.” <sup>f941</sup>

To comprehend the names and number of all the martyrs that suffered in all these ten persecutions (which are innumerable) as it is impossible, so it is hard, in such a variety and diversity of matter, to keep such a perfect order and course of years and times, that either some be not left out, or that every one be reduced into his right place; especially seeing the authors themselves, whom, in this present work, we follow, do diversely disagree both in the times, in the names, and also in the kind of martyrdom of them that suffered. As for example: where the common reading and opinion of the church and epistles decretal do take Anacletus to succeed after Clement, next before Evaristus: contrary, Eusebius, <sup>f942</sup> making no mention of Cletus, but of Anacletus, saith, that Evaristus succeeded next to Clement. Likewise Ruffinus and Epiphanius, speaking nothing of Anacletus, make mention of Linus, and of Cletus, next before Clement, but say nothing of Anacletus: whereby it may appear that Cletus and Anacletus were both one. Sabellicus, <sup>f943</sup> speaking of Linus and of Cletus,

saith, that they were ordained helpers under Peter, while he labored in his apostleship abroad, and so saith also Marianus Scotus: contrary, Irenaeus <sup>f944</sup> speaketh of Anacletus, making no mention of Cletus. Whereby it may appear by the way, what credit is to be given to the decretal epistles, whom all the later histories of the pope's church do follow in this behalf, etc. Moreover, whereas Antoninus, Vincentius, Jacobus (in Supplemento), <sup>f945</sup> Simoneta, <sup>f946</sup> Aloisius, with others, declare of Linus, Cletus, Clement, Anacletus, Evaristus, Alexander, bishops of Rome, that they died martyrs, Eusebius, in his "Ecclesiastical History," writing of them, maketh thereof no mention.

### THE THIRD PERSECUTION.

**Between the second Roman** <sup>a27</sup> persecution and the third, was but one year, under the emperor Nerva, after whom succeeded Trajan; and under him followed the third persecution. So the second and the third are noted of some to be both one, having no more difference but one year between them. This Trajan, if we look well upon his politic and civil governance, might seem (in comparison of others) a right worthy and commendable prince, much familiar with inferiors, and so behaving himself toward his subjects, as he himself would have the prince to be to him, if he himself were a subject. Also he was noted to be a great observer of justice, insomuch that when he ordained any praetor, giving to him the sword, he would bid him use the sword against his enemies in just causes: and if he himself did otherwise than justice, to use then his power against him also. But for all these virtues, toward christian religion he was impious and cruel; who caused the third persecution of the church.

And first, as touching Clement (whom Marianus Scotus calleth the first bishop of Rome after Peter), <sup>f947</sup> they say that he was sent out into banishment by Trajan beyond the Euxine, with two thousand Christians, where he opened a well-spring to those who, in the wilderness, were condemned to the mines. Afterward, being accused to the emperor, he was thrown into the sea with a millstone fastened about his neck; and not long after, his body was cast up and buried (as Platina saith) at the place where the well was made. Some say it was found first in the days of pope Nicholas I. <sup>f948</sup> But, forasmuch as I find of his martyrdom no firm relation in the ancient authors, but only in such new writers of later times, which

are wont to paint out the lives and histories of good men with feigned additions of forged miracles, therefore I count the same of less credit: as I do also certain decretal epistles, untruly (as may seem) ascribed and intituled to his name. Eusebius, in his third book, writing of Clement, giveth no more of him, but thus: “After he had governed the church of Rome nine years, the said Clement left the succession thereof to Evaristus.”

Of which Evaristus next bishop of Rome, thus we find in Irenaeus: <sup>f949</sup> Peter and Paul (saith he), committed the charge of that church to Linus; after whom came Anacletus; then succeeded Clement; next to Clement followed Evaristus; after whom came Alexander; and then Sixtus, the sixth bishop of Rome after the apostles: after Sixtus sat Telesphorus; <sup>f950</sup> then Hyginus; then Pius; then Anicetus. And when Soter took the place after him, then the twelfth bishop of Rome was Eleutherius. <sup>F951</sup> Thus after Clement followed (as is said) Evaristus, in the second or third year of Trajan, as saith Eusebius; or, as Nicephorus saith, the fourth year of the said emperor. But howsoever the count of years standeth, little or nothing remaineth of the acts and monuments either of this, or of other bishops of Rome in those days; whereby it may appear that no great account was then made of Roman bishops in those days, whose acts and deeds were then either so lightly reputed, or so slenderly committed to history. Notwithstanding, certain decretal epistles <sup>f952</sup> are remaining, or rather thrust upon us in their names; containing in them little substance of any doctrine, but altogether stuffed with laws, injunctions, and stately decrees, little to the purpose, and less savouring of the nature of that time then present. Amongst whom also are numbered the two epistles of this Evaristus. “And when he had given these orders, and had made six priests, two deacons, and five bishops for sundry places,” saith the story, “he suffered martyrdom.” But what kind of death, for what cause he suffered, what constancy he showed, what was the order or conversation of his life, is nothing touched; and seemeth therefore the more to be doubted that which our new histories do say, because the old ancient writers have no remembrance thereof, which otherwise would not have passed such things over in silence, if they had been true. Again, neither do the authors fully agree in the time of his martyrdom, which Naucleus witnesseth <sup>f953</sup> to be in the last year of Trajan: but Platina thinketh rather that he suffered under

Adrian. The Fasciculus temporum referreth it to the third year of Adrian; Volateran to the beginning of the reign of Adrian. <sup>F954</sup> Contrary, Eusebius (coming near to the simple truth, as seemeth) doth affirm that Evaristus succeeded Clement in the third year of Trajan; and so, giving to him nine years, it should follow thereby that Evaristus deceased the twelfth year of Trajan. <sup>F955</sup>

After whom succeeded next Alexander I. in the governance of that church, of whose time and death the like discrepance is among the writers. Marianus Scotus saith, he was the fourth bishop from Peter: but that could not be. Some say he was the sixth, and some the seventh: but they likewise were deceived; for the most part all do grant Sixtus to be the sixth. Damasus affirmeth, that he was in the reign of Trajan: and how can that be, when the said Damasus affirmed before, that Evaristus his predecessor suffered in the last year of Trajan, and then the bishopric stood at least a month void: except he mean that the said Alexander I. succeeded Evaristus in the last year of Trajan. **But then how can that stand with Bede and Marianus** <sup>a28</sup> Scotus, which say that he suffered under Trajan; or with Otho of Frisinghen, <sup>f956</sup> who saith, he suffered the fourth year of Adrian, when he had been bishop ten years, by the general consent of most writers?

They which write of the deeds and doings of this blessed bishop, as Bergomensis, <sup>f957</sup> Antoninus, Equilinus, <sup>f958</sup> and such as follow them, declare that he had converted a great part of the senators to the faith of Christ, amongst whom was Hermes, a great man in Rome, whose son, being dead, Alexander raised again to life, and likewise restored sight to his maid being blind. Adrian the emperor, then absent, hearing this, sent word to Aurelian, prefect of Rome, to apprehend Alexander, with Euentius and Theodulus (otherwise called Theodorus, as Platina saith), his two deacons, and Hermes, and to commit them to ward with Quirinus the tribune: which being done, as their story recordeth, Alexander, inclosed in a diverse prison from Hermes, notwithstanding, by the guiding of an angel, through three doors with three locks a-piece, was brought with candlelight to the prison of Hermes; and then returning to his own prison again, cured the daughter of Quirinus his keeper, named Balbina; by reason whereof the said Quirinus, with his whole household, were all baptized, and suffered also for the faith of Christ. "Thus then," saith the story, "about the second

year of Adrian, Aurelian the prefect took Alexander the bishop, with Hermes, his wife, children, and his whole household, to the number of one thousand two hundred and fifty, and threw them into prison. And not long after, the said Alexander, with Euentius his deacon, and Hermes, and the rest, were burnt in a furnace. Theodulus, another deacon of Alexander, seeing and rebuking the cruelty of the tyrant, suffered also the same martyrdom.”

Quirinus also, the same time (as saith Antoninus), having first his tongue cut out, then his hands and feet off, afterward was beheaded and cast to the dogs: Equilinus saith, that he was beheaded and cast into the Tiber, in the reign of the emperor Claudius; but that cannot be: albeit Platina maketh relation but only of Alexander, with his two deacons aforesaid, declaring moreover, that, in the time of this bishop, Sapphira of Antioch, and Sabina, a Roman, suffered martyrdom. <sup>F959</sup>

Florilegus, the author of “Flores Historiarum,” <sup>f960</sup> affirmeth, that Alexander, bishop of Rome, was beheaded seven miles out of Rome (where he lieth buried), in the year one hundred and five; but that agreeth not with the chronicles above recited. Eusebius <sup>f961</sup> recordeth of him no more, but that in the third year of Adrian, he ended his life and office, after he had been bishop ten years.

Divers miracles are reported of this Alexander, in the canon-legends, and lives of saints; which as I deny not but they may be true, so, because I cannot avouch them by any grave testimony of ancient writers, therefore I dare not affirm them, but do refer them to the authors and patrons thereof, where they are found. Notwithstanding, whatsoever is to be thought of his miracles, this is to be affirmed and not doubted, but that he was a godly and virtuous bishop.

And as I say of his miracles, the like judgment also I have of the ordinances both of him and of Evaristus his predecessor, testified in the pope’s decrees by Gratian, <sup>f962</sup> where it is said that Evaristus divided divers titles in the city of Rome to the priests; also ordained in every city seven deacons to be associate with and assist the bishop in his preaching, both for his defense, and for the witness of truth. <sup>F963</sup> Notwithstanding, if probable conjectures might stand against the authority of Gratian and his decrees, here might be doubted whether the absolute ordination of priests

were first forbidden by Evaristus, and whether the intitulation of priests were first by him brought in or not: wherein an instance may be given to the contrary, that this intitulation seemeth to take its first beginning at the council of Chalcedon,<sup>f964</sup> and of pope Urban II. in the council of Placentia. In the which council of Chalcedon the words of the canon (making no mention of Evaristus at all) do expressly forbid, that any ecclesiastical person, either priest or deacon, should be ordained absolutely: otherwise the imposition of hands, without some proper title of the party ordained, to stand void and frustrate, etc.<sup>f965</sup> And likewise Urban II. in the council of Placentia<sup>f966</sup> doth decree the same, alleging no name of Evaristus, but the statutes of former councils.<sup>f967</sup>

Moreover, in the time of Evaristus, the church, then being under terrible persecutions, was divided into no peculiar parishes or cures, whereby any title might rise, but was scattered rather in corners and deserts, where they could best hide themselves. And as the church of Rome in those days was not divided into several parishes or cures (as I suppose), so neither was then any such open or solemn preaching in churches, that the assistance or testimony of seven deacons either could avail among the multitude of the heathen, or be needed amongst the christian secret congregations. Again, this constitution of seven deacons seemeth rather to spring out of the council of Neocesarea, long after Evaristus,<sup>f968</sup> where it was appointed that in every city, were it never so small, there should be seven deacons after the rule. And this rule the said council taketh out of the book of the Acts of the Apostles, making no word or mention of Evaristus at all.<sup>f969</sup> But these (as is said) be but only conjectures, not denying that which is commonly received, but only showing what may be doubted in their epistles decretal.

More unlike it seemeth to be true that is recorded and reported of Alexander, of whom we read, that he was the first founder and finder of holy water mixed with salt, to purge and sanctify them upon whom it is sprinkled. The words of the Distinction be these: "We bless water mixed with salt among the people, that all men, being sprinkled therewith, may be sanctified and purified; and this we command all priests to do," etc.<sup>f970</sup> The opinion is also (but how true I have not to affirm), that by him first was ordained water to be mixed with wine in the chalice. *Item*, that by

him was brought in the piece of the mass canon, beginning, “Qui pridie,” etc.

And thus much of these aforesaid bishops of Rome, martyred in the days of Trajan and Adrian.

**In this third persecution** <sup>a29</sup> Pliny the second, a man learned and famous, seeing the lamentable slaughter of Christians, and moved therewith to pity, wrote to Trajan of the pitiful persecution, certifying him that there were many thousands of them daily put to death, of which none did any thing contrary to the Roman laws worthy persecution; saving that they used to gather together in the morning before day, and sing hymns to a certain God whom they worshipped, called Christ — in all other their ordinances they were godly and honest. Whereupon the persecution by commandment of the emperor was greatly stayed and diminished. The form and copy of which epistle of Pliny, I thought here not inconvenient to set down, as followeth: <sup>f971</sup>

### **THE EPISTLE OF PLINY A HEATHEN PHILOSOPHER, TO TRAJAN THE EMPEROR.**

It is an inviolable rule with me, sir, to make reference of all those things wherein I doubt, to you; for who is better able either to direct my judgment or instruct my ignorance? I have never yet witnessed any of the proceedings against the Christians; and therefore I am quite at a loss what punishment ought to be administered, and to what extent; and how far it is proper that any inquiry should be made after them. Nor am I at all clear, whether any difference should be made for age, or whether those of tender years should be treated with the same severity as adults; also whether repentance should entitle to a pardon, or whether he who has once been a Christian should gain nothing by ceasing to be one; also, whether the bare profession, unaccompanied by any criminal conduct, should be visited with punishment, or only crimes which may be connected with the profession. In the mean time, I have adopted this course with those who have been brought before me as christians. I ask them whether they are Christians; if they confess to it, I repeat the question a second and a third time,

accompanied with threats: if they persist, I order them to be led to punishment; for of this I never doubted, that, whatever their opinions might be, a contumacious and inflexible obstinacy deserved correction. Some of those infected with this infatuation, being citizens of Rome, I have reserved as privileged persons to be sent thither. But the crime spreading (as is usually the case) while it was actually under prosecution, more cases soon occurred. An anonymous libel was presented to me, containing the names of many persons, who yet denied that they were, or ever had been, Christians, and repeated after me an invocation of the gods, and offered worship with wine and incense to your image (which for this purpose I ordered to be brought with the images of the deities), and they even cursed Christ; things — which, I am told, no real Christian can be prevailed on to do: on this account I thought proper to discharge them. Others, on being accused by an open informer, have allowed that they were Christians, but presently after denied it; alleging, that once indeed they were Christians, but that they ceased to be such, some three years ago, others more, some even twenty years back: these, likewise, all worshipped your image and the images of the gods, and even cursed Christ: but the whole account they gave of their crime or error (whichever it is to be called) amounted only to this, — viz, that they were accustomed on a stated day to meet before day-light, and to repeat together a set form of prayer<sup>f972</sup> to Christ as a God, and to bind themselves by an obligation — not indeed to commit wickedness; but, on the contrary, — never to commit theft, robbery, or adultery, never to falsify their word, never to defraud any man: after which it was their custom to separate, and reassemble to partake in common of a harmless meal, from which last practice, however, they had desisted, in consequence of my edict, in which (agreeably to your command) I forbade such societies. This being the whole of their statement, I judged it quite necessary to examine two young women, who were said to be deaconesses, by torture, in order to get at the real truth; but I found out nothing except absurd and raving superstition. I have thought proper, therefore, to suspend all further proceedings in order to consult you. For it appears to me a matter which calls for serious deliberation,

especially on account of the great number of the persons involved, many of all ranks and ages, and of both sexes, being already under prosecution, and more will soon be in the same situation. Not that I think it impossible to check and master the evil: this at least is certain, that the temples which were nearly deserted have begun to be frequented, and the sacred solemnities which had been intermitted are again attended, and victims, which lately were very scarce, owing to the scarcity of purchasers, are now selling every where. Whence it is easy to conjecture, that crowds might be reclaimed from their error, if only pardon should be promised to such as repent.

### THE EPISTLE OF TRAJAN TO PLINY.

You have followed just the course which you ought, my dear Secundus, in dealing with the Christians who have been brought before you; for no specific rule can be framed so as to be of universal application. These people, however, must not be purposely sought after: if they be brought before you and convicted, they must be punished; yet with this restriction, that if any one declares that he is not a Christian, and shall prove that he is not by the fact of supplicating our gods, however suspected for the past, let him be pardoned on his repentance.

Tertullian, <sup>1973</sup> writing upon this letter of Trajan, above prefixed, thus saith: “O sentence of necessity confused! as men innocent he would not have them to be sought for, and yet causes them to be punished as persons guilty.” And thus the rage of that persecution ceased for a time, although, notwithstanding, many naughty-disposed men and cruel officers there were, who, upon false pretense to accomplish their wicked minds, ceased not to afflict the Christians in divers provinces: and especially if any occasion were given (never so little) for the enemies to take hold of, or if any commotion were raised in the provinces abroad, by and by the fault was laid upon the Christians. As in Jerusalem, after that the emperor Trajan had sent down his commandment that whosoever could be found of the stock of David, he should be inquired out and put to death: upon this Hegesippus, writing, saith, that certain sectaries there were of the Jewish nation, that accused Simeon, the bishop then of Jerusalem and son of

Cleophas, to be of the stock of David, and that he was a christian. Of the which his accusers it happened also (saith the said Hegesippus), that certain of them likewise were apprehended and taken to be of the stock of David, and so right justly were put to execution themselves, who sought the destruction of others. As concerning Simeon the blessed bishop, the aforesaid Hegesippus thus writeth: That Simeon the Lord's nephew, when he was accused to Atticus the proconsul by the malicious sect of the Jews, to be of the line of David, and to be a Christian, was scourged during the space of many days together, being a hundred and twenty years of age. In which his martyrdom he endured so constantly, that both the proconsul and all the multitude did marvel to see him of that age so constantly to suffer; and so at last, being crucified, finished his course in the Lord, for whom he suffered, as partly before also is recorded.

In this persecution of Trajan above specified (which Trajan next followed after Nerva), besides the other aforementioned, also suffered Phocas bishop of Pontus, <sup>f974</sup> whom Trajan, because he would not do sacrifice to Neptune, caused to be cast into a hot lime-kiln, and afterward to be put into a scalding bath; where the constant godly martyr, in the testimony of Christ, ended his life, or rather entered into life. <sup>F975</sup>

In the same persecution suffered also Sulpitius and Servilianus, two Romans; whose wives are said to be Euphrosyne and Theodora, whom Sabina did convert to the faith of Christ, and who after were also martyred. Of which Sabina, Jacobus Philippus (author of the book called "Supplementum") reporteth that she was beheaded on the mount Aventine in Rome, by Elipidus the prefect, in the days of Adrian. <sup>F976</sup> Under whom also suffered Seraphia, a virgin of Antioch, as Hermannus and Antoninus witness. <sup>F977</sup>

The aforesaid authors, Antoninus <sup>f978</sup> and Equilinus, make mention moreover of Nereus and Achilleus, who, in this persecution of Trajan, had the crown of martyrdom, being put to death at Rome. Eusebius <sup>f979</sup> maketh mention of one Sagaris, who, about the same time, suffered martyrdom in Asia, Servilius Paulus being then proconsul in that province.

In this persecution, beside many others, suffered the blessed martyr of Christ, Ignatius, who, unto this day, is had in famous reverence among very many. This Ignatius was appointed to the bishopric of Antioch next

after Peter in succession. Some do say, that he, being sent from Syria to Rome, because he professed Christ, was given to the wild beasts to be devoured. <sup>F980</sup> It is also said of him, that when he passed through Asia, being under the most strict custody of his keepers, he strengthened **and confirmed the churches** <sup>a30</sup> through all the cities as he went, both with his exhortations and preaching of the word of God; and admonished them especially, and before all other things, to beware and shun those heresies risen and sprung up newly among them, and that they should cleave and stick fast to the tradition of the apostles; which he, for their better safeguard, being now about to suffer martyrdom, judged it necessary to put in writing. Accordingly, having come to Smyrna, where Polycarp was, he wrote one epistle to the church of Ephesus, wherein he maketh mention of Onesimus as their pastor; and another he wrote to the church at Magnesia on the Maeander, wherein also he mentioneth Damas as their bishop. Also another he wrote to the church at Tralles, the bishop of which church at that time he noteth to be one Polybius. Another he wrote to the church at Rome, wherein he exhorts them not to use means for his deliverance from martyrdom, lest they should deprive him of that which he most longed and hoped for. <sup>F981</sup>

But it will be worth while citing a short passage thereof, in confirmation of what has been said. <sup>F982</sup>

“From Syria to Rome,” saith he, “I fight with, wild beasts, by land and by sea, by night and by day, being chained among ten leopards (that is, a band of soldiers), who are made even worse by kind treatment. By their injuries, however, I learn daily the more to be a disciple of Jesus; — yet am I not hereby justified. O that I were come to the real wild beasts, which are prepared for me! May I find them eager to dispatch me! I will encourage them to devour me without delay, and not use me as some, whom through fear they would not touch. And if they will not dispatch me willingly, I will provoke them to it. Pardon me; — I know what is good for me. Now I begin to be a disciple. I care for nothing, of visible or invisible things, so that I may but win Christ. Let fire and the cross, let the companies of wild beasts, let breaking of bones and tearing of limbs, let the grinding of the whole body, and all the

malice of the devil, come upon me; be it so, only may I win Christ Jesus!"

Such things wrote he from the aforesaid city of Smyrna, to the congregations which we have recited. And even when he was now sentenced to be thrown to the beasts, such was the burning desire that he had to suffer, that he spake, what time he heard the lions roaring, saying, "I am the wheat of Christ: I am going to be ground with the teeth of wild beasts, that I may be found pure bread." He suffered in the eleventh year of Trajan the emperor. <sup>F983</sup>

Besides this godly Ignatius, many thousands also were put to death in the same persecution, as appeareth by the letter of Pliny the younger above recited, written to the emperor. Jerome in his book intituled "Catalogus Scrip. Eccles." <sup>F984</sup> maketh mention of one Publius, bishop of Athens, who, for the faith of Christ, the same time during this persecution, was put to death and martyred.

### **ADRIAN, EMPEROR.**

Next after this Trajan, succeeded Adrian the emperor, under whom suffered Alexander the bishop of Rome, with his two deacons Euentius and Theodorus; <sup>f985</sup> also Hermes and Quirinus, with their families, as late before was declared.

It is signified moreover in the histories, that in the time of this Adrian Zeno, a nobleman of Rome, with ten thousand two hundred and three were slain for Christ. <sup>F986</sup> Henry de Herford and Bergomensis <sup>f987</sup> make mention of ten thousand, as being crucified in the days of this Adrian, on mount Ararat, crowned with crowns of thorn, and thrust into the sides with sharp darts, after the example of the Lord's passion; whose captains (as Antoninus <sup>f988</sup> and Vincentius <sup>f989</sup> declare) were Achaicus, Heliades, Theodorus, and Carcerius. Whether this story be the same with the other above of Zeno or not, it is doubted. <sup>F990</sup> As touching the miracles done, and the speaking of the angel, I refer the certainty thereof to Vincentius, and such other like authors, where more things seem to be told than be true.

There was one Eustachius a captain, whom Trajan in time past had sent out to war against the barbarians. After he had by God's grace valiantly

subdued his enemies, and now was returning home with victory, Adrian, for joy, meeting him in his journey to bring him home with triumph, by the way first would do sacrifice to Apollo for the victory gotten, willing also Eustachius to do the same with him. But when Eustachius could by no means thereto be enforced, being brought to Rome, there with his wife and children he suffered martyrdom under the foresaid Adrian. It were a long process here to recite all the miracles contained, or rather suspected, in the story of this Eustachius; concerning his conversion and death; how the crucifix appeared to him between the horns of an hart; of the saving of his wife from the shipmen; of one of his sons saved from the lion, the other saved from the wolf; of their miraculous preservation from the wild beasts, and from the torments of fire — mentioned in Bergomensis, Vincentius, and others. <sup>F991</sup> All which as I find them in no ancient records, so I leave them to their authors, and the compilers of the legends.

**We read also of Faustinus and Jobita,** <sup>a31</sup> citizens of Breschia in Italy, who suffered-martyrdom with like grievous torments. At the sight whereof one Calocerius, <sup>f993</sup> seeing their so great patience in so great torments, cried out with these words, “Verily great is the God of christians:” <sup>f994</sup> which words being heard, forthwith he was apprehended, and being brought to the place of their execution, was made partaker of their martyrdom. <sup>F995</sup>

The history of Nicephorus maketh mention of Anthia, a godly woman, who committed her son Eleutherius to Anicetus bishop of Rome, to be brought up in the doctrine of christian faith; who afterwards, **being bishop of Illyricum,** <sup>a32 f995</sup> was beheaded with his aforesaid mother Anthia. <sup>F996</sup>

Justus also, and Pastor; two brethren, with like martyrdom ended their lives in a city of Spain, called Alcala, under the said Adrian the emperor.

Likewise **Symphorissa, the wife of Getulus** <sup>a33</sup> the martyr, with her seven children, is said about the same time to suffer; who first was much and often beaten and scourged; afterwards was hanged up by the hair of her head; at last, having a huge stone fastened unto her, was thrown headlong into the river, and, after that, her seven children in like manner, with sundry and divers kinds of punishment diversly martyred by the tyrant.

The story of Hermannus, and Antoninus, and others, report of Sophia, with her three children also; also of Seraphia and Sabina, as having suffered under the said emperor, about the year of our Lord 130.

As concerning Alexander bishop of Rome, with his two deacons, also with Hermes, Quirinus, Seraphia and Sabina, some writers (as Bede and Marianus Scotus) record that they suffered under Trajan. Others again (as Otho of Frisinghen; with like more) report that they suffered in the fourth year of this emperor Adrian: <sup>f997</sup> but of these martyrs sufficient hath been said before.

**A little before,** <sup>a34</sup> mention was made of Symphorissa, otherwise named Symphorosa, wife of Getulus, with her seven sons. This Getulus or Getulius was a minister or teacher (as witness the Martyrology [and Chronicle] of Ado <sup>f998</sup> ) in the city of Tibur, which Getulus, with Cerealis, Amantius, and Primitivus, by the commandment of Adrian, were condemned to the fire; wherein they were martyred and put to death. The names, moreover, of the seven sons of this Symphorosa I find to be Crescens, Julianus, Nemesius, Primitivus, Justinus, Stacteus, and Eugenius, **whom the [Martyrology and] Chronicle of Ado** <sup>a35</sup> declare to have been put to death at the commandment of Adrian, being fastened to seven stakes, and so racked up with a pulley, and at last were thrust through; Crescens in the neck, Julianus in the breast, Nemesius in the heart; Primitivus about the navel, Justinus cut in every joint of his body, Stacteus run through with spears, Eugenius cut asunder from the breast to the lower parts. Next day their bodies were all together cast into a deep pit, by the idolatrous priests entitled “**Ad septem Biothanatos.**” <sup>a36</sup> “ After the martyrdom of whom Symphorosa, the mother, did likewise suffer, as is before declared.

While Adrian the emperor was at Athens, he was initiated into the Eleusinian <sup>f999</sup> and most of the other mysteries of the Greeks; after which he gave free leave and liberty, whosoever would, to persecute the Christians. Whereupon Quadratus, a man of no less excellent zeal than of famous learning, being then bishop of Athens, and disciple of the apostles, <sup>f1000</sup> or at least succeeding incontinent the age of the apostles, and following after Publius (who a little before was martyred for the testimony of Christ), did offer up and exhibit unto Adrian the emperor a learned and

excellent apology in the defense of the christian religion; wherein he declared the christians, without all just cause or desert, to be so cruelly intreated and persecuted. The like, also, did Aristides, an excellent philosopher in Athens, who, for his singular learning and eloquence, being notified to the emperor, and coming to his presence, there made before him an eloquent oration. Moreover he did exhibit unto the said emperor a memorable apology for the Christians, so full of learning and eloquence, that, as Jerome saith, it was a spectacle and admiration to men in his time, that loved to see wit and learning. Over and besides these, there was also another named Serenius Granianus, <sup>f1001</sup> proconsul of Asia, who likewise did write very pithy and grave letters to Adrian the emperor, showing and declaring therein that it was not consonant with right or reason, for the blood of innocents to be given to the rage and fury of the people, and so to be condemned for no fault, only for the name and sect that they followed.

Thus, the goodness of God being moved with the prayers and constant labor of these so excellent men, so turned the heart of the emperor, that he, being better informed concerning the order and profession of the christians, became more favorable unto them. And, immediately upon the same, directed his letters to Minucius Fundanus (as is partly before mentioned), proconsul of Asia, willing him from henceforth to exercise no more such extremity against the christians, as to condemn any of them, having no other crime objected against them, but only their name. The copy of which his letter, because that Justin in his apology doth allege it, I thought, therefore, to express the same in his own words, as followeth: —

### **THE LETTER OF ADRIAN THE EMPEROR, TO THE PROCONSUL, MINUCIUS FUNDANUS.**

I have received a letter written to me by the very illustrious Serenius Granianus, your predecessor in office. The subject is one which I feel bound to inquire into, both that these people may not be vexatiously disturbed, and that base informers may not be encouraged in their vile occupation. To the matter then — if the people of the province will appear openly to support their charges against the Christians, so as to give them opportunity of answering for themselves before the tribunal, let them keep to this alone, and not proceed by rude demands and vain clamours: for it is much

more becoming, if any one wishes to accuse, that *you* should take regular cognizance of the matter. If then any one shall accuse them and shew that they are breaking the laws, do you determine according to the degree of their offense. But if, by Hercules, the charge prove to be a calumny, do you estimate the enormity of such calumny and take care to punish it. <sup>f1002</sup>

Thus, by the merciful providence of God, some more quiet and rest was given to the church, although Hermannus thinketh these halcyon days did not very long continue, but that the emperor, changing his edict, began to renew again persecution of God's people, albeit this soundeth not to be so by the words of Melito in his apology to Marcus Antoninus hereafter ensuing. In the mean time this is certain, that in the days of this Adrian, the Jews rebelled against the Romans and spoiled the country of Palestine: against whom the emperor sent Julius Severus, who overthrew in Jewry fifty castles, and burnt and destroyed nine hundred and fourscore villages and towns, and slew of the Jews fifty thousand, so that with famine, sickness, sword, and fire, Judah was almost desolate. But at length Adrian the emperor, who otherwise was named AELius, repaired and enlarged the city again of Jerusalem, <sup>f1003</sup> which was called after his name AELiopolis, or AELia Capitolina, the inhabiting whereof he granted only to the Gentiles, and to the Christians, forbidding the Jews utterly to enter into the city.

After the death of Adrian, who died by bleeding at the nose, succeeded Antoninus Pius, in the year of our Lord 138, and reigned twenty and three years, who, for his clemency and modest behavior, had the name of *Pius*, and is for the same in histories commended. His saying was, that he had rather save one citizen, than destroy a thousand of his adversaries. At the beginning of his reign, such was the state of the church, as Adrian his predecessor had left it, as in which, although there was no edict set forth to persecute the Christians, yet the tumultuous rage of the heathen multitude, for the causes above specified, did not cease to disquiet and afflict the quiet people of God; imputing and ascribing to the Christians whatsoever misfortune happened contrary unto their desires; moreover, inventing against them all false crimes and contumelies whereof to accuse them. By reason whereof, divers there were in sundry places much molested, and some put to death: albeit, as it is to be supposed, not by the consent of the emperor, who of nature was so mild and gentle, that either he raised up no

persecution against the Christians, or else he soon stayed the same, being moved.

**And here occasion** <sup>a37</sup> serveth <sup>f1004</sup> to speak of Justin, a man in learning and philosophy excellent, and a great defender of the christian religion; who also exhibited two Apologies, concerning the defense of christian doctrine, the one to Antoninus Pius, the emperor, the other to the senate of Rome.

This Justin was born at Neapolis, <sup>f1005</sup> in the country of Palestine, whose father was Priscus son of Bacchius, as he himself doth testify, <sup>f1006</sup> by whom in his youth he was set to school to learn; where, in process of time, he became a famous and worthy philosopher, of whose excellency many learned and notable men do record. For first he, being altogether inflamed and ravished with desire of knowledge, would in no wise be satisfied in his mind, before he had gotten instructors singularly seen in all kind of philosophy. Whereupon he writeth of himself, in the beginning of his dialogue with Trypho, thus, declaring that in the beginning he, being desirous of joining that sect and society, applied himself to be scholar to a certain Stoic, and, remaining with him a time, when he nothing profited in divine knowledge (whereof the Stoic had no skill, and affirmed the knowledge thereof not to be necessary), he forsook him, and went to another, of the sect of the Peripatetics, a sharp-witted man, as he thought; with whom, after he had been awhile, he demanded of him a stipend for his teaching, for the better confirmation of their familiarity. Whereupon Justin, accounting him as no philosopher, left him, and departed. And yet not satisfied in mind, but desirous to hear of further learning in philosophy, adjoined himself to one that professed the Pythagorean sect, a man of great fame, and one who made no small account of himself. Whom after he had followed a time, his master demanded of him whether he had any sight in music, astronomy, and geometry; without the sight of which sciences (he said) he could not be apt to receive the knowledge of virtue and felicity; unless before he had used to apply his mind from sensible matters to the contemplation of things intelligible. And, speaking much in the commendation of these sciences, how profitable and necessary they were, after that Justin had declared himself not to be seen therein, the philosopher gave him over; which grieved Justin not a little, and so much the more, because he thought his master to have some knowledge in those

sciences. After this Justin, considering with himself what time was requisite to the learning of these sciences, and thinking not to defer any longer, thought best to resort to the sect of the Platonists, for the great fame that ran of them. Wherefore he chose unto him a singular learned man of that sect, who lately was come to those parts; and so, remaining with him, seemed to profit not a little in contemplation of supernal things and invisible forms, insomuch that he thought shortly to aspire to such sharpness of wit and wisdom, that, out of hand, he might achieve to the comprehension and contemplation of God; which is the end of Plato's philosophy. And in this manner he bestowed his youth: but afterward he, growing to a riper age, how and by what means the said Justin came to the knowledge and profession of Christianity, it followeth likewise in his first Apology: where he affirmeth of himself (as witnesseth Eusebius <sup>f1007</sup>), that when he did behold the Christians in their torments and sufferings to be so constant in their profession, he was therewith marvellously moved. After this manner reasoning with himself: that it was impossible for that kind of people to be subject to any vice or carnality, still less cannibalism, which vices, of their own nature, are not able to sustain any sharp adversity, much less the bitterness of death. The sight whereof helped him not a little (being of his own nature inclined to the searching of true knowledge and virtue), to begin to love and embrace the christian religion, for so he doth witness of himself in the end of his second Apology; signifying there, how it was his seeking and endeavor to attain to Christianity, when he perceived how the Christians, by malice of wicked persons, were compelled to suffer wrong and torments, and to be evil spoken of. By sight whereof, as he saith himself, he became a Christian, through this occasion. <sup>f1008</sup> Being in this state of mind, as is aforesaid, it came in his head, for his more quietness, to go aside to a certain solitary place void of concourse of people, near to the sea-side; whither as he approached, thinking there to be all alone, he fell in with an old and venerable father of a comely visage and gentle behavior, who, making up to him, began to reason with him: where, after long disputation, when the old man had declared unto him, that there was no knowledge of truth amongst the philosophers, who neither knew God, neither were aided by the Holy Ghost; and further had reasoned with him of the immortality of the soul, of the reward of the godly, and punishment of the wicked: then Justin, being confirmed with his reasons and arguments, yielded to him of his own

accord; and demanded of him by what means he might attain to that true knowledge of God, whereof he had spoken; who then counselled him to read and search the prophets, adjoining therewith prayer. “But what master,” quoth Justin, “should I use for the instruction thereof, and who shall be able to help us if these philosophers (as you say) lack the truth, and are void of the same?” To whom the old father answered:

“There have been, many years before all these reputed philosophers, others more ancient than they, who were blessed, just, and lovers of God, who spake by the spirit of God, foreseeing and prophesying these things which we see now come to pass; and therefore they are called prophets. These alone saw the truth, and revealed it to men, neither fearing nor passing for any; who were seduced with no desire of human applause, but only spake and taught those things which they themselves both heard and saw, being inspired with the holy Spirit of God; whose writings and works yet to this day remain, out of which the reader may receive great profit and knowledge of things, as concerning the first creation of the world, and end of the same, with other things necessary to be known of every true philosopher. But faith is necessary to profit by them; for in their teaching they do not use any demonstration, as being in themselves (independently of any demonstration) sure witnesses of the truth. Moreover, the course of events, (not to mention that the miracles also, which they wrought, entitle them to credit), both past and present, constraineth us of necessity to believe the things spoken by them, when they both glorified God as the Maker and Father of all things, and also did prophesy before, of Christ his Son to be sent of him; all which, the false prophets, being filled with a false and corrupt spirit, neither have done, nor do, but only take upon them to work certain prodigious wonders to astound men, setting out thereby to the world false and unclean spirits. But before all things, make thy prayer that the gates of light may be opened unto thee, for these things cannot be seen or comprehended by every man, but only by him to whom God and his Christ give the understanding thereof.”

These things, with much more (which now leisure serveth not to prosecute), after the aforesaid old father had declared unto him, he

departed, exhorting him well to follow the things which he had spoken; and, after that, Justin (as he himself witnesseth) saw him no more. Immediately after this, Justin, being all inflamed as with a fire kindled in his breast, began to conceive a love and zeal towards the prophets, and all such as were favored of Christ. And thus he, revolving in his mind more and more these words, found only this philosophy among all other professions both sure and profitable. And so became he a philosopher at first, and by these means, afterwards, he was made a Christian, and baptized. But where he received this holy sacrament of baptism is not recorded, nor yet by what occasion he left his country and came to Rome. This only we read in Jerome, that he was in Rome, and there used certain exercises which he called Diatribes, disputing there with Crescens, a Cynic philosopher, as is before touched. But this is certain, how that Justin, after he had received the profession of the christian religion, became an earnest defender of the same; travailing and disputing against all the adversaries thereof, fearing neither peril of life nor danger of death, whereby he might maintain the doctrine of Christ against the malicious blasphemers, and also augment the number of christian believers, as may appear by his vehement disputations against the heathen philosophers: also, it well appeareth in that long disputation which he had with Trypho, a Jew, at Ephesus; as also in his confutations of heretics. Furthermore, his Conflicts and Apologies, which with great courage and boldness he exhibited against the persecutors of the Christians, both to the emperor and the magistrates, yea and the whole senate of Rome, do testify the same.

**Of the which Apologies,** <sup>a38</sup> the first <sup>f1009</sup> he wrote to Antoninus Pius the emperor, and the second to the senate of Rome, as is before mentioned; where, in the first, writing to Antoninus the emperor, and his successors, with gravity and free liberty he declareth unto them how they had the name, commonly being reputed and taken as virtuous philosophers, maintainers of justice, lovers of learning: but whether they were so, their acts declared. As for him, neither for flattery, nor favor at their hands, he was constrained thus to write unto them; but only to sue unto them, and desire a serious and righteous kind of dealing in their judgments and sentences (for it becometh princes to follow uprightness and piety in their judgments, not tyranny and violence); and also in plain words chargeth as well the emperor as the senate with manifest wrong, for that they did not

grant the Christians that which is not denied to all other malefactors, judging men to death not convicted, but only for the hatred of the name. "Other men which be appeached," said he, "in judgment, are not condemned before they are convicted: but on *us*, you take our name only for the crime, when indeed you ought to see justice done upon our accusers." And again, saith he, "If a Christian, being accused, only deny that name, him you release, if not able to charge him with any other offense. But, if he stand to his name, only for his confession you cast him: whereas, indeed it were your duty rather to examine their manner of life, what thing they confess or deny, and according to their deserts to see justice done."

And, in the same, further he saith: "You examine not the causes, but, incensed with rash affections, as with the spur of fury, ye slay and murder them not convicted, without any respect of justice." <sup>f1010</sup> And further he addeth, "Some peradventure will say, certain of them have been apprehended and taken in evil doings: as though," saith he, "you used to inquire upon them, being brought afore you, and not commonly to condemn them before due examination of their offense, for the cause above mentioned." Where also, in the end of the said Apology, after this manner he reprehendeth them; "You do degenerate," quoth he, "from the goodness of your predecessors, whose example you follow not; for your father Adrian, of famous memory, caused to be proclaimed, that Christians accused before the judge should not be condemned, unless they were found guilty of some notorious crime." I find that all his vehement and grave Apology standeth upon most strong and firm probations, denying, that the Christians ought by conscience, at the will and commandment of the emperor and senate, to do sacrifice to the idols: for which they, being condemned, affirm that they suffer open wrong; affirming, moreover, that the true and only religion is the religion of the Christians, whose doctrine and conversation have no fault.

And likewise, in his second Apology, writing with great liberty to the senate, he declared that of necessity he was compelled to write and utter his mind and conscience to them. For that in persecuting of the Christians they did neglect their duty, and highly offended God, and therefore need they had to be admonished. And further, mentions one of the martyrs as reproaching Urbicius, prefect of the city, saying, "That he put men to

death and torments for no offense committed, but for the confession only of the name of Christ; which proceedings and judgments neither became the emperor, nor Caesar's son, nor the senate;" <sup>f1011</sup> defending, moreover, in the said Apology, and purging the Christians of such crimes as falsely were laid and objected against them by the heathen.

**By these things** <sup>a39</sup> it is apparent, with what zeal and faith this Justin did strive against the persecutors, which (as he said) could kill only, but could not hurt.

**This Justin,** <sup>a39</sup> by the means and malice of Crescens the philosopher (as will be hereafter declared), suffered martyrdom under Marcus Antoninus Verus, about the time that Polycarp was martyred in Asia, as witnesseth Eusebius. <sup>f1012</sup>

Justin, although with these and such-like persuasions he did not so prevail with the emperor, as to cause him to love his religion and become a Christian (for that is not recorded), yet thus much he obtained, that Antoninus, writing to his officers in Asia in the behalf of the Christians, required and commanded them, that those Christians only who were found guilty of any trespass, should suffer; and such as were not convicted, should not for the name only be punished, because they were called Christians, **as well may appear** <sup>a40</sup> by his letter sent down to the commons of Asia, the tenor whereof here ensueth. <sup>f1013</sup>

## **THE EPISTLE OF ANTONINUS PIUS, TO THE COMMONS OF ASIA.**

Emperor and Caesar, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Augustus, Armenicus, Pontifex Maximus, tribune fifteen times, consul thrice, to the common council of Asia, greeting.

I am persuaded, that the gods will take care that persons such as you describe these Christians to be, shall not escape with impunity; for they are much more concerned to punish those who refuse to worship them, than you are. But are they quite the characters you represent? You overwhelm them with trouble, and only confirm them in the opinions which they really do hold, when you charge them with being "atheists:" and it seems infinitely preferable to them to die for their God, than to live under such an

imputation. And here it may not be amiss for me to refer to the earthquakes which are continually happening, and remind you how disheartened you are whenever they occur, and how you then envy these people their state of mind, as compared with your own: at such seasons whilst they wax the more bold in their God, you seem to have forgotten that there are gods, and the worship of the eternal is the last thing you think of; and yet the Christians who do worship him, you hunt and persecute to death. Many of the governors of the provinces heretofore wrote about these people to our father of blessed memory, who in reply directed them “not to molest the Christians, unless they should appear to be attempting something against the Roman government.” I have also myself received many communications respecting them, to which I have returned answer to the same effect as my father did. Wherefore, if any one hereafter shall prosecute a Christian, merely as such, though the accused should plainly be proved to be one, let him be acquitted; but let the accuser be punished.

This godly edict of the emperor was **proclaimed at Ephesus**, <sup>a41 f1014</sup> in the public assembly of all Asia, whereof Melito also, bishop of Sardis, who flourished in the same time, maketh mention, in his apology written in defense of our doctrine, to M. Antoninus Verus, as hereafter (Christ willing) shall appear. By this means, then, the tempest of persecution in those days began to be appeased, through the merciful providence of God, who would not have his church utterly to be overthrown, though hardly yet to grow.

### THE FOURTH PERSECUTION.

After the decease of the aforesaid quiet and mild prince Antoninus Pius (who, among all other emperors of that time made the most quiet end), followed his son Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Verus (with Lucius Verus, his brother), about the year of our Lord 161, a man of nature more stern and severe; and, although in study of philosophy and in civil government no less commendable, yet, toward the christians sharp and fierce; by whom was moved the fourth persecution after Nero.

**Among those who sustained** <sup>a42</sup> the cruelty of this persecution at Rome, under this Marcus Antoninus Verus, is mentioned Felicitas, with her seven children. The names of her children Bergomensis, and other historians, do thus recite: Januarius, Felix, Philip, Silvanus, Alexander, Vitalis, and Martial. Of whom her first and eldest son, Januarius, after he was whipped and scourged with rods, was pressed to death with leaden weights: Felix and Philip had their brains beaten out with mallets: Silvanus was cast down headlong, and had his neck broken: furthermore, Alexander, Vitalis, and Martial, were beheaded. Last of all, Felicitas, the mother (otherwise than the accustomed manner was for such as had borne children), was slain with the sword. <sup>f1015</sup>

To these above recited, is also to be added Praxedes, a blessed virgin, the daughter of a citizen of Rome, who, in the time of Anicetus there bishop, was so brought up in the doctrine of Christ, and so affected to his religion, that she, with her sister Patientiana, <sup>f1016</sup> bestowed all her patrimony upon the relieving of poor Christians, giving all her time to fasting and prayer, and to the burying of the bodies of the martyrs. And after she had made free all her family with her servants, after the death of her sister she also departed, and was buried in peace.

Under the same Antoninus also suffered Ptolomaeus and Lucius, for the confession of Christ; whose history, because it is described in the Apology of Justin Martyr, I thought therefore so to set forth the same, as it is alleged in Eusebius, <sup>f1017</sup> declaring the manner and occasion thereof, in words and effect as followeth: —

A certain woman had a husband who led a lascivious and libidinous course of life; she herself also had formerly been guilty of the same. But having become acquainted with the christian religion, she became chaste herself and made it her constant endeavor to persuade him to be the same; repeating to him oftentimes the truths and precepts of Christianity, and telling him of the punishment in eternal fire which was prepared for such as lead an obscene and disorderly life. But he, persevering in his lascivious habits, alienated thereby his wife's affections. At length the woman, judging it a wicked thing for her to cohabit with a husband who (disregarding the law of nature and common propriety) only sought

ways to gratify his lust; was minded to be divorced from him. But her friends advising her still to continue with him in hope that he might yet mend, she put a force on herself and continued with him. But after this, her husband, having gone a journey to Alexandria, was reported to her as living there more licentiously than ever; whereupon, she (fearing lest by her continuing in connection with him, she should be counted a partaker of his sins) sent him what is termed a bill of divorce and separated from him. But this excellent fellow, who ought to have rejoiced that his wife (who formerly committed the basest lewdness, and took pleasure in drunkenness and all manner of vice) had now desisted from such practices herself and wished him to desist also, and had got divorced from him only because he would not comply, publicly accused her of being a Christian. Whereupon she presented a petition to thee, O emperor, that she might have liberty first to set her affairs in order; after which settlement she would put in an answer to the accusation. To which you condescended.

But her heretofore husband, being unable to substantiate anything against her, set upon one Ptolomaeus (the same whom Urbicius has put to death) who had been her instructor in the christian religion, in the following manner. He persuaded a centurion, who was his friend, to apprehend Ptolomaeus, and having put him in bonds to ask him this one question, Whether he were a Christian. Ptolomaeus (being a lover of truth and a hater of deceit and equivocation) confessed that he was a Christian; whereupon the centurion caused him to be bound in fetters, and afflicted him with a long imprisonment. At length being brought before Urbicius, he was again asked the plain question, Whether he were a Christian. He, knowing in himself the blessings he had received through the doctrine of Christ, again confessed himself a follower of that heavenly learning. For he who denies himself to be a Christian, either denies because he disapproves of Christianity, or avoids the profession of it because he feels himself unworthy and a stranger to its blessings; neither of which can be said of a true Christian. He was immediately ordered to execution. Whereupon one Lucius (himself a Christian) considering the injustice of the sentence, said

to Urbicius; — “What is the reason that you have sentenced a man who is neither an adulterer, nor a fornicator, nor a murderer, nor a thief, nor a robber, nor convicted of any misdemeanor whatever, but simply owns to the appellation of a Christian? Such proceedings as these, O Urbicius, are not in character with the “Pious” emperor, or the “philosopher” son of Caesar, or the “sacred” senate. <sup>f1018</sup> But Urbicius made no reply, except, “You seem to be one of this sort, yourself.” Lucius admitting that it was so, Urbicius ordered him also to be led off to execution. He declared himself much obliged to him, “for I shall be delivered (said he) from such wicked tyrants, and go to my God, a gracious father and king.” A third stepping forward and making the same profession, was condemned to undergo the same punishment.

And thus much out of the Apology of Justin, by the which story it may appear not to be true what Gratian attributeth unto Hyginus, bishop of Rome, the deciding of causes matrimonial, seeing that in Justin’s time (who was in the same age as Hyginus), the divorcement of this woman in this history above touched, was not decided by any ecclesiastical law, or brought before any bishop, but was brought before a heathen prince, and determined by the law civil.

**Henry of Herford** <sup>a43</sup> [in Westphalia] recordeth, out of the Martyrology of Isuardus, of one Concordius, a minister of the city of Spoleto, who, in the reign of this Antoninus Verus, because he would not sacrifice unto Jupiter, but did spit in the face of the idol, after divers and sundry punishments sustained, at last with the sword was beheaded. Vincentius <sup>f1019</sup> reciteth a long story of his acts and life, whereof some part, perhaps, may seem tolerable. But this verily appeareth to be false and fabulous, concerning the water flowing beside his sepulcher in the aforementioned city of Spoleto, unto the which water was given (saith Vincentius) by the virtue of him for whose name he suffered, to restore sight to the blind, to heal the sick, and to cast out devils, etc. Which kind of virtue, to open the eyes of the blind, and to expel devils, neither doth God give to any creature of water, neither is it likely that Concordius, the blessed martyr, did or would require any such thing at the hands of God.

Isuardus and Bede, Vincentius and Henry of Herford, with other authors more, make relation of divers other martyrs that by sundry kinds of torments were put to death under the aforesaid Antoninus Verus: the names of whom be Symmetrius, Florellus, Pontian, Alexander, Caius, Epipodius, Victor, Corona, Marcellus, and Valerian. The cause of whose martyrdom was the reprehending of idolatry, and because, at the emperor's commandment, they would not sacrifice to idols. Many sorts of punishments and miracles are told of them; but at length the end of them all is this, that they were beheaded. Whereby it may be the more suspected the histories of these writers not to be certain or true, as well touching these as also other martyrs, as may appear in Vincentius, in Petrus "De Natalibus," and other authors of like sort. In which authors they who list to read more of their miracles, there may find them.

**In the rage of this** <sup>a44</sup> fourth persecution, under the reign of Antoninus Verus, suffered also the before-mentioned good Justin, who first exhibited unto the emperor, and to the senate, his second Apology in the defense of the Christians, and afterward himself also died a martyr. Of whom, in the history of Eusebius, <sup>f1020</sup> it is thus recorded: —

About the time that Polycarp, with divers other saints, suffered martyrdom in Pergamos, a city of Asia, this Justin presented a second book in defense of our doctrine to the emperors aforesaid. After which he was also crowned with like martyrdom unto those whom he, in his book, had defended; through the malicious means and crafty circumvention of Crescens.

This Crescens was a philosopher, conforming his life and manners to the Cynical denomination, whom because this Justin had confuted in open audience; he therefore, as much as in him lay, did work and procure unto him this crown of martyrdom. And thus much did also Justin (himself a philosopher of no mean order) foresee and declare in his aforesaid Apology, predicting almost all those things beforehand which were to happen unto him, in these words. "I also expect myself to be betrayed and put in the stocks by some one of those whom I have named, perhaps by that pseudo-philosopher, Crescens, who is louder of fame than of truth: for the man does not deserve the name of a philosopher, who

publicly asserts what he does not know to be true — for example, ‘that the Christians are atheistical and impious persons’ — merely to gratify and please the multitude. In so doing he commits a grievous error. If he never met with any account of our doctrine, it is very wicked of him to inveigh against us, and he is far worse in so doing than the generality of men, who are mostly cautious how they talk about what they do not understand, lest they speak what is false. If he has met with it, but did not understand the majestic sublimity thereof; or, understanding it, acts thus in order to avoid the suspicion of being himself a Christian, that is still more base and wicked, in that he avows himself the slave of popular opinion and the fear of man. For I would have you know that, when I proposed and asked him some questions on the subject, I discovered that he really knew nothing about it. And to prove the truth of what I say, I am ready (if these our disputations have not come to your knowledge) to propose the questions to him again in your presence — and this exercise will be by no means derogatory to your Imperial Dignity. But if both my questions and his answers have been made known to you, then it must be clear to you already, that he is quite ignorant of our religion. If, however, he understands it, but does not freely declare himself because of his auditors, then is he plainly no philosopher (as I said before), but a slave to popular opinion; and has no esteem for that most excellent saying of Socrates in Plato, that no man is to be preferred before the truth.”

And thus much of Justin, out of Justin himself.

Now, to verify that which Justin here of himself doth prophesy, “That Crescens would procure his death,” Tatian (a man brought up of a child in the learning of the Gentiles, and who obtained in the same not a little fame, and who also left behind him many good monuments and commentaries,) writeth in his book against the gentiles in this sort: “And Justin,” saith he, “that most excellently learned man, full well spake and uttered his mind, that the afore-recited men were like unto thieves, or liers by the high-way side.” And in the said book, speaking afterwards of certain philosophers, the said Tatian inferreth thus: “Crescens, therefore,” saith he, “when he came first into that great city, passed all others in the vicious love of

children, and was very much given to covetousness; and whereas he taught that men ought not to regard death, he himself did fear death, and he did all his endeavor to oppress Justin with death, as with the greatest evil that was; and all because that Justin, speaking truth, reprov'd the philosophers to be men only for the belly, and deceivers: and this was the cause of Justin's martyrdom."

**Jerome**, <sup>a45</sup> in his Ecclesiastical Catalogue, thus writeth: "Justin, when in the city of Rome he had his disputations, and had reprov'd Crescens, the Cynic, a great blasphemer of the Christians, for a belly-god, and a man fearing death, and also a follower of lust and lechery; at last, by his endeavor and conspiracy, was accused to be a Christian, and for Christ shed his blood," A.D. 153, under Antoninus Pius, according to the abbot of Ursperg; but according to others, A.D. 165 or 166, in the sixth year of the emperor Marcus Antoninus. <sup>f1021</sup>

**Here is to be** <sup>a46</sup> gathered how Epiphanius was deceived in the time of his death, saying, "That he suffered under Rusticus the prefect, and Adrian the emperor, being of thirty years of age;" which indeed agreeth neither with Eusebius, nor Jerome, nor Suidas, nor others more, who manifestly declare and testify how he exhibited his Apology unto Antoninus Pius, who came after Adrian. Thus hast thou, good reader, the life of this learned and blessed martyr, fully and amply discoursed, for the better commendation of his excellent and notable virtues, of whose final end thus writeth Photius, saying, "That he, suffering for Christ, died cheerfully and with honor." <sup>f1022</sup>

In the time of the same Marcus a great number of them which truly professed Christ, suffered most cruel torments and punishments, both in Asia and France. In the number of whom was Polycarp, the worthy bishop of Smyrna, who, in the great rage of this persecution in Asia, among many other most constant saints, was also martyred. Of whose end and martyrdom I thought it here not inexpedient to commit to history so much as Eusebius <sup>f1023</sup> declareth to be taken out of a certain letter or epistle: written by them of his own church to all the brethren throughout the world: <sup>f1024</sup> the tenor of which epistle here followeth.

The church of God which sojourns at Smyrna to that which sojourns at Philomelium, <sup>f1025</sup> and to all the churches throughout

the world composing the holy catholic church, mercy, peace, and the love of God the Father and of the Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied! We have written to inform you, brethren, concerning the martyrs, but particularly concerning the blessed Polycarp, who, as it were, sealed up the persecution with his own blood.

And in the same epistle, before they enter into further matter of Polycarp, they discourse of other martyrs, describing what patience they abode in and showed, in suffering their torments.

Their patience was so admirable (saith the epistle) that the bystanders were amazed; while they beheld them torn with whips till their veins and arteries appeared, yea and even their bowels and the inward structure of their frame were laid open to view; then, laid on prickly sea-shells, and on little sharp spikes or nails called **ὀβελίσκοι** and, in short, made to go through every kind of punishment and torture that could be devised; and, lastly, thrown to the wild beasts to be devoured.

But especially in the aforesaid epistle, mention is made of one Germanicus, how he most worthily persevered and overcame, by the grace of God, that fear of death which is engrafted in the common nature of all men; whose patience and sufferance were so notable, that the whole multitude, wondering at this beloved martyr of God for this his so bold constancy, and also at the singular strength and fortitude of the whole of the Christians, began suddenly to cry with a loud voice, saying, “Away with the atheists: <sup>f1026</sup> let Polycarp be sought for.” **And whilst a great** <sup>a47</sup> uproar and tumult began thus to be raised upon those cries, a certain Christian, named Quintus, lately come out of Phrygia, having been shown the wild beasts and threatened with being thrown to them, quailed with fear, and, to save his life, gave in. The letter states, that this man had, more hastily than wisely, rushed up, with others, before the tribunal; and thereupon being taken, afforded by his apostasy a signal warning to all, not to venture on such trials fool-hardily and without counting the cost.

But now we will surcease to speak more of them, and return to Polycarp, of whom the aforesaid letter consequently declareth as followeth:

The admirable Polycarp, when first he heard what was passing, was not at all flurried, but preserved his usual calmness and presence of mind, and purposed to remain in the city: but being prevailed on by those about him, who earnestly besought him to convey himself away, he retired to a village not far off; and there, with a few friends, he spent his time entirely, night and day, in praying (as he had ever been wont) for the peace of all the churches throughout the world. Three days before he was apprehended, as he was thus praying at night, he fell asleep, and saw in a dream the pillow take fire under his head, and presently consumed. Waking thereupon, he forthwith related the vision to those about him, and prophesied that he should be burnt alive for Christ's sake. It is further stated, that when the persons who were in search of him were close at hand, he was induced, for the love of the brethren, to retire to another village, to which, notwithstanding, the pursuers soon followed him; and having caught a couple of boys dwelling there about, they whipped one of them till he directed them to Polycarp's retreat. The pursuers having arrived late in the day, <sup>f1027</sup> found him gone to bed in the top room of the house, whence he might have escaped into another house, if he would; but this he refused to do, saying, "The will of the Lord be done." Hearing that they were come, as the said history relates, he came down, and spoke to them with a cheerful and pleasant countenance: so that they were wonder-struck, who, having never known the man before, now beheld his venerable age and the gravity and composure of his manner, <sup>f1028</sup> and wondered why they should be so earnest for the apprehension of so old a man. He immediately ordered a table to be laid for them, and exhorted them to eat heartily, and begged them to allow him one hour to pray without molestation; which being granted, he rose and began to pray, and was so full of the grace of God, that they who were present and heard his prayers were astonished, and many now felt sorry that so venerable and godly a man should be put to death.

After this the aforesaid epistle or letter, prosecuting the history, addeth more, as followeth: —

When he had finished his prayers, wherein he made mention of all whom he had ever been connected with, small and great, noble and vulgar, and of the whole catholic church throughout the world, the hour being come for their departure, they set him on an ass and brought him to the city, on the great sabbath. <sup>f1029</sup> There met him the irenarch <sup>f1030</sup> Herod, and his father Nicetes, who taking him up into their chariot, began to exhort him, saying, "What harm is it to say 'Lord Caesar,' and to sacrifice, and save yourself?" At first he was silent: but being pressed to speak, he said "I will not do you advise me." When they saw that he was not to be persuaded, they gave him rough language, and pushed him hastily down, so that in descending from the chariot he grazed his shin. But he, unmoved as if he had suffered nothing, went on cheerfully, under the conduct of his guards, to the Stadium. There, the noise being so great that few could hear anything, a voice from heaven said to Polycarp as he entered the Stadium, "Be strong, Polycarp, and play the man." No one saw him that spake, but many of our people heard the voice. When he was brought to the tribunal, there was a great tumult as soon as it was generally understood that Polycarp was apprehended. The proconsul asked him, if he were Polycarp. When he assented, the former counselled him to deny Christ, saying, "Consider thyself, and have pity on thy own great age;" and many other suchlike speeches which they are wont to make: — "Swear by the fortune of Caesar" — "Repent" — "say, Away with the atheists." Then Polycarp, with a grave aspect, beholding all the multitude in the Stadium, and waving his hand to them, he gave a deep sigh, and, looking up to heaven, said, "Take away the atheists." The proconsul then urged him, saying, "Swear, and I will release thee; — reproach Christ." Polycarp answered, "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he never once wronged me; how then shall I blaspheme my King, who hath saved me?" The proconsul again urged him, "Swear by the fortune of Caesar." Polycarp replied, "Since you still vainly strive to make me swear by the fortune of Caesar, as you express it, affecting ignorance of my real character, hear me frankly declaring what I am — I am a Christian — and if you desire to learn the christian doctrine, assign me a day, and you shall hear." The proconsul said, "Persuade the

people.” Polycarp said, “I have thought proper to address you, because we are taught to pay to magistracies and powers ordained of God, all honor, which is consistent with a good conscience. But I do not hold those people worthy that I should apologize to them.” Hereupon the proconsul said, “I have wild beasts; and I will expose you to them, unless you repent.” “Call for them,” replied Polycarp; “for repentance with us is a wicked thing, if it is to be a change from the better to the worse, but a good thing if it is to be a change from evil to good.” “I will tame thee with fire,” said the proconsul, “since you despise the wild beasts, unless you repent.” Then said Polycarp, “You threaten me with fire, which burns for an hour, and is soon extinguished; but the fire of the future judgment, and of eternal punishment reserved for the ungodly, you are ignorant of. But why do you delay? Do whatever you please.”

While saying this, and much more of the same kind, he was filled with confidence and joy, and grace shone in his countenance, and was so far from being confounded by the proconsul’s menaces, that, on the contrary, the proconsul himself was visibly embarrassed, and sent the herald to proclaim thrice in the middle of the Stadium, “Polycarp hath professed himself a Christian.” Which words were no sooner spoken, but the whole multitude, both of Gentiles and Jews, dwelling at Smyrna, with outrageous fury shouted aloud, “This is the doctor of Asia, the father of the Christians, and the subverter of our gods, who hath taught many not to sacrifice nor adore.” They now called on Philip, the asiarch, <sup>f1031</sup> to let loose a lion against Polycarp. But he refused, alleging that he had closed his exhibition. They then unanimously shouted, that he should be burnt alive. For his vision must needs be accomplished — the vision which he had when he was praying, and saw his pillow burnt, when he turned to the faithful that were with him, and said, prophetically, “I must be burnt alive.” This was no sooner said, than done; for the people immediately gathered wood and other dry matter from the workshops and baths: in which service the Jews (with their usual malice) were particularly forward to help.

The pile being now made, he put off his garments and unloosed his girdle, and attempted to take off his shoes, — a thing which he had not been accustomed to do — because the faithful were wont to strive who should be most assiduous in serving him. For even in his younger days he had been held in great respect, for his integrity and blameless conduct. Immediately the materials for making the pile were placed around him, and when they would have fastened him to the stake, he said, “Leave me as I am; for he who giveth me strength to sustain the fire, will enable me also, without your securing me with nails, to remain without flinching in the pile.” Upon which they bound him, without nailing him. So he, having his hands bound behind him, like a distinguished ram selected from a large flock, to be offered as an acceptable burnt-offering to God Almighty, said thus: — “O Father of thy beloved and blessed Son Jesus Christ, through whom we have attained the knowledge of thee, the God of angels and principalities, and of all creation, and of all the just who live in thy sight, I bless thee that thou hast counted me worthy of this day and of this hour, to receive my portion among the number of martyrs in the cup of Christ, for the resurrection and eternal life both of soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost; among whom may I be received before thee this day, as a sacrifice well-savoured and acceptable, which thou the faithful and true God hast prepared, promised beforehand, and fulfilled accordingly. Wherefore I praise thee for all things, I bless thee, I glorify thee, through the eternal High-Priest, Jesus Christ, thy well-beloved Son; through whom to thee with him, in the Holy Spirit, be glory, both now and for ever. Amen.”

As soon as he had uttered the word “Amen,” and finished his prayer, the officers lighted the fire; and a great flame bursting out, we, to whom it was given to see it, and who were also reserved to relate to others what happened, we saw a wonder. For the flame, forming the appearance of all arch, as the sail of a vessel filled with wind, surrounded, as with a wall, the body of the martyr; which was in the midst, not as burning flesh, but as gold and silver refining in the furnace. We received also in our nostrils such a fragrance as proceeds from frankincense or some other precious

perfume. At length the wicked people, observing that his body could not be consumed with the fire, ordered the confector <sup>f1032</sup> to approach, and to plunge his sword into his body. Upon this such a quantity of blood gushed out, that the fire was extinguished; and all the multitude were astonished to see this difference providentially made between the unbelievers and the elect, of whom this most admirable man was one, the last surviving apostolical and prophetic teacher in our times, having been the bishop of the catholic church of Smyrna; for whatever he spoke, both has been and shall be accomplished. But the envious, malignant, and spiteful enemy of the just, observing the gloriousness of his martyrdom, and the blamelessness of his life, even from his youth up, and knowing that he was now crowned with immortality, and had received the prize of unquestionable victory, studied to prevent us from obtaining his poor body, though many of us longed to do so, that we might have communion with his sacred remains. <sup>f1033</sup> For some persons suggested to Nicetes, the father of Herod and the brother of Alce, <sup>f1034</sup> to go to the proconsul, and entreat him not to deliver the body to the Christians, “lest,” said they, “leaving the crucified one, they should begin to worship *him*.” And they said these things upon the suggestions and arguments of the Jews, who also watched us when we were going to take the body from the pile: unacquainted indeed with our views, viz. that it is not possible for us to forsake Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all who are to be saved <sup>f1035</sup> of the human race, nor ever to worship any other. For Him, as being the Son of God, we *worship*; but the martyrs, as disciples and followers of the Lord, we *love*, <sup>f1036</sup> and that justly, on account of the distinguished affection which they bore toward their King and Master. And may we be ranked at last in their number! The centurion, perceiving the malevolence of the Jews, placed the body in the midst of the fire, and burned it. Then we gathered up his bones — more precious than gold and jewels — and deposited them in a proper place, where, if possible, we shall meet, and the Lord will grant us in gladness and joy to celebrate the birthday of his martyrdom, both in commemoration of those who have wrestled before us, and for the instruction and confirmation of those who come after.

Thus much concerning the blessed Polycarp, who, together with eleven Philadelphians, was crowned with martyrdom at Smyrna: who alone is so preeminently famous among all men, that even the heathens everywhere make mention of him.

Thus have you heard, out of the epistle of the brethren of Smyrna, the whole order and life of Polycarp: whereby it may appear that he was a very aged man, who had served Christ eighty-six years since the first knowledge of him, and served also in the ministry about the space of seventy years. This Polycarp was the scholar and hearer of John the evangelist, and was placed by the said John in Smyrna. Of him also Ignatius maketh mention in his epistle, which he wrote in his journey to Rome, going toward his martyrdom, and commendeth to him the government of his church at Antioch, whereby it appeareth that Polycarp was then in the ministry. Likewise Irenaeus writeth of the said Polycarp after this manner: “He always taught,” said he, “those things which he had learned of the apostles (leaving them to the church), and which are alone true. Whereunto also all the churches that be in Asia, and all they which succeeded after Polycarp, to this day, bear witness.” <sup>f1037</sup> And the same Irenaeus witnesseth also that the said Polycarp wrote an epistle to the Philippians, <sup>f1038</sup> which whether it be the same that is now extant and read in the name of Polycarp, it is doubted of some: notwithstanding in the said epistle divers things are found very wholesome and apostolic: as where he teacheth of Christ, of judgment, and of the resurrection. Also he writeth of faith very worthily, thus declaring, that by grace we are saved, and not by works, but in the will of God by Jesus Christ.

In Eusebius <sup>f1039</sup> we read in like manner a part of an epistle written by Irenaeus to Florinus, wherein is declared, how that the said Irenaeus, being yet young, was with Polycarp in Asia; and at what time he wrote, well remembered what Polycarp did, and the place where he sat teaching, his whole order of life, and the proportion of his body, with the sermons which he uttered to the people. And furthermore, he perfectly remembered, how that the said Polycarp oftentimes reported unto him those things which he had heard them speak concerning the Lord’s doings, power, and doctrine, who heard the Word of Life with their own ears, all which [things] were consonant and agreeable to the holy scripture. This, with much more, hath Irenaeus concerning Polycarp.

Jerome also, writing of the same Polycarp, <sup>f1040</sup> hath, how he was in great estimation throughout all Asia, for that he was scholar to the apostles, and to them who did see and were conversant with Christ himself: whereby it is to be conjectured his authority was great, not only with them of his own church, but with all other churches about him.

**Irenaeus, in his book** <sup>a48</sup> against heresies, and Eusebius <sup>f1041</sup> in his Ecclesiastical History, report this worthy saying of Polycarp: “This Polycarp,” saith he, “meeting at a certain time Marcion, the heretic, who said to him, ‘Dost thou not know me?’ made answer, ‘I know that thou art the first-begotten of Satan.’” So great fear what evil might ensue thereof, had the disciples of the apostles, that they would not even speak to those whom they knew to be depravers of the verity, even as St. Paul saith: “A heretic, after the first and second admonition, shun and avoid, knowing that he which is such a one, is perverse and sinneth, and damneth himself.”

Over and besides, it is witnessed by the said Irenaeus, that Polycarp came to Rome in the time of Anicetus, bishop of Rome, about the year of our Lord 160, in the reign of Antoninus Pius: the cause of his coming thither appeareth to be about the controversy of Easter-day, wherein the Asians and the Romans something disagreed among themselves. And therefore the said Polycarp, in the behalf of the brethren and church of Asia, took his long journey thither, to come and confer with Anicetus. Whereof writeth also Nicephorus, <sup>f1042</sup> declaring, that Polycarp and Anicetus something varied in opinions and judgment about that matter, and yet, that notwithstanding, both friendly communicated either with the other, insomuch that Anicetus, in his church, gave place to Polycarp, to minister the communion and sacrament of the Lord’s supper, for honor sake. Which may be a notable testimony now to us, that the doctrine concerning the free use and liberty of ceremonies, was at that time retained in the church without any offense of stomach, or breach of christian peace in the church.

This Polycarp (as is above mentioned) suffered his martyrdom even in his own church at Smyrna, where he had labored so many years in planting of the gospel of Christ; which was in the fourth persecution after Nero, <sup>f1043</sup> when Marcus Aurelius Antoninus and Lucius Aelius Verus reigned, A.D. 167, as the abbot of Ursperg <sup>f1044</sup> affirmeth; and in the year 169, and the seventh of M. Antoninus, as Eusebius witnesseth in his Chronicles; <sup>f1045</sup>

the seventh day before the kalends of March; <sup>f1046</sup> whereby it appeareth that Socrates (cited in the “Historia Tripartita”) was much deceived, saying, that Polycarp suffered in the time of Gordian. <sup>F1047</sup>

In this fourth persecution, besides Polycarp and others mentioned before, we read also in Eusebius of divers others, who about the same time likewise did suffer at Smyrna. <sup>F1048</sup>

**Of Germanicus** <sup>a49</sup> mention is made above, in the story of Polycarp, of whom writeth Eusebius, <sup>f1049</sup> noting him to be a young man, and most constantly to persevere in the profession of Christ’s doctrine; whom when the proconsul wanted to persuade to remember his youth, and to spare himself, being in the flower of his age, he would not be allured; but constantly and boldly, and of his own accord, incited and provoked the wild beasts to come upon him, and to devour him, that he might be delivered more speedily out of this wretched life.

Over and besides, in the same persecution suffered moreover Metrodorus, a minister, who was given to the fire, and so consumed. Another was worthy Pionius, who, after much boldness of speech, with his apologies exhibited, and his orations made to the people in the defense of christian faith, and after much relieving and comforting of such as were in prisons and otherwise discomfited, at last was put to cruel torments and afflictions; then given likewise to the fire, and so finished his blessed testimony.

Beside these also suffered Carpus, Papyrus, and Agathonica, a woman; who, after their most constant and worthy confessions, were put to death at Pergamos, in Asia, as witnesseth Eusebius. <sup>F1050</sup>

Under the said Antoninus Verus, and in the same persecution, which raged not in Rome and Asia only, but in other countries also, suffered the glorious and most constant martyrs of Lyons and Vienne, two cities in France; giving to Christ a glorious testimony, and to all christian men a spectacle or example of singular constancy and fortitude in Christ our Savior. The history of whom, because it is written and set forth by their own churches, where they did suffer, mentioned in Eusebius, <sup>f1051</sup> I thought here to express the same in the form and effect of their own

words, as there is to be seen. The title of which their epistle, written to the brethren of Asia and Phrygia, thus beginneth: —

**A LETTER OF THE BRETHREN OF FRANCE, IN THE CITIES OF VIENNE AND LYONS, TO THE BRETHREN OF ASIA AND PHRYGIA.**

The servants of Christ, inhabiting the cities of Vienne and Lyons, in France, to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia, having the same faith and hope of redemption with us: peace, grace, and glory from God the Father, and from Christ Jesus our Lord. <sup>F1052</sup>

We are not competent to describe with accuracy in words or in writing, the greatness of the affliction sustained here by the saints, the intense animosity of the heathen against them, and the complicated sufferings of the blessed martyrs. The grand enemy assaulted us with all his might; and by his first essays, exhibited intentions of exercising malice without limits and without control. He left no method untried to habituate his slaves to his bloody work, and to prepare them by previous exercises against the servants of God. Christians were absolutely prohibited from appearing in any houses except their own, in baths, in the market, or in any public place whatever. The grace of God, however, fought for us, preserving the weak and exposing the strong; who, like pillars, were able to withstand him in patience and to draw the whole fury of the wicked against themselves. These entered into the contest and sustained every species of pain and reproach. What was heavy to others, to them was light, while they were hastening to Christ; evincing indeed, that “the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us.” The first trial was from the people at large; shouts, blows, the dragging of their bodies, the plundering of their goods, casting of stones, and the confining of them within their own houses, and all the indignities which may be expected from a fierce and outrageous multitude, these were magnanimously sustained. And now, being led into the forum by the tribune and the magistrates, they were examined before all the people, whether they were Christians; and on pleading guilty, were shut up in prison till the arrival of the governor. Before him they were at length brought; and

he treated us with great savageness of manners. The spirit of Vettins Epagathus, one of the brethren, was roused — a man full of charity both to God and man — whose conduct was so exemplary, though but a youth, that he might justly be compared to old Zacharias; for he “walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless;” a man ever unwearied in acts of beneficence to his neighbours, full of zeal towards God, and fervent in spirit. He could not bear to see so manifest a perversion of justice; but, being moved with indignation, he demanded to be heard in behalf of the brethren, and pledged himself to prove that there was nothing atheistic or impious among them. Those about the tribunal shouted against him. He was a man of quality; and the governor, being vexed and irritated by so equitable a demand from such a person, only asked him if he were a Christian; and this he confessed in the most open manner: — the consequence was, that he was ranked amongst the martyrs. He was called indeed, the Advocate of the Christians; but he had an advocate within, the Holy Spirit, more abundantly than Zacharias, which he demonstrated by the fullness of his charity, cheerfully laying down his life in defense of his brethren; for he was, and is still, a genuine disciple of Christ, “following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth.”

The rest began now to be proved. <sup>F1053</sup> The capital martyrs appeared indeed ready for the contest, and discharged their part with all alacrity of mind. Others seemed not so ready; but rather, unexercised, and as yet weak and unable to sustain the shock of such a contest: of these, ten in number lapsed, whose case filled us with great and unmeasurable sorrow, and dejected the spirits of those who had not yet been apprehended, who, though they sustained all indignities, yet deserted not the martyrs in their distress. Then we were all much alarmed because of the uncertain event of confession; not that we dreaded the torments with which we were threatened, but because we looked forward to the end, and feared the danger of apostasy. Persons were now apprehended daily of such as were counted worthy to fill up the number of the lapsed, so that the most excellent were selected from the two churches, even those by whose labors they had been founded and

established. There were seized at the same time some of our heathen servants, — for the governor had openly ordered us and ours all to be examined, — who, by the impulse of Satan, and fearing the torments which they saw inflicted on the saints; at the suggestion of the soldiers, accused us of eating human flesh, and of various unnatural crimes, and of things not fit even to be mentioned or imagined, and such as ought not to be believed of mankind.

These things being commonly reported, all were incensed even to madness against us; so that if some were formerly more moderate on account of any connexions of blood, affinity or friendship, they were then transported beyond all bounds with indignation. Now was it that our Lord's word was fulfilled, "The time will come when, whosoever killeth you, will think that he doeth God service." The holy martyrs now sustained tortures which exceed the powers of description; Satan laboring by means of these tortures, to extort something slanderous against Christianity. The whole fury of the multitude, the governor, and the soldiers, was spent in a particular manner on Sanctus of Vienne, the deacon, and on Maturus, a late convert indeed, but a magnanimous wrestler in spiritual things; and on Attalus of Pergamos, a man who had ever been a pillar and support of our church; and lastly on Blandina, through whom Christ showed that those things that appear unsightly and contemptible among men are most honorable in the presence of God, on account of love to his name exhibited in real energy, and not in boasting and pompous pretences. For — while we all feared; and among the rest while her mistress according to the flesh, who herself was one of the noble army of martyrs, dreaded that she would not be able to witness a good confession, because of the weakness of her body; — Blandina was endued with so much fortitude, that those who successively tortured her from morning to night, were quite worn out with fatigue, and owned themselves conquered and exhausted of their whole apparatus of tortures, and were amazed to see her still breathing whilst her body was torn and laid open: they confessed that any single species of the torture would have been sufficient to dispatch her, much more so great a variety as had been applied. But the blessed woman, as a

generous wrestler, recovered fresh vigor in the act of confession; and it was an evident refreshment, support, and an annihilation of all her pains, to say — “I am a Christian, and no evil is committed among us.”

In the mean time Sanctus, having sustained in a manner more than human the most barbarous indignities, while the impious hoped to extort from him something injurious to the gospel, through the duration and intensesness of his sufferings, resisted with so much firmness, that he would neither tell his own name, nor that of his nation or state, nor whether he was a freeman or a slave; but to every interrogatory he answered in Latin, “I am a Christian.” This, he repeatedly owned, was to him both name, and country, and family, and every thing; and nothing else could the heathen draw from him. Hence the indignation of the governor and of the torturers was fiercely levelled against this holy person, so that having exhausted all the usual methods of torture, they at last clapped brazen plates to the most tender parts of his body. These were made red hot for the purpose of scorching him, and yet he remained upright and inflexible, and firm in his confession; being, no doubt, bedewed and refreshed by the heavenly fountain of the water of life which flows from Christ. His body witnessed indeed the ghastly tortures which he had sustained, being one continued wound and bruise, altogether contracted, and no longer retaining the form of a human creature. In this man the view of Christ suffering wrought great marvels, confounded the adversary, and showed for the encouragement of the rest, that nothing is to be feared where the love of the Father is; and that nothing is painful where the glory of Christ is exhibited. For when, after some days, the impious had renewed his tortures and imagined that a fresh application of the same method of punishment to his wounds, now swollen and inflamed, must either overcome his constancy, or, by dispatching him on the spot, strike a terror into the rest (as he could not even bear to be touched by the hand), this was so far from being the case, that, contrary to all expectation, his body recovered its natural position in the second course of torture; he was restored to

his former shape and to the use of his limbs; so that, by the grace of Christ, this cruelty proved not a punishment, but a cure.

One of those who had denied Christ was Biblias, a female. Satan imagining that he had now devoured her, and desirous to augment her condemnation, by inducing her to accuse the Christians falsely, caused her to be led to the torture; and supposing her to be a weak and timorous creature, tempted her to charge us with horrid impieties. But in her torture she recovered herself, and awoke as out of a deep sleep, being admonished by a temporary punishment of the danger of eternal fire in hell; and, in opposition to the impious, she said, "How can we eat infants, — we, to whom it is not lawful to eat the blood of beasts?" And now she professed herself a Christian, and was added to the army of martyrs.

The power of Christ, manifested in the patience of his people, had now exhausted the usual artifices of torment; and the devil was driven to new resources. Christians were thrust into the darkest and most noisome parts of the prison: their feet were distended in the stocks, even to the fifth hole; and in this situation they suffered all the indignities which diabolical malice could inflict. Hence many of them were suffocated in prison, whom the Lord, showing forth his own glory, was pleased thus to take to himself. The rest, though afflicted to such a degree as to seem scarcely capable of recovery under the kindest treatment, destitute as they were of all help and support, yet remained alive, strengthened by the Lord, and confirmed both in mind and body: and these encouraged and comforted the rest.

Some young persons who had been lately seized, and whose bodies had been unexercised with sufferings, being unequal to the severity of the confinement, expired. The blessed Pothinus, bishop of Lyons, upwards of ninety years of age, and very infirm and asthmatic, yet strong in spirit, and panting after martyrdom, was dragged before the tribunal: his body was worn out indeed with age and disease; yet he retained a soul through which Christ might triumph. Borne by the soldiers to the tribunal, and attended by the magistrates and all the multitude, shouting against him as if he were

Christ himself, he made a good confession. Being asked by the governor who was the God of the Christians, he answered, "If ye be worthy, ye shall know." He was then unmercifully dragged about, and suffered variety of ill treatment: those who were near, insulted him with their hands and feet, and those at a distance threw at him whatever came to hand: every one looked upon himself as deficient in zeal if he did not insult him in some way or other; for thus they imagined they revenged the cause of their gods. He was thrown into prison almost breathless, and after two days expired.

And in the same epistle of the aforesaid brethren of France, writing to the brethren of Asia, it followeth in this manner:

And here appeared a remarkable dispensation of Providence and the immense compassion of Jesus, such indeed as is rarely exhibited among the brethren, but not foreign to the Character of Christ. Many who, when first apprehended, had denied their Savior, were, notwithstanding, shut up in prison and suffered dreadful severities, as their denial of Christ availed them not. But those who confessed him, were imprisoned as Christians, abstracted from any other charge. Now the former, as if they had been murderers and incestuous wretches, were punished much more than the rest: but the joy of martyrdom supported the latter, and the hope of the promises, and the love of Christ, and the Spirit of the Father. The former were oppressed with the pangs of guilt; so that while they were dragged along, their very countenances distinguished them from the rest: but the faithful proceeded with cheerful steps; their countenances shone with much grace and glory; their bonds were as the most beautiful ornaments; and they themselves looked as brides adorned with their richest array, breathing the fragrance of Christ so much, that some thought they had been literally perfumed. The others went on dejected, spiritless, and forlorn, and in every way disgraced, insulted even by the heathen as cowards and poltroons, and treated as murderers; they had lost the precious, the glorious, the soul-reviving appellation. The rest observing these things, were confirmed in the

faith, confessed without hesitation on their being apprehended, and would not entertain the diabolical suggestion for a moment.

The martyrs were put to death in various ways: or, in other words, they wove a chaplet of various odours and flowers, and presented it to the Father. In truth, it became the wisdom and goodness of God to appoint that his servants, after enduring a great and variegated contest, should, as victors, receive the great crown of immortality. Maturus, Sanctus, Blandina, and Attalus, were led to the wild beasts into the amphitheatre to be the common spectacle of Gentile inhumanity.

One day extraordinary of the shows being afforded to the people on our account, Maturus and Sanctus again underwent various tortures in the amphitheatre, as if they had suffered nothing before. Thus were they treated like those wrestlers, who, having conquered several times already, were obliged afresh to contend with other conquerors by fresh lots, till some one was conqueror of the whole number, and as such was crowned. Here they sustained again, as they were led to the amphitheatre, the blows usually inflicted on those who were condemned to wild beasts; they were exposed to be dragged and torn by the beasts, and to all the barbarities which the mad populace with shouts demanded, and above all to the hot iron chair, in which their bodies were roasted and emitted a disgusting smell. Nor was this all: the persecutors raged still more, resolved, if possible, to overcome their patience. But not a word could be extorted from Sanctus besides what he first had uttered — the word of confession. These then after remaining alive a long time, expired at length, and became a spectacle to the world, equivalent to all the variety usual in the fights of gladiators.

Blandina, suspended from a stake, was exposed as food to the wild beasts: she was seen suspended in the form of a cross and employed in vehement supplication. The sight inspired her fellow-combatants with much alacrity, while they beheld with their bodily eyes, in the person of their sister, the figure of Him who was crucified for them, that he might persuade those who believe in him, that every one who suffers for the glory of Christ, always has

communion with the living God. None of the beasts at that time touched her: she was taken down from the stake and thrown again into prison, and reserved for a future contest; that having overcome in various exercises, she might fully condemn the old serpent, and fire the brethren with a noble spirit of christian emulation. Weak and contemptible as she might be deemed, yet when clothed with Christ, the mighty and invincible champion, she became victorious over the enemy in a variety of encounters, and was crowned with immortality.

Attalus also was vehemently demanded by the multitude, for he was a person of great reputation among us. He advanced in all the cheerfulness and serenity of a good conscience; — an experienced Christian, and ever ready and active in bearing testimony to the truth. He was led round the amphitheatre, and a tablet carried before him, inscribed in Latin: “This is Attalus the Christian.” The rage of the people would have had him dispatched immediately; but the governor, understanding that he was a Roman, ordered him back to prison: and concerning him and others, who could plead the same privilege of Roman citizenship, he wrote to the emperor and waited for his instructions.

The interval which this circumstance occasioned was not unfruitful to the church. — The unbounded compassion of Christ appeared in the patience of many. Dead members were restored to life by means of the living; and the martyrs became singularly serviceable to the lapsed; and thus the church rejoiced to receive her sons returning to her bosom, for by these means most of those who had denied Christ were recovered and dared to profess their Savior: they felt again the divine life in their souls: they approached to the tribunal; and their God who willeth not the death of a sinner, being again precious to their souls, they desired a fresh opportunity of being interrogated by the governor.

Caesar sent orders that the confessors of Christ should be put to death; and that the apostates from their divine Master should be dismissed. — It was now the general assembly held annually at Lyons and frequented from all parts and this was the time when

the christian prisoners were again exposed to the populace. The governor, again interrogated. Roman citizens had the privilege of dying by decollation; the rest were exposed to wild beasts; and now it was that our Redeemer was magnified in those who had apostatized. They were interrogated separate from the rest, as persons soon to be dismissed, and made a confession to the surprise of the Gentiles, and were added to the list of martyrs. A small number still remained in apostasy; but they were those who possessed not the least spark of divine faith, had not the least acquaintance with the riches of Christ in their souls, and had no fear of God before their eyes; whose life had brought reproach on Christianity; and had evidenced them to be the children of perdition; but all the rest were added to the church.

During their examination, a man who had lived many years in France, and was generally known for his love of God and zealous regard for divine truth, a person of apostolical endowments, a physician by profession, a Phrygian by nation, and named Alexander, stood near the tribunal, and by his gestures encouraged them to profess the faith. He appeared to all who surrounded the tribunal as one who travailed in much pain on their account. And now the multitude, incensed at the christian integrity exhibited at the conclusion by the lapsed, made a clamor against Alexander as the cause of this change. Upon which the governor ordered him into his presence, and asked him who he was. He declared that he was a Christian. The former in great wrath condemned him instantly to the wild beasts; — and the next day he was introduced with Attalus. For the governor, willing to gratify the people, delivered Attalus again to the wild beasts; and these two underwent all the usual methods of torture in the amphitheatre: indeed they sustained a very grievous conflict, and at length expired. Alexander neither groaned nor spake a word, but in his heart conversed with God. Attalus, sitting on the iron chair and being scorched, when the smell issued from him, said to the multitude in Latin, “This indeed which ye do is to devour men; but we devour not our fellow-creatures, nor practice any other wickedness.” Being asked what is the name of God, he answered, “God has not a name as men have.”

On the last day of the spectacles, Blandina was again introduced with Ponticus a youth of fifteen: they had been daily brought in to see the punishment of the rest. They were ordered to swear by the idols; and the mob perceiving them to persevere immovably, and to treat their menaces with superior contempt, were incensed; and no pity was shown either to the sex of the one, or to the tender age of the other. Their tortures were now aggravated by all sorts of methods; and the whole round of barbarities was inflicted; but menaces and punishments were equally ineffectual. Ponticus, animated by his sister, who was observed by the heathen to strengthen and confirm him, after magnanimous exertion of patience, yielded up the ghost.

And now the blessed Blandina, last of all, as a generous mother having exhorted her children, and sent them before her victorious to the king, reviewing the whole series of their sufferings, hastened to undergo the same herself, rejoicing and triumphing in her exit, as if invited to a marriage supper, not as one going to be exposed to wild beasts. After she had endured stripes, the tearing of the beasts, and the iron chair, she was enclosed in a net, and thrown to a bull; and having been tossed some time by the animal, and proving quite superior to her pains, through the influence of hope, and the realizing view of the objects of her faith and her fellowship with Christ, she at length breathed out her soul. Even her enemies confessed that no woman among them had ever suffered such and so great things. But their madness against the saints was not yet satiated. For the fierce and savage tribes of men, being instigated by the ferocious enemy of mankind, were not easily softened; and they now began another peculiar war against the bodies of the saints. That they had been conquered by their patience, produced no stings of remorse: indeed the feelings of common sense and humanity appear to have been extinguished among them. Disappointment increased their fury. The governor, and the mob equally showed their ferocious malice; that the Scripture might be fulfilled

“He that is unjust let him be unjust still,” as well as “He that is holy let him be holy still.” (Revelation 22:11)

They now exposed to dogs the bodies of those who had been suffocated in prison, and carefully watched night and day, lest any of our people should by stealth perform the funeral rites. And then exposing what had been left by the wild beasts or by the fire, relics partly mangled and partly scorched, and the heads of others with their trunks, they preserved them by military guards unburied for some days. Some gnashed on them with their teeth, desirous, if possible, to make them feel still more of their malice. Others laughed and insulted them, praising their own idols, and ascribing to them the vengeance inflicted on the martyrs. All, however, were not of this fierce mould. Yet even those who were of a gentler spirit, and who sympathized with us in some degree, upbraided us, often saying, Where is their God — and what profit did they derive from their religion, which they value above life itself? Such variety was there in the behavior of the heathen towards us.

As for ourselves our sorrow was great, that we were deprived of the melancholy satisfaction of interring our friends. Neither did the darkness of the night befriend us herein, nor could we prevail by prayers or by price. They watched the bodies with unremitting vigilance, as if to deprive them of sepulture was to them an object of great importance. The bodies of the martyrs having been contumeliously treated and exposed for six days, were burnt and reduced to ashes, and scattered by the wicked into the Rhone, that not the least particle of them might appear on the earth any more. And they did these things, as if they could prevail against God and prevent their resurrection — and that they might deter others, as they said, from the hope of a future life, — “on which relying they introduce a new and strange religion, and despise the most excruciating tortures, and die with joy. Now let us see if they will rise again, and if their God can help them and deliver them out of our hands.” <sup>F1054</sup>

Out of the same writing, moreover, concerning these martyrs of France afore-mentioned, is recorded also another history not unworthy to be noted, taken out of the same fifth book of Eusebius, <sup>f1055</sup> which history is this:

“There was among these constant and blessed martyrs one Alcibiades, who led an austere kind of life, and hitherto had fed on nothing but bread and water. Being thrown into confinement he endeavored there to practice the same austerity of life, when it was revealed to Attalus after his first conflict in the amphitheatre, that Alcibiades did not do well in not making use of God’s creatures and thereby casting a stumbling-block in the way of others. Alcibiades was convinced of his mistake, and thenceforth partook without scruple of all things, and gave God thanks. A proof that in those days they were not destitute of the grace of God, but the Holy Spirit was their counsellor.”

Thus have ye heard the whole account of the **blessed saints of** <sup>a50</sup> France, Vettius, Zacharias, Sanctus, Maturus, Attalus, Blandina, Alexander, Alcibiades, with others, recorded and set forth by the writing of certain christian brethren of the same church and place of France. <sup>F1056</sup> In the which aforesaid writing of theirs, moreover, appeareth the great meekness and modest constancy of the said martyrs described in these words:

“Such imitators were they of Christ (who being in the form of God thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet, etc. Philippians 2:6) that though they were in such a height of glory, and had suffered as martyrs not once, nor twice, but often, and had been taken from the wild beasts and committed again to prison, although they had the marks of fire and the scars of stripes and wounds all over their bodies; yet they neither declared themselves martyrs, nor would they suffer us to call them by that name. But if any of us at any time, either by letter or in discourse, called them martyrs, they censured it sharply. For they readily allowed the appellation of martyr to Christ (‘the faithful and true witness and the first begotten of the dead and the Prince of the life of God’); they commemorated also those martyrs who had already departed this life, and said, ‘Those are now martyrs whom Christ vouchsafed to take to himself while they were making their confession, he having (as it were) sealed their testimony by their death: but we are mean and humble confessors.’ And with tears they besought the brethren to pray earnestly for them that they might be perfected. Thus they in fact exhibited the virtue of martyrdom, and manifested their

noble spirit by their patience, fearlessness, and undaunted courage, but being filled with the fear of God, they deprecated the being called martyrs by the brethren.”

And after, in the said writing, it followeth more:

“They humbled themselves under the mighty hand of God, by which they are now greatly exalted. They excused themselves to all men, but they accused no man; they loosed all, but they bound none; and for them which did so evil entreat them they prayed, after the example of Stephen, that perfect martyr, ‘O Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.’”

And after, again:

“They did not proudly triumph over those that fell; but bestowed on the indigent among them those good things of which they had a superabundance, having motherly bowels of compassion, pouring forth many tears for them to their heavenly Father. They sought life for themselves, and he gave it them, and so they were ready to communicate it to others. They went to God, victors over all; having always loved peace, and continually recommended it, they departed in peace to God; leaving no grief to their mother, no faction or dissension among the brethren, but joy, peace, concord, and love.”

The aforesaid martyrs of France at the same time commended Irenaeus, newly then made minister, with their letters unto Eleutherius bishop of Rome, as witnesseth Eusebius, in the fourth chapter of the said fifth book; which Irenaeus first was the hearer of Polycarp, then made minister (as is said) under these martyrs: and, after their death, made bishop afterwards of Lyons in France, and succeeded after Pothinus.

Besides the before-named good Justin, there was also about the same time in Asia, Claudius Apollinaris or Appollinarius, bishop of Hierapolis, and also Melito, Bishop of Sardis, an eloquent and learned man, much commended of Tertullian; who, succeeding after the time of the apostles, in the reign of this Antoninus Verus, exhibited unto him learned and eloquent apologies in defense of Christ’s religion; like as Quadratus and Aristides above mentioned did unto the emperor Adrian, whereby they moved him

somewhat to storage of his persecution. In like manner did this Apollinaris and Melito (stirred up by God) adventure to defend in writing the cause of the Christians unto this Antoninus. Of this Melito Eusebius in his fourth book maketh mention, <sup>f1057</sup> and excerpteth certain places of his Apology, in these words, as followeth: <sup>f1058</sup>

“Now,” saith he, “which was never seen before, the godly suffer persecution, by occasion of certain edicts proclaimed throughout Asia: for impudent informers, covetous of other men’s goods, taking occasion from those proclamations, rob openly, night and day, spoiling innocent persons of their goods.”

And it followeth after:

“Now if all this be done by your command, let it stand good. For a just emperor can never authorize anything that is unjust, and we will cheerfully submit to the honor of such a death. This only we humbly crave of you, that you would first take cognizance yourself of those who manifest such determination under all their trials, and then decide impartially whether they deserve punishment and death, or to live in peace and quietness. But if these proceedings and this new edict (too bad to be enacted even against barbarian enemies) do not proceed from you, then we the more earnestly beseech you not to permit us any longer to be infested with these public rapines. For the system which we profess first flourished among the barbarians. <sup>F1059</sup> Afterward, in the reign of the great Augustus your progenitor it began to flourish in the Roman provinces, and proved a most fortunate omen for the rising empire. For from that time the power of Rome was greatly aggrandized. To which prosperous state of affairs you have happily succeeded, and shall continue, together with your son; if you will but defend that religion which was nursed up together with the empire, and which began under the reign of the great Augustus, and which your ancestors honored together with other religions. And verily this is no small proof of the connection between the success of our religion and the prosperity of your happily begun empire, viz. that from the time of Augustus no untoward accident has occurred, but on the contrary brilliant success and glory have crowned all the

public measures, agreeably to the wishes of all men. Only Nero and Domitian (and they — influenced thereto by certain ill-natured persons) endeavoured to bring our religion under reproach; from whom the fashion of malicious detraction was propagated to succeeding times, agreeably to irrational usage in such cases. But your pious predecessors corrected their mistake, and frequently by rescripts reproved such as audaciously attempted to behave insolently towards us. Among whom your grandfather Adrian wrote to Fundanus proconsul of Asia, and many others; and your father (at the time when you were his colleague in the empire) wrote to the cities that they should not raise tumults nor commit any insolencies against us, particularly to the Larisseans, to the Thessalonians, to the Athenians, and to all the Greeks. The more confidently, then, do we persuade ourselves that you (who retain the same opinion of us as they held, yea, who are much more graciously and thoughtfully disposed) will do all that we request of you.”

Thus much out of the Apology of Melito, who, writing to Onesimus, giveth to us this benefit; to know the true catalogue and the names of all the authentic books of the Old Testament, received in the ancient time of the primitive church. Concerning the number and names whereof, the said Melito in his letter to Onesimus declareth; how that he, returning into the parts where these things were done and preached, there he diligently inquired out the books approved of the Old Testament, the names whereof in order he subscribeth, and sendeth unto him as followeth: the five books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy; Joshua; Judges; Ruth; Four Books of Kings; Two Books of Chronicles; the Psalms of David; the Proverbs of Solomon, called also the Book of Wisdom; <sup>f1060</sup> the Preacher; the Song of Songs; Job; the books of the Prophets Esay, Jeremy; Twelve Prophets in one book; Daniel, Ezekiel, Esdras. And thus much of this matter which I thought here to record, for it is not unprofitable for these latter times to understand what in the first times was received and admitted as authentic, and what otherwise.

But from this little digression, to return to our matter omitted; that is, to the Apologies of Apollinarius and Melito, in the story so it followeth; that whether it was by the occasion of these two Apologies, or whether it was

through the writing of Athenagoras, a philosopher, and a legate of the Christians, it is uncertain: but this is certain, that the persecution the same time was stayed. Some do think, which most probably seems to touch the truth, that the cause of staying this persecution did arise upon a wonderful miracle of God showed in the emperor's camp by the Christians, the story whereof is this. At what time the emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus <sup>f1061</sup> warred against the Quadi, Vandals, Sarmatians, and Germans, in the expedition against them, his army, by reason of the imminent assault of the enemy, was cooped and shut in within the straits and hot dry places, where his soldiers, besides other difficulties of battle, being destitute of water five days, were like to have perished; which dread not a little discomforted them, and abated their courage; whereupon, in this so great distress and jeopardy, the christian soldiers suddenly withdrew from the army for their succour; who, falling prostrate upon the earth, by ardent prayer by and by obtained of God double relief: by means of whom, God gave certain pleasant showers from the sky whereby as their soldiers quenched their thirst, so were a great number of their enemies discomfited and put to flight by continual lightnings which shot out of the air. This miracle so pleased and won the emperor, that, ever after, he waxed gentler and gentler to the Christians, and directed his letters to divers of his rulers (as Tertullian in his Apology witnesseth), commanding them therein to give thanks to the Christians, no less for his victory, than for the preservation of him and all his men. <sup>F1062</sup> The copy of which letter ensueth:

**MARCUS AURELIUS <sup>a51</sup> ANTONINUS, EMPEROR, TO THE  
SENATE AND PEOPLE OF ROME. <sup>F1063</sup>**

This is to inform you of my efforts and successes in the German war, also of the difficulties to which I was once reduced in the enemy's territory, being hemmed in by seventy-four dragons. <sup>F1064</sup> When within nine miles of us, the scouts gave notice that they were approaching, and Pompeianus, my lieutenant-general, sent me word that they were in sight. I, therefore, thought no less but to be overwhelmed, I and my army — consisting of the first and tenth legions, the double legion, and the legion of the Euphrates <sup>f1065</sup> — by such an immense multitude, numbering nine-hundred-and-seventy-five thousand armed men. Seeing that my forces bore no

comparison in point of numbers to the enemy, I betook myself in prayer to our national deities for assistance; gaining no answer from them, and being reduced to straits by the enemy, I sent for the people we call Christians. On being mustered they were found to be pretty numerous. I vented my fury at them in a manner they little deserved, as I afterward learned from experience of their marvellous power. They presently fell to work, not with weapons, armor, and trumpets, a mode of preparation from which they are abhorrent, being contented with the God whom they carry about with them in their consciences. And really it does seem — though we account them atheists — that they have a God in their breasts, and one who is able to defend: for falling prostrate on the ground, they interceded both for me and my army, imploring succor under our pressing need of water and provision: for it was the fifth day of our being without water, and we were in an enemy's country, in the very heart of Germany. Scarcely had they fallen prostrate on their faces, and poured forth prayers to a God unknown to me, when suddenly there descended from the sky — on us a most cool and refreshing rain, but on our enemies hail mixt with lightning; insomuch that we at once perceived, that a most potent God had interposed irresistibly in our favor. Wherefore, we hereby grant full toleration to these people, lest peradventure by their prayers they should procure some like interposition *against* us. And I forbid, in virtue of my imperial authority, that the profession of Christianity be objected to any man for a crime. And if any one shall accuse a Christian merely on the ground that he is such, I desire that the accused be acquitted, though he confess to the charge, provided nothing else be objected to him but his religion; but let his accuser be burnt alive. Nor do I wish a confessed and proved Christian to be urged by the proconsul of the province to change his religion, but that he should be left to his own choice. And this my decree I wish to be ratified by a decree of the senate; and I charge Verasius Pollio, prefect of the city, to take care that it be hung up publicly to be read, in Trajan's forum, and that it be transmitted into all the provinces. I also give free leave to all persons to transcribe and use this edict, taking it from our attested copy publicly hung up in the forum. <sup>F1066</sup>

Thus the tempestuous rage of persecution against the Christians began for a time to assuage, partly by the occasion hereof, partly also upon other causes incident, compelling the enemies to surcease their persecution; as — great plagues and pestilence lying upon the country of Italy; likewise great wars, as well in the east parts, as also in Italy and France; terrible earthquakes, great floods, noisome swarms of flies and vermin devouring their cornfields, etc. And thus much of things done under Antoninus Verus; which Antoninus, in the beginning of his reign, joined with him in the government of the empire, his brother **Lucius Aelius Verus**,<sup>a52</sup> who also was with him at the miraculous victory gotten by the Christians, as Eusebius recordeth.<sup>f1067</sup> Contrary, Platina, in “Vita Soteris,” and Matthew of Westminster, in his book intituled “Flores Historiarum,” refer the same to the time of Antoninus Verus, and his son Lucius Antoninus Commodus; and not of his brother Lucius Aelius Verus. But howsoever the truth of years doth stand, certain it is, that after the death of Marcus Antoninus Verus, and of Lucius Aelius Verus, succeeded Lucius Antoninus Commodus [A.D. 180], the son of Marcus Verus, who reigned thirty years.

In the time of this Commodus, although he was an incommodious prince to the senators of Rome, yet notwithstanding there was some quietness universally through the whole church of Christ from persecution, by what occasion it is not certain. Some think (of whom is Xiphilinus),<sup>f1068</sup> that it came through Marcia, the emperor’s concubine, who favored the Christians. But howsoever it came, the fury of the raging enemies was then somewhat mitigated, and peace was given (saith Eusebius) by the grace of Christ unto the church, throughout the whole world; at what time, the wholesome doctrine of the gospel allured and reduced the hearts of all sorts of people unto the religion of the true God, insomuch that many, both rich and noble personages of Rome, with their whole families and households, to their salvation, adjoined themselves to the church of Christ.

Among whom there was one Apollonius, a nobleman and a senator of Rome, mentioned in Eusebius,<sup>f1069</sup> who was maliciously accused unto the senate, by one whom Jerome writeth to be the servant of the said Apollonius, and nameth him Severus; but whose servant soever he was, the wretched man came soon enough before the judge, and was condignly rewarded for that his malicious diligence. For, by a law which the emperor made, that no man upon pain of death should falsely accuse the Christians,

he was put to execution, and had his legs broken forthwith by the sentence of Perennis the judge, which, though a heathen man, he pronounced against him. But the beloved martyr of God, when the judge, with much ado, had obtained of him to render an account of his faith before the honorable senate, under their warrant of life he did the same, and delivered unto them an eloquent defense of the christian belief. But, the said warrant notwithstanding, he, by the decree of the senate, was beheaded, and so ended his life; for that there was an ancient law among them decreed, that none that professed Christ, and was arraigned there-for, should be released without recantation, or altering his opinion.

This Commodus is said in stories, to have been so sure and steady-handed in casting the dart, that in the open theater, before the people, he would encounter with the wild beasts, and be sure to hit them in the place appointed. Among divers other his vicious and wild parts, he was so far surprised in pride and arrogancy, that he would be called Hercules; and many times would show himself to the people in the skin of a lion, to be counted thereby the king of men, like as the lion is of the beasts.

Upon a certain time, being his birthday, this Commodus, calling the people of Rome together in a great royalty, having his lion's skin upon him, made sacrifice to Hercules and Jupiter, causing it to be cried through the city, that Hercules was the patron and defender of the city. There were the same time at Rome, Vincentius, Eusebius, Peregrinus, and Potentianus, <sup>f1070</sup> learned men, and instructors of the people, who, following the steps of the apostles, went about from place to place where the gospel was not yet preached, converting the Gentiles to the faith of Christ. These, hearing the madness of the emperor and of the people, began to reprove their idolatrous blindness, teaching in villages and towns all that heard them to believe **upon the one triune** <sup>a53</sup> God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and to come away from such worshipping of devils, and to give honor to God alone, who only is to be worshipped; willing them to repent and to be baptized, lest they perish with Commodus. With this their preaching they converted one Julius, a senator, and others, to the religion of Christ. The emperor, hearing thereof, caused them to be apprehended of Vitellius his captain, and to be required to sacrifice unto Hercules and Jupiter, which when they stoutly refused, after divers grievous torments and great

miracles by them done, at last they were pressed with leaden weights to death. <sup>F1071</sup>

This Peregrinus, above mentioned, had been sent before by Sixtus, bishop of Rome, into the parts of France, to supply there the room of a bishop and teacher, by reason that for the continual and horrible persecutions thereabout touched, those places were left desolate and destitute of ministers and instructors; where, after he had occupied himself with much fruit among the flock of Christ, and had stablished the church there, returning home again to Rome, there he finished at last (as it is said) his martyrdom. <sup>F1072</sup> Now remaineth likewise to speak of Julius, which Julius being (as is touched before) a senator of Rome, and now won by the preaching of these blessed men to the faith of Christ, did eftsoons invite them, and brought them home to his house, where, being by them more fully instructed in christian religion, he believed the gospel, and sending for one Ruffinus, a priest, was with all his family by him baptized; who did not (as the common sort was wont to do) keep close and secret his faith, but, incensed with a marvellous and sincere zeal, openly professed the same; altogether wishing and praying it to be given to him by God, not only to believe in Christ, but also to hazard his life for him. Which thing the emperor hearing, how that Julius had forsaken his old religion and become a christian, forthwith sent for him to come before him; unto whom he spake on this wise: “O Julius, what madness hath possessed thee, that thus thou dost fall from the old and common religion of thy forefathers, who acknowledged and worshipped Jupiter and Hercules as their gods, and now dost embrace this new and fond religion of the Christians?” At which time Julius, having good occasion to show and open his faith, gave straightway account thereof to him, and affirmed that Hercules and Jupiter were false gods, and how the worshippers of them would perish with eternal damnation and punishments. The emperor hearing how that he condemned and despised his gods, being then inflamed with a great wrath (as he was by nature very choleric), committed him forthwith to Vitellius, the captain of the guard, a very cruel and fierce man, either to see Julius sacrifice to mighty Hercules, or, refusing the same, to slay him. Vitellius (as he was commanded) exhorted Julius to obey the emperor’s commandment, and to worship his gods, alleging how that the whole empire of Rome was not only constituted, but also preserved and

maintained by them; which Julius denied utterly to do, at the same time admonishing sharply Vitellius to acknowledge the true God, and obey his commandments, lest he, with his master, should die some grievous death; whereat Vitellius, being moved, caused Julius with cudgels to be beaten unto death.

These things being thus briefly recited, touching such holy martyrs as hitherto have suffered, now remaineth that we return again to the order of the Roman bishops, such as followed next after Alexander, at whom we left off; whose successor next was Xistus or Sixtus, the sixth bishop, counted after Peter, who governed the church the space of ten years; as Damasus and others do write. Uspergensis maketh mention but of nine years. Platina recordeth that he died a martyr, and was buried at the Vatican. <sup>f1073</sup> But Eusebius, speaking of his decease, maketh no word or mention of any martyrdom. In the second tome of the Councils, certain epistles be attributed to him, whereof Eusebius, Damasus, Jerome, and other old authors, as they make no relation, so seem they to have no intelligence nor knowledge of any such matter. In these counterfeit epistles, and in Platina, it appeareth that Sixtus was the first author of these ordinances: First, that the holy mysteries and holy vessels, should be touched but only of persons holy and consecrated, especially of no woman. *Item*, that the corporas-cloth should be made of no other cloth but of fine linen. *Item*, that such bishops as were called up to the apostolic see, returning home again, should not be received at their return, unless they brought with them letters from the bishop of Rome, saluting the people. *Item*, at the celebration, he ordained to be sung this verse, “Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus, Dominus Deus Sabbaoth.” And here (by the way) it is to be noted, that the said Platina, <sup>f1074</sup> in the life of this Sixtus, doth testify that Peter ministered the celebration of the communion only with the Lord’s Prayer. These trifling ordinances of Sixtus, <sup>f1075</sup> who is so rude that seeth not, or may not easily conjecture them to be falsely fathered on Sixtus, or on any father of that time? First, by the uniform rudeness and style of all those decretal letters, nothing savouring of that age, but rather of the latter Dunstical times that followed; also, by the matter and argument in those letters contained, nothing agreeing with the state of those troublesome days. Neither again is it to be supposed, that any such recourse of bishops was then to the apostolical see of Rome, that

it was not lawful to return without their letters; when the persecution against the Christians was then so hot, in the days of Adrian, that the bishops of Rome themselves were more glad to fly out of the city, than other bishops were to come to them unto Rome. And if Sixtus added the “Sanctus” unto the mass canon, what piece then of the canon went before it, when they who put to the other patches came after Sixtus? And if they came after Sixtus, <sup>f1076</sup> that added the rest, why did they set their pieces before his, seeing they that began the first piece of the canon, came after him?

The same likewise is to be judged of the epistles and ordinances of Telesphorus, who succeeded next unto Sixtus, and, being bishop of that church the term of eleven years, the first year of the reign of Antoninus Pius, died a martyr about the year of our Lord 138. His epistle, like unto the rest, containing in it no great matter of doctrine, hath these ordinances. First, he commandeth all that were of the clergy to fast and abstain from flesh-eating seven weeks before Easter: that three masses should be said upon the nativity-day of the Lord: that no man should accuse either bishop or priest. He ordained moreover, “Gloria in excelsis,” to be added to the mass, etc. But these things falsely to be feigned upon him, may easily be conjectured. For, as touching the seven weeks’ fast, neither doth it agree with the old Roman term commonly received, calling it “Quadragesima,” that is, the forty days’ fast; neither with the example of our Savior, who fasted not seven weeks, but only forty days. Moreover, as concerning this forty days’ fast, we read of the same in the epistle of Ignatius, which was long before Telesphorus: whereby it may appear that this Telesphorus was not the first inventor thereof. And, if it be true which is lately come out in the name of Abdias (but untruly, as by many conjectures may be proved), there it is read, that in the days of St. Matthew, this Lent fast of forty days was observed long before Telesphorus, by these words that follow: “In the days,” saith he, “either of Lent, or in the time of other lawful fastings, he that abstaineth not as well from eating meat, as also from the mixture of bodies, doth incur in so doing, not only pollution, but also committeth offense, which must be washed away with the tears of repentance.” Again, Apollonius affirmeth, that Montanus the heretic was the first deviser and bringer-in of these laws of fasting into the church, which before was used to be free. <sup>F1077</sup> But

especially by Socrates, writer of the Ecclesiastical History, who lived after the days of Theodosius, it may be argued, that this seven weeks' fast is falsely imputed to Telesphorus. For Socrates, in his fifth book, speaking of this time, hath these words: "The Romans do fast three weeks continuously before Easter, except the Saturdays and Sundays." <sup>F1078</sup> And moreover, speaking of divers and sundry fastings of Lent in sundry and divers churches, he addeth these words: "And because that no man can produce any written commandment about this matter, it is therefore apparent, that the apostles left this kind of fast free to every man's will and judgment, lest any should be constrained, by fear and necessity, to do that which is good," etc. With this of Socrates, agree also the words of Sozomen, <sup>f1079</sup> living much about the same time, in his seventh book, where he thus writeth: "The whole fast of Lent," saith he, "some comprehend in six weeks; as do the Illyrians and west churches, with all Lybia, Egypt, and Palestine: some in seven weeks, as at Constantinople, and the parts bordering to Phoenicia: others in three weeks, next before the day of Easter, and some again in two weeks," etc. By which it may be collected, that Telesphorus never ordained any such fast of seven weeks, which otherwise never would have been neglected in Rome and in the west churches; neither again would have been unrecorded by these ancient ecclesiastical writers, if any such thing had been. The like is to be thought also of the rest, not only of his Constitutions, but also of those of the other ancient bishops and martyrs who followed after him, as of Hyginus, who, succeeding him, and dying also a martyr, A.D. 142, as Volateran declareth, <sup>f1080</sup> is said, or rather is feigned, to have brought in the use of the chrisms and of at least one godfather or one godmother in baptism, and to have ordained the dedication of churches; whereas in his time so far was it off, that any solemn churches were standing in Rome, that uneth <sup>f1081</sup> the Christians could safely convent in their own houses. Likewise the distinguishing the orders of metropolitans, bishops, and other degrees, savours of nothing less than of that time.

After Hyginus followed Pius, who, as Platina reporteth, was so precisely devout about the holy mysteries of the Lord's table, that if any one crumb thereof did fall down to the ground, he ordained that the priest should do penance forty days; if **any fell upon the altar**, <sup>a54 f1082</sup> he should do penance three days; if upon the linen corporas-cloth, four days; if upon

any other linen cloth, nine days. And if any drop of the blood, saith he, should chance to be spilt, wheresoever it fell, it should be licked up, if it were possible: if not, the place should be washed, or pared, or scraped, and the parings or scrapings burned, and the ashes laid in the sanctuary. All which toys may seem to a wise man more vain and trifling, than to savor of those pure and strict times of those holy martyrs. This Pius, as is reported, was much conversant with Hermas, called otherwise Pastor. Damasus saith, he was his brother. <sup>F1083</sup> But how is it likely, that Hermas being the disciple of Paul, or one of the seventy disciples, could be the brother of this Pius? Of this Hermas, and of his Revelations, the aforesaid Pius, in his epistle decretal (if it be not forged) <sup>f1084</sup> maketh mention; declaring that the angel of God appeared unto him in the habit of a shepherd, commanding him that Easter day should be celebrated of all men upon no other day but on Sunday: “whereupon,” saith the epistle, “Pius the bishop, by his authority apostolical, decreeth and commandeth the same to be observed of all men.”

Then succeeded Anicetus, Soter, and Eleutherius, about the year of our Lord one hundred and fourscore. <sup>F1085</sup> This Eleutherius, at the request of Lucius, king of Britain, sent to him Damian and Fugatius, by whom the king was converted to Christ’s faith, and baptized, about the year of our Lord 179. Nauclerus <sup>f1086</sup> saith it was in the year 156. Henry of Herford saith it was in the year 179, in the nineteenth of Verus the emperor. Some say it was in the sixth year of Commodus, which should be about A.D. 185. **Timotheus, in his story,** <sup>a57</sup> thinketh that Eleutherius came himself: but that is not likely. **And, as** <sup>a58</sup> there is a variance among the writers for the count of years, so doth there arise a question among some, whether Eleutherius was the first that introduced the faith from Rome into this land or not. Nicephorus <sup>f1087</sup> saith that Simon Zelotes came into Britain. Some others allege out of Gildas, “De Victoria Aureliani Ambrosii,” <sup>f1088</sup> that Joseph of Arimathea, after the dispersion of the [early church by the] <sup>f1089</sup> Jews, was sent, by Philip the apostle, from France to Britain, about the year of our Lord 63; and here remained in this land all his time; and so with his fellows, laid the first foundation of christian faith among the people of Britain: whereupon other preachers and teachers, coming afterward, confirmed the same, and increased it more. And therefore doth Peter of Clugni count the Scottishmen among the more ancient Christians. <sup>F1090</sup> For

the confirmation hereof might be alleged the testimony of Origen, of Tertullian, and even the words of the letter of Eleutherius, which import no less but that the faith of Christ was here in England among the people of Britain, before Eleutherius' time, and before the king was converted: but hereof more shall be spoken hereafter (Christ willing), when, after the tractation of these ten persecutions, we shall enter into the matter of our English stories.

About this time of Commodus afore mentioned, among divers other learned men and famous teachers, whom God stirred up at that time (as he doth at all other times raise up some) in his church, to confound the persecutors by learning and writing (as the martyrs, to confirm the truth with their blood), were Serapion, bishop of Antioch, and Hegesippus a writer of the Ecclesiastical History, from Christ's passion to his own time, as witness Jerome and Eusebius, <sup>f1091</sup> which books of his be now remaining: but those that be remaining (which be five) "De excidio urbis Hierosolymitanae" <sup>f1092</sup> be not mentioned, neither of Jerome, nor Eusebius, nor of Miltiades, who also wrote his Apology in defense of Christian Religion, as did Melito, Quadratus, and Aristides before-mentioned. **About the same time** <sup>a59</sup> also wrote Heraclitus, who first began to write annotations on the epistles of the apostle Paul. Also Theophilus bishop of Caesarea, Dionysius bishop of Corinth, a man famously learned, who wrote divers epistles to divers churches; and, among others, one to the Gnosian church, wherein he exhorts Pinytus, their bishop, <sup>f1093</sup> "that he would lay no yoke of chastity of any necessity upon his brethren; but that he would consider the infirmity of others, and bear with it." Moreover, the said Dionysius, writing in his epistles of Dionysius the Areopagite, <sup>f1094</sup> declareth of him how that he was first converted to the christian faith by St. Paul, according as in the Acts is recorded; and afterwards was made the first bishop of Athens; but maketh there no mention of his book "De Hierarchia," whereby it may easily appear, what is to be judged of that book. Furthermore, by the epistles of the said Dionysius of Corinth, this we have to understand to have been the use at that time in churches, to read the letters and epistles, such as were sent by learned bishops and teachers unto the congregations, as may appear by these words of Dionysius, who, writing to the church of the Romans, and to Soter, saith, "This day we celebrate the holy dominical-day, in which we have read

your epistle, which always we will read for our exhortation; like as we do read also the epistle of Clement sent to us before,” etc. <sup>f1095</sup> Where also mention is made of keeping of Sunday holy, whereof we find no mention made in ancient authors, before his time, except only in Justin Martyr, who, in his first Apology, declareth two times most especially used by christian men for congregating together: first, when any convert was to be baptized; the second was upon the Sunday, which was wont for two causes then to be hallowed, “first, because,” saith he, “upon that day God made the world: secondly, because that Christ, upon that day, first showed himself, after his resurrection, to his disciples,” etc.

The same time, moreover, lived Pantaenus, who was the first in Alexandria that professed in open school to read, of whom is thought first to proceed the order and manner among the Christians to read and profess in universities. This Pantaenus, for his excellency of learning, was sent by Demetrius, bishop of Alexandria, to preach to the Indians, where he found the gospel of St. Matthew written in Hebrew, left there by St. Bartholomew, which book, afterwards, he brought with him from thence to the library of Alexandria. <sup>F1096</sup>

**Over and besides** <sup>a60</sup> these above named, about the days of Commodus, wrote also Clemens Alexandrinus, a man of notable and singular learning, whose books, although for a great part they be lost, yet certain of them yet remain; wherein is declared among other things, the order and number of the books and gospels of the New Testament. <sup>F1097</sup>

During all the reign of Commodus, God granted rest and tranquillity, although not without some bloodshed of certain holy martyrs, as is above declared, unto his church. In the which time of tranquillity, the Christians, having now some leisure from the foreign enemy, began to have a little contention among themselves about the ceremony of Easter: which contention, albeit of long time before it had been stirring in the church (as is before mentioned, in speaking of Polycarp and Anicetus), yet the variance and difference of that ceremony brought no breach of christian concord and society among them; neither as yet did the matter exceed so far, but that the bond of love, and communion of brotherly life, continued, although they differed in the ceremony of the day. For they of the West church, pretending the tradition of Paul and Peter (but indeed being the

tradition of Hermas and of Pius), kept one day, which was upon the Sunday after the fourteenth day of the first month. <sup>F1098</sup> The church of Asia, following the ordinance of John the apostle, observed another, as more shall be declared (the Lord willing) when we come to the time of Victor bishop of Rome. In the mean time, as concerning the fourth persecution, let this hitherto suffice.

### THE FIFTH PERSECUTION.

After the death of Commodus reigned Pertinax but a few months: after whom succeeded Severus, under whom was raised the fifth persecution against the christian saints; who, reigning the term of eighteen years, the first ten years of the same was very favorable and courteous to the Christians: afterward, through sinister suggestions and malicious accusations of the malignant, he was so incensed against them, that by proclamations he commanded no Christians any more to be suffered. Thus the rage of the emperor being inflamed against them, great persecution was stirred up on every side, whereby an infinite number of martyrs were slain, as Eusebius <sup>f1099</sup> recordeth, which was about the year of our Lord 205. The crimes and false accusations objected against the Christians are partly touched before; as sedition and rebellion against the emperor, sacrilege, murdering of infants, incestuous pollution, eating raw flesh, libidinous commixture, whereof certain indeed, called then “Gnostici,” were infamed. *Item*, it was objected against them for worshipping the head of an ass; which, whereof it should rise, I find no certain cause, except it were, perhaps, by the Jews. Also, they were charged for worshipping the sun, for that peradventure before the sun did rise, they convented together, singing their morning hymns unto the Lord, or else because they prayed toward the east: but specially, for that they would not with them worship their idolatrous gods, and were counted as enemies to all men.

The persons who managed this persecution under the emperor were chiefly Hilarian, Vigellius, Claudius, Herminian governor of Cappadocia, Cecilius, Capella, Vespronius; <sup>f1100</sup> also Demetrius mentioned of Cyprian, and Aquila judge of Alexandria, of whom Eusebius <sup>f1101</sup> maketh relation.

The places where the force of this persecution most raged, were Africa, Alexandria, Cappadocia, and Carthage. The number of them that suffered

in this persecution, by the report of Ecclesiastical History, was innumerable; of whom the first was Leonidas the father of Origen, who was beheaded. With whom also Origen his son, being of the age then of seventeen years, would have suffered (such a fervent desire he had to be martyred for Christ), had not his mother privily, in the night season, conveyed away his clothes and his shirt. Whereupon more for shame to be seen, than for fear to die, he was constrained to remain at home; and when he could do nothing else, yet he writeth to his father a letter with these words, "Take heed to yourself, that you change not your thought and purpose for our sake," etc. <sup>f1102</sup> Such a fervency had this Origen, being yet young, to the doctrine of Christ's faith, by the operation of God's heavenly providence, and partly also by the diligent education of his father, who brought him up from his youth most studiously in all good literature, but especially in the reading and exercise of holy scripture; wherein he had such inward and mystical speculation, that many times he would move questions to his father of the meaning of this place or that place in the scripture. Insomuch that his father, divers times, would uncover his breast being asleep, and kiss it, giving thanks to God which had made him so happy a father of such a happy child. After the death of his father, and all his goods confiscated to the emperor, he, with his poor mother and six brothers, were brought to such extreme poverty, that he did sustain both himself and them by teaching a school: till at length, being weary of the profession, he transferred his study only to the knowledge and seeking of divine scripture, and such other learning [as was] conducive to the same. <sup>F1103</sup> So much he profited both in the Hebrew and other tongues, that he conferred the Hebrew text with the translation **of the Seventy;** <sup>a61</sup> and, moreover, did find out and confer the other translations which we call the common translations of Aquila, of Symmachus, and Theodotion. Also he adjoined to these aforesaid other translations, whereof more is in the history of Eusebius expressed. <sup>F1104</sup>

They that write of the life of Origen, testify of him that he was quick and sharp of wit, much patient of labor, a great travailer in the tongues, of a spare diet, of a strict life, a great faster; his teaching and his living were both one; his going was much barefoot; a strict observer of that saying of the Lord, bidding to have but "one coat," etc. He is said to have written so much as seven notaries and so many maids every day could pen. <sup>F1105</sup> The

number of his books [say Epiphanius and Ruffinus] <sup>f1106</sup> came to six thousand volumes; the copies whereof he used to sell for three pence, or a little more, for the sustentation of his living. <sup>F1107</sup> But of him more shall be touched hereafter. So zealous was he in the cause of Christ, and of Christ's martyrs, that he, nothing fearing his own peril, would assist and exhort them going to their death, and kiss them; insomuch that he was oft in jeopardy to be stoned of the multitude; and sometimes, by the provision of christian men, had his house guarded about with soldiers, for the safety of them who daily resorted to hear his readings. <sup>F1108</sup> And many times he was compelled to shift places and houses, for such as laid wait for him in all places: but great was the providence of God to preserve him in the midst of all this tempest of Severus. Among others who resorted unto him, and were his hearers, Plutarch was one, and died a martyr; and with him Serenus his brother, <sup>f1109</sup> who was burnt. The third after these was Heraclides, the fourth Heron, who were both beheaded. The fifth was another Serenus, also beheaded. [Of women] Rhais, <sup>f1110</sup> and Potamiena who was tormented with pitch poured upon her, and martyred with her mother Marcella, who died also in the fire.

This Potamiena was of a fresh and flourishing beauty, who, because she could not be removed from her profession, was committed to Basilides, one of the captains there in the army, to see the execution done. Basilides, receiving her at the judge's hand, and leading her to the place, showed her some compassion in repressing the rebukes and railings of the wicked adversaries: for the which Potamiena the virgin, to requite again his kindness, bade him be of good comfort, saying, "That she would pray the Lord to show mercy upon him," and so went she to her martyrdom, which she both strongly and quietly did sustain.

Not long after it happened that Basilides was required by his fellow-soldiers, on some occasion, to swear; which thing he refused to do, plainly affirming that he was a Christian [for their oath then was wont to be by the idols and the emperor]. At the first he was thought dissemblingly to jest; but after, when he was heard constantly and in earnest to confirm the same, he was had before the judge, and so by him committed to ward. The Christians marvelling thereat, as they came to him in the prison, inquired of

him the cause of that his sudden conversion. To whom he answered again, and said, “That Potamiena, three days after her martyrdom, stood by him in the night, put a crown upon his head, and said she had entreated the Lord for him, and had obtained her request; adding moreover, That it should not be long, but he should be received up.” Which things thus done, the next day following he was had to the place of execution, and there beheaded. <sup>F1111</sup>

Albeit, the said Eusebius giveth this story of no credit, but only of hearsay, as he there expresseth.

As divers and many there were that suffered in the days of this Severus, so some there were again, who, being put to great torments, through the protection of God’s providence yet escaped with life: of whom was one Alexander, who, for his constant confession and torments suffered, was made bishop afterward of Jerusalem, together with Narcissus; who, being then an old man of **a hundred and sixteen years**, <sup>a63</sup> as saith Eusebius, was unwieldy for his age to govern that function alone.

Of this Narcissus it is reported in Eusebius’s History, that certain miracles by him were wrought, very notable, if they be true.

First, of water by him turned into oil, at the solemn vigil of Easter, what time the congregation wanted oil for their lamps. Another miracle is also told of him, which is this: “There were three evil disposed persons, who, seeing the soundness and grave constancy of his virtuous life, and fearing their own punishment (as a conscience that is guilty is always fearful), thought to prevent his accusations, in accusing him first, and laying a heinous crime unto his charge. And to make their accusation more probable before the people, they bound their accusation with a great oath, one wishing to be destroyed with fire, if he said not true; the other to be consumed with a grievous sickness; the third to lose both his eyes, if they did lie. Narcissus, although having his conscience clear, yet not able, being but one man, to withstand their accusation bound with such oaths, gave place, and removed himself from the multitude into a solitary desert by himself, where he continued the space of many years. In the mean time, to them which so willingly and wickedly forswore themselves, this happened: The first, by

casualty of one little small sparkle of fire, was burnt with his goods and all his family. The second was taken with a great sickness from the top to the toe, and devoured with the same. The third, hearing and seeing the punishment of the others, confessed his fault, but through great repentance poured out such tears, that he lost both his eyes; and thus was their false perjury punished. <sup>F1112</sup> Narcissus, after long absence, returning home again, was by this means both cleared of the fact, and received into his bishopric again: to whom as is said, for impotency of his age, Alexander was joined in execution of the function. <sup>F1113 f1114</sup>

Of this Alexander is recorded in the said Ecclesiastical History, that after his agonies and constancy of his confession showed in the persecution of Severus, he was admonished, by a vision in the night season, **to make his journey** <sup>a64</sup> up to Jerusalem from Cappadocia (where he had been a bishop already), to see there the sacred places, and to pray. Thus he, taking his journey, and drawing near to the city, a vision with plain words was given to certain chief heads of Jerusalem, to go out of the gate of the city, there to receive the bishop appointed to them of God. And so was Alexander met and received, and joined partner with aged Narcissus, as is before expressed, in the city of Jerusalem; where he continued bishop above forty years, until the persecution of Decius, and there erected a famous library, where Eusebius had his chiefest help in writing his Ecclesiastical History. <sup>F1115</sup> He wrote also divers epistles to divers churches, and licensed Origen openly to teach his church. At length, being very aged, he was brought from Jerusalem to Cesarea before the judge under Decius, where, after his constant confession the second time, he was committed to prison, and there died.

Besides these that suffered in this persecution of Severus, recited by Eusebius, Vincentius also <sup>f1116</sup> speaketh of one Andoclus, whom Polycarp before had sent into France which Andoclus, because he had spread there the doctrine of Christ, was apprehended of Severus, and first beaten with staves and bats, and after was beheaded. <sup>F1117</sup>

To these above-named may also be added Asclepiades, who, although he was not put to death in this persecution of Severus, yet therein constantly he did abide the trial of his confession, and suffered much for the same, as

Alexander before-mentioned did. Wherefore afterward he was ordained bishop of Antioch, where he continued the space of seven years; of whom Alexander writes unto the church of Antioch out of prison, much rejoicing and giving thanks to God, to hear that he was their bishop. <sup>F1118</sup>

About the same time, during the reign of Severus, died Irenaeus. Henry of Herford, **Ado, and other martyr-writers**, <sup>a65</sup> do hold that he was martyred, with a great multitude of others more, for the confession and doctrine of Christ, about the fourth or fifth year of Severus. This Irenaeus, as he was a great writer, so was he greatly commended of Tertullian for his learning, who calleth him, "A great searcher of all kind of learning." <sup>F11109</sup> He was first scholar and hearer of Polycarp; from thence either was sent, or came to France; and there, by Pothinus, and the rest of the martyrs, was instituted into the ministry, and commended by their letter to Eleutherius, as is before premonished. At length, after the martyrdom of Pothinus, he was appointed bishop of Lyons, where he continued about the space of three and twenty years. In the time of this Irenaeus the state of the church was much troubled, not only for the outward persecution of the foreign enemy, but also for divers sects and errors then stirring; against which he diligently labored, and wrote much, although but few books be now remaining. The nature of this man, well agreeing with his name, was such, that he ever loved peace, and sought to set agreement when any controversy rose in the church. And therefore, when the question of keeping the Easter day was renewed in the church between Victor bishop of Rome and the churches of Asia, and when Victor would have excommunicated them as schismatics, for disagreeing from him therein; Irenaeus, with other brethren of the French church, sorry to see such a contention among brethren for such a trifle, convented themselves together in a common council, and directing their letter with their common consent subscribed, sent unto Victor, entreating him to stay his purpose, and not to proceed in excommunicating his brethren for that matter. Although they themselves agreed with him in observing the Sunday-Easter as he did, yet with great reasons and arguments they exhorted him not to deal so rigorously with his brethren, who followed the ancient custom of their country-manner in that behalf. And besides this, he wrote divers other letters abroad concerning the same contention, declaring the excommunication of Victor to be of no force. <sup>F1120</sup>

Not long after Irenaeus followed also Tertullian, about the time of this Severus and Antoninus Caracalla his son; a man both in Greek and Latin well expert, having great gifts in disputing, and in writing eloquent; as his books declare, and as the commendation of all learned men doth testify no less. To whom Vincentius of Lerins giveth such praise, that he calleth him “the flower of all Latin writers.” And of the eloquence of his style he thus writeth, “that with the force of his reasons,” he saith, “whom he could not persuade, them he compelled to consent unto him. How many words, so many sentences, and how many sentences, so many victories he had,” etc.

Such men, for doing and writing, God raised up from time to time, as pillars and stays for his poor church, as he did this Tertullian in these dangerous days of persecution. For when the Christians were vexed with wrongs and falsely accused of the Gentiles, Tertullian, taking their cause in hand, defended them against the persecutors, and against their slanderous accusations. <sup>F1121</sup> First, that they never minded any stir or rebellion, either against the empire or emperors of Rome, he proved, forso much as the use of Christians was to pray for the state of their emperors and governors. And whereas they were accused falsely to be enemies of all mankind, “How could that be?” saith Tertullian to Scapula, “seeing the proper office of the Christians is, by their profession, to pray for all men, to love their enemies, never requiting evil for evil, whereas all others do love but only their friends, and scarcely them.” As touching the horrible slander of murdering infants, “How can that be true of the Christians?” saith he, “whose order is to abstain from all blood and strangled; insomuch that it is not lawful for them to touch the blood of any beast at their tables when they feed? From filthy copulation no sort more free than they, which are, and ever have been, the greatest observers of chastity; of whom, such as may, live in perpetual virginity all their life; such as cannot, contract matrimony, for avoiding all whoredom and fornication.” Neither could it be proved that the Christians worshipped the sun: which false surmise Tertullian declared to rise hereof, for that the manner of the Christians was to pray toward the east. Much less was there any of them so mad as to worship an ass’s head; whereof the occasion being taken only of the Jews, <sup>f1122</sup> the slander thereof he proved to be falsely and wrongfully laid to the charge of the Christians.

And likewise from all other lies and slanders objected of the heathen against the Christians, the said Tertullian purgeth the Christians, declaring them to be falsely belied and wrongfully persecuted, not for any desert of theirs, but only for the hatred of their name. And yet notwithstanding, by the same persecutions, he proveth, in the same Apology, the religion of the Christians nothing to be impaired, but rather increased. “The more,” saith he, “we are mown down of you, the more rise up. The blood of Christians is seed. For what man,” saith he, “in beholding the painful torments, and the perfect patience of them, will not search and inquire what is the cause? And when he hath found it out, who will not agree unto it? And when he agreeth to it, who will not desire to suffer for it?” <sup>f1123</sup> “Thus,” saith he, “this sect will never die, which, the more it is cut down, the more it groweth. For every man, seeing and wondering at the sufferance of the saints, is moved the more thereby to search the cause; in searching, he findeth it, and finding, he followeth it.” <sup>F1124</sup>

Thus Tertullian, in this dangerous time of persecution being stirred up of God, defended the innocency of the Christians against the blasphemy of the adversaries; and moreover, for the instruction of the church, he compiled many fruitful works; whereof some are extant, some are not to be found. Notwithstanding the great learning and famous virtues of this worthy man, certain errors and blemishes are noted in his doctrine, **as are both in** <sup>a66</sup> Origen and Irenaeus, who were before him, and likewise in them (were they never so excellent) that followed him; which errors all here in order to note and comprehend, were too long a matter for this story to prosecute. This, by the way, shall be sufficient to admonish the reader, never to look for any such perfection of any man in this world, how singular soever he be (Christ only excepted), but some blemish or other joineth itself withal, whereof more, perchance, shall be said when we come to Cyprian.

And now, to return again to the order of bishops of Rome intermitted. After Eleutherius afore-mentioned, next in the bishopric of Rome succeeded Victor; who, as Platina saith, died quietly in the days of Severus. But Damasus, and such as do follow the common chronicles, <sup>f1125</sup> affirm that he died a martyr, after he had sat ten (or as some say twelve) years. This Victor was a great stirrer (as partly before is signified) in the controversy about Easter-day, for the which he would have proceeded in

excommunication against the churches of Asia, had not Irenaeus, then bishop of Lyons, with the counsel of his other brethren there assembled, repressed his intended violence.

As touching that controversy of Easter in those days of the primitive church, the original thereof was this, as Eusebius, Socrates, Platina, and others record. First, certain it is, that the apostles, being only intentive and attendant to the doctrine of salvation, gave no heed nor regard to the observation of days and times, neither bound the church to any ceremonies and rites, except those things necessary, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, as strangled and blood; which was ordained then of the Holy Ghost, not without a most urgent and necessary cause, touched partly in the history before. For when the murdering and blood of infants were commonly objected by the heathen persecutors against the Christians, they had no other argument to help themselves, nor to repel the adversary, but only their own law, by the which they were commanded to abstain, not only from all men's blood, but also from the blood of all common beasts. And therefore that law seemeth by the Holy Ghost to be given, and also to the same end continued in the church, so long as the cause (that is, the persecutions of the heathen Gentiles) continued. Besides these, we read of no other ceremonies or rites, which the apostles greatly regarded, but left such things free to the liberty of Christians, every man to use therein his own discretion, for the using or not using thereof. Whereupon, as concerning all the ceremonial observations of days, times, places, meats, drinks, vestures, and such others; of all these things neither was the diversity among men greatly noted, nor any uniformity greatly required. Insomuch that Irenaeus, writing to Victor of the tradition of days, and of fastings, and of the diversity of these things then used among the primitive fathers, saith: "Notwithstanding all this variety, all they kept peace among themselves, and yet we keep it still; and this difference of fasting among us commendeth more the concord of faith." <sup>F1126</sup> And so long did the doctrine of christian liberty remain whole and sound in the church till the time of Victor, which was about the year of our Lord 197; although the diversity of these usages began before also in the days of Pius, about the year of Christ 143, to be misliked; yet restraint hereof was not so much urged before, as in the time of Victor. And yet neither did the violence of Victor take such place, but that the doctrine of christian liberty was defended and

maintained by means of Irenaeus and others, and so continued in the church till after the council of Nice. — And thus much concerning the doctrine of christian liberty, and of the differences of rites and ceremonies.

Now to return to Victor again, to show what diversity there was in observing the day of Easter, and how it came, thus is the story. First, in the time of Pius, in the year of Christ 143, the question of Easter-day began first to be moved, at what time Pius, by the revelation of Hermas, decreed the observation of that day to be changed, from the wonted manner of the fourteenth day of the moon in the first month, unto the next Sunday after. After him came Anicetus, Soter and Eleutherius, bishops of Rome, who also determined the same. <sup>F1127</sup> Against these stood Melito bishop of Sardis, Polycarp, and, as some think, Hegesippus, with other learned men of Asia; which Polycarp, being sent by the brethren of Asia, came to Rome as is aforesaid, to confer with Anicetus in that matter: wherein when they could not agree after long debating, yet notwithstanding, they did both communicate together with reverence, and departed in peace. And so the celebration of Easter-day <sup>f1128</sup> remained ἄδιάφορον, as a thing indifferent in the church, till the time of Victor; who, following after Anicetus and his fellows, and chiefly stirring in this matter, endeavored by all means and might to draw, or rather subdue, the churches of Asia unto his opinion; thinking moreover to excommunicate all those bishops and churches of Asia, as heretics and schismatics, which disagreed from the Roman order: had not Irenaeus otherwise restrained him from that doing, as is aforesaid, which was about the year of our Lord 197, in the reign of Commodus. Thus then began the uniformity of keeping that holy day to be first required as a thing necessary, and all they accounted as heretics and schismatics, who dissented from the bishop and tradition of Rome.

With Victor stood the following bishops — Theophilus bishop of Cesarea in Palestine, Narcissus of Jerusalem, Irenaeus of Lyons, Palmas [of Amastris] and the other bishops in Pontus, Bachyllus of Corinth, the bishops of Osroene, and others more: all which condescended to have the celebration of Easter upon the Sunday, partly, because they would differ from the Jews in all things as much as they might, and partly, because the resurrection of the Lord fell on the same day. <sup>F1129</sup>

On the contrary side, divers bishops were in Asia, of whom the principal was Polycrates bishop of Ephesus; who, having assembled a great multitude of bishops and brethren of those parts, by the common assent of the rest, wrote again to Victor and to the church of Rome, declaring, that they had ever from the beginning observed that day, according to the rule of Scripture, unchanged, neither adding nor altering any thing from the same; alleging, moreover, for themselves the examples of the apostles and holy fathers their predecessors, as Philip the apostle, with his three daughters, who died at Hierapolis; also John the apostle and evangelist, at Ephesus; Polycarp, at Smyrna; Thrasesas of Eumenia, bishop and martyr, at Smyrna; likewise Sagaris at Laodicea, bishop and martyr; holy Papius, and Melito at Sardis. Beside these, bishops also of his own kindred, and his own ancestors, to the number of seven, who were all bishops before him, and he the eighth now after them; all of these observed (saith he) the solemnity of Easter on the same day, and after the same wise and sort, as we do now. <sup>F1130</sup>

Victor, being not a little moved herewith, by letters again denounceth against them (more bold upon authority than wise in his commission) violent excommunication; albeit by the wise handling of Irenaeus, and other learned men, that matter was staid, and Victor otherwise persuaded. What the persuasions of Irenaeus were, partly may appear in Eusebius, <sup>f1131</sup> the sum whereof tendeth to this effect:

“That the variety and difference of ceremonies is no strange matter in the church of Christ, when as this variety is not only in the day of Easter, but also in the manner of fasting, and in divers other usages among the Christians: for some fast one day, some two days, some others fast more. Others there be, who, counting forty hours, both day and night, take that for a full fast. And this so diverse fashion of fasting in the church of Christ began not only in this our time, but was before among our fore-elders. And yet, notwithstanding, they with all this diversity were in unity among themselves, and so be we; neither doth this difference of ceremonies any thing hinder, but rather commendeth the concord of faith. And he bringeth forth the examples of the fathers, of Telesphorus, Pius, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherius, and such others, who neither observed the same usage themselves, nor prescribed it

to others; and yet, notwithstanding, kept christian charity with such as came to communicate with them, though not observing the same form of things which they observed; as well appeared by Polycarp and Anicetus, who, although they agreed not in one uniform custom of rites, yet refused not to communicate together, the one giving reverence unto the other.”

Thus the controversy being taken up between Ireneus and Victor, [the matter] remained free to the time of the Nicene council. And thus much concerning the controversy of that matter, and concerning the doings of Victor.

After Victor, succeeded in the see of Rome, Zephyrinus, in the days of the aforesaid Severus, about the year of our Lord 202. To this Zephyrinus be ascribed two epistles, in the first tome of the Councils. But, as I have said before of the decretal epistles of other Roman bishops, so I say and verily suppose of this; that neither the countenance of the style, nor the matter therein contained, nor the condition of the time, doth otherwise give to think of these letters, but that they be verily bastard letters; not written by these fathers, nor in these times, but craftily and wickedly packed in by some, which, to set up the primacy of Rome, have most pestilently abused the authority of these holy and ancient fathers, to deceive the simple church. For who is so rude, but that in considering only the state of those terrible times he may easily understand (except affection blind him), beside a number of other probable conjectures to lead him, that the poor persecuted bishops in that time would have been glad to have any safe covert to put their heads in: so far was it off, that they had any list or leisure then to seek for any primacy or patriarchship, or to drive all other churches to appeal to the see of Rome, or to exempt all priests from the accusation of any layman; as in the first epistle of Zephyrinus is to be seen, written to the bishops of Sicily: and likewise the second epistle of his to the bishops of the province of Egypt, containing no manner of doctrine, nor consolation necessary for that time, but only certain ritual decrees to no purpose, argueth no less, but the said epistles neither to savor of that man, nor to taste of that time.

Of like credit also seemeth the constitution of the patines of glass, which Damasus saith that the same Zephyrinus ordained to be carried before the

priest at the celebration of the mass. Again Platina writeth that he ordained the administration of the sacrament to be no more used in vessels of wood, or of glass, or of any other metal, except only silver, gold, and tin, etc. But how these two testimonies of Damasus and Platina join together, let the reader judge; <sup>f1132</sup> especially seeing the same decree is referred to Urban that came after him. Again, what needed this decree of golden chalices <sup>f1133</sup> to be established afterward in the councils of Tribur <sup>f1134</sup> and Rheims, if it had been enacted before by Zephyrinus? How long this Zephyrinus sat, our writers do vary. Eusebius saith, he died in the reign of Caracalla, and sat seventeen years. Platina writeth that he died under Severus, and sat eight years; and so saith also Nauclerus. Damasus affirmeth, that he sat sixteen years and two months. <sup>F1135</sup>

Matthew of Westminster, <sup>f1136</sup> author of the story intituled “Flores Historiarum,” with other later chronicles, maketh mention of Perpetua, and Felicitas, and Revocatus her brother, also of Saturninus and Satyrus brothers, and Secundolus, who, in the persecution of this Severus, gave over their lives to martyrdom for Christ; being thrown to wild beasts, and devoured of the same in Carthage in Africa; save that Saturninus, brought again from the beasts, was beheaded, and Secundolus died in prison about the year of our Lord 202, as writeth Florilegus.

This Severus, the persecutor, reigned, as the most part of writers accord, the term of eighteen years, who, about the latter time of his reign, came with his army hither into Britain; where, after many conflicts had with the Britons, in the borders of the north he cast up a ditch, with a mighty wall made of earth and turfs and strong stakes, to the length of about seventy miles, from the one side of the island to the other, beginning at the Tyne, and reaching to the Scottish sea: <sup>f1137</sup> which done, he removed to York, and there, by the breaking in of the northern men and Scots, was besieged and slain, about the year of our Lord 211, leaving behind him two sons, Bassianus and Geta; which Bassianus, surnamed Caracalla, after he had slain his brother Geta here in Britain, governed the empire alone, the space of six years. After whose death, (he being slain also of his servants, as he had slain his brother before), succeeded Macrinus with his son Diadumenus, to be emperor; who, after they had reigned one year, were both slain of their own people.

After them followed Varius Heliogabalus in the empire, rather to be called a monster than a man; so prodigious was his life in all gluttony, filthiness, and ribaldry. Such was his pomp, that in his lamps he used balm, and filled his fish-ponds with rose-water. To let pass his sumptuous vestures, which he would not wear but only of gold and most costly silks; and his shoes glistening with precious stones finely engraved; he was never two days served with one kind of meat; he never wore one garment twice. And likewise, for his fleshly wickedness, some days his company was served at meal with the brains of ostriches, and a strange fowl called phoenicoptery, another day with the tongues of popinjays, and other sweet singing birds. Being nigh to the sea, he never used fish; in places far distant from the sea, all his house was served with most delicate fishes. At one supper he was served with seven thousand fishes, and five thousand fowls. At his removing in his progress, often there followed him six hundred chariots laden only with bawds, common harlots, and ribalds. He sacrificed young children, and preferred to the best advancements in the common-wealth most light personages, as bawds, minstrels, carters, and such like; in one word, he was an enemy to all honesty and good order. And when he was foretold by his sorcerers and astronomers that he should die a violent death, he provided robes of silk to hang himself, swords of gold to kill himself, and strong poison in [boxes of] jacinth and emerald to poison himself, if needs he must thereto be forced. Moreover, he made a high tower, having the floor of boards covered with gold plate, bordered with precious stones, from the which tower he would throw himself down, if he should be pursued of his enemies. But notwithstanding all his provision, he was slain of the soldiers, drawn through the city, and cast into the Tiber, after he had reigned two years and eight months, as witnesseth Eutropius; others say four years.

This Heliogabalas, having no issue, adopted to his son and heir Aurelius Alexander Severus, the son of Mammaea, who, entering his reign the year of our Lord 222, continued thirteen years, well commended for being virtuous, wise, gentle, liberal, and to no man hurtful. And as he was not unlearned himself, through the diligent education of Mammaea his mother, so he was a great favourer of wise and learned men. Neither did he any thing in the commonwealth, without the assistance of learned and sage counsellors. It is reported of him that he bore such stomach against corrupt

judges, that when he chanced to meet with any of them, by the commotion of his mind he would cast up gall, being so moved with them that he could not speak, and was ready with his two fingers to put out their eyes. From his court he dismissed all superfluous and unneedful servants, saying, that he was no good pupil which fed idle servants with the bowels of his commonwealth. <sup>F1138</sup>

Among his other good virtues, it appeareth also that he was friendly and favorable unto the Christians, as by this act may be gathered: for when the Christians had occupied a certain public place in some good use (belike for the assembling and conventing together of the congregation) the company of the cooks or tiplers made challenge of that place to belong unto them. The matter being brought before the emperor, he judged it more honest, for the place to be continued to the worship of God, howsoever it were, than be polluted by the dirty slubbering of cooks and scullions.

By this it may be understood, that in Rome no Christian churches were erected unto this time, when yet (notwithstanding this favor of the emperor) no public house could quietly be obtained for the Christians. So that, by the reason hereof, may appear the decretal epistle and ordinance of pope Hyginus concerning the dedication of churches, above-mentioned, to be falsified. And likewise the ordinance of Pius his successor, **concerning the** <sup>a67</sup> altar, <sup>f1139</sup> to be also false. For what altar was it likely they had in the time of Hyginus and Pius, A.D. 150, when at this time, A.D. 223, which was long after, no public place almost could be granted them for the Christians to assemble together.

Of this Alexander, Platina writeth, <sup>f1140</sup> that as he was a great hater of all boasters and flatterers, so he was of such prudence, that no deceit could escape him; and bringeth in a story of one Turinus, who had gotten craftily many great bribes and gifts, by making the people believe that he was of great authority with the emperor, and that he could help them to have whatsoever they sued for. Whereof the emperor being certified, he caused him in the open market to be fastened to a stake, and there killed with smoke, while the crier stood thus crying to the people; "Smoke he sold, and with smoke he is punished."

Mammaea, the mother of this Alexander above-mentioned (whom Jerome calleth a devout and religious woman), hearing of the fame and the excellent

learning of Origen, who was then at Alexandria, sent for him to Antioch, desirous to see and hear him: unto whom the aforesaid Origen, according to her request, resorted, and after that he had there remained a space with the emperor and his mother, returned again to Alexandria. And thus continued this good emperor his reign the space of thirteen years; at length, at a commotion in Germany, with his mother Mammaea he was slain. After whom succeeded Maximin, A.D. 235, contrary to the mind of the senate, only appointed by the soldiers to be emperor. During all this time between Severus and this Maximin, the church of Christ, although it had not perfect peace, yet it had some mean tranquillity from persecution. Albeit, some martyrs there were at this time that suffered, whereof Naucerus giveth this reason: "For although," saith he, "Alexander, being persuaded through the entreating of his mother Mammaea, did favor the Christians, yet notwithstanding, there was no public edict or proclamation provided for their safeguard." By reason whereof, divers there were who suffered martyrdom under Almachius and other judges. In the number of whom, after some stories, was Calixtus bishop of Rome, who succeeded next unto Zephyrinus <sup>f1141</sup> above mentioned; and after him Urban also, who, both being bishops of Rome, **did both suffer**, <sup>a68</sup> by the opinion of some writers, under Alexander Severus. This Calixtus, in his two decretal epistles, written to Benedict and to the bishops of France, giveth these ordinances; that no actions or accusations against the prelates or doctors of the church should be received; that no secret conspiracies should be made against bishops; item, no man to communicate with persons excommunicate; also, no bishop to excommunicate or to deal in another's diocese. And here he expoundeth the diocese or the parish of any bishop or minister to be his wife: "The wife," saith the apostle, "is bound to the law, as long as the husband liveth; when he is dead, she is free from the law." "So," saith Calixtus, "the wife of a bishop (which is his church) so long as he liveth, is bound only to him, neither ought to be judged or disposed by any other man, without his will and judgment. After his death, she is free from the law to marry to whom she will, so it be in the Lord, that is 'regulariter,' regularly." In the end of the said his epistle decretal, he confuteth the error of those who hold, "that they which are fallen are not to be received again:" which heresy, after the time of Calixtus or Calistus, came in first by Novatian, in the days of Cornelius, A.D. 251. Moreover, in his said first epistle decretal is contained the Fast of the Four

Times, commonly called the Ember-fast, whereof also Marianus Scotus maketh mention. But Damasus, speaking of the same fast, saith, he ordained the fast but of three times, which was for the increase of corn, wine, and oil.

By these hitherto premised, it is not hard for a quick reader to smell out the crafty juggling of that person or persons, whosoever they were, that falsely have ascribed these decretal institutions to those holy fathers. For first, what leisure had the Christians to lay in their accusations against their bishops, when we never read, or find in any story, any kind of variance in those days among them; but all love, mutual compassion, and hearty communion among the saints? And as we read of no variance among the people in those days, nor of any fault or backsliding among the bishops, who for the most part then died all constant martyrs, so neither do we read of any tribunal seat or consistory used or frequented then about any such matters. Again, if a man examine well the dangers of those busy days, he shall see the poor flock of the Christians so occupied and piteously oppressed by the cruel accusations of the heathen infidels, that though the *cause* did, yet the *time* would not serve them to commence any law against their bishops. Secondly, as touching their conspiracy against bishops, what conspiracy either would they then practice against them, who always gave their lives for their defense? Or how could they then conspire in any companies together, when never a true christian man durst once put his head out of his doors? neither was there in the church any christian man in those perilous days, except he were a true man indeed, such as was far from all false conspiracies. And when all the world almost in all places conspired against them, what time, what cause, or what heart, trow ye, could they have to conspire against their instructors? Thirdly, concerning the confutation of that heresy, how standeth the confutation with the time of Calixtus, when Novatian, the author of that heresy, was after him in the time of Cornelius? Fourthly, if by the law of Calixtus every diocese or parish be the proper wife of every bishop or minister, then how many bishops' wives, and parsons' wives, has the adulterous pope of Rome deflowered in these latter days of the church! who so proudly and impudently hath intermeddled and taken his pleasure, and his own profit, in every diocese and parish almost through all Christendom, without all leave and license of the good man; who hath been in the mean

time, and yet is compelled still, wheresoever the pope's holiness cometh, "Vigilanti stertere naso," <sup>f1142</sup> and to give him leave unasked to do what he list. Wherefore if this canon decretal be truly his, <sup>f1143</sup> why is it not observed, so as it doth stand, without exception? If it be not, why is it then falsely forged upon him, and the church of Christ deceived? and certes, lamentable it is, that this falsifying of such trifling traditions, under the false pretense of antiquity, either was begun in the church to deceive the people, or that it hath remained so long undetected. For, as I think, the church of Christ will never be perfectly reformed, before these decretal constitutions and epistles, which have so long put on the visor of antiquity, shall be fully detected, and appear in their own color, wherein they were first painted.

And yet neither do I say this, or think contrary, but that it may be, that bishops of Rome, and of the same name, have been the true authors of these traditions. But here cometh in the error (as I credibly suppose), that when other later bishops of the like name have devised these ceremonial inventions, the vulgar opinion of men hath transferred them to the first primitive fathers; although being of another time, yet bearing the same name with the true inventors thereof. But of Calixtus enough; who, as Damasus saith, in the days of this Alexander Severus died a martyr. Vincentius affirmeth, that he was tied to a great stone, and so out of a window was thrown into a ditch. <sup>F1144</sup> Eusebius, speaking of his death, maketh no mention of his martyrdom, and saith he sat five years; Platina saith six years; Sabellicus giveth him seven years, and so doth Damasus. <sup>F1145</sup>

After Calixtus followed Urban, about the year of our Lord 223; who, in his epistle decretal (coming out of the same forge) which he wrote in common to all bishops, maketh no mention of the heavy persecutions of the church, nor ministereth any exhortation of comfort or constancy to the brethren; but only giveth many strict precepts for not transporting or alienating the goods of the church, and to pay truly their offerings which they vow: also to have all common among the clergy. Moreover, about the end of his epistle, he instituteth the confirmation of children after baptism (which the papists be wont to take into the number of their seven sacraments) affirming and denouncing more than Scripture will bear, that the imposition of the bishop's hand bringeth the Holy Ghost, and that thereby men be

made full Christians, etc. But of these decretal epistles enough is said before, more may be considered of the discreet reader. Marianus Scotus, Sabellicus, Nauclerus, and other late story-writers do hold, as is aforesaid, that he died a martyr in the days of Alexander Severus, <sup>f1146</sup> after he had governed that seat four years, as Damasus and Platina do witness; as Marianus saith, eight years.

The same Damasus and Platina do testify of him, that he, by his preaching and holiness of life, converted divers heathens to the faith. Among whom were Tiburtius, and Valerian the [espoused] husband of Cecilia, who both, being [brothers and] noblemen of Rome, remained constant in the faith unto martyrdom. **Of this Cecilia** <sup>a69</sup> thus it is written in the Martyrology by Ado:

“Cecilia the virgin, after she had brought Valerian, her husband espoused. and Tiburtius his brother, to the knowledge and faith of Christ, and, with her exhortations, had made them constant unto martyrdom; after the suffering of them she was also apprehended by Almachius the ruler, and brought to the idols to do sacrifice: which thing when she abhorred to do, she should be presented before the judge to have the condemnation of death. In the mean time, the serjeants and officers which were about her, beholding her comely beauty, and the prudent behavior in her conversation, began, with many persuasions of words, to solicit her mind to favor herself, and that so excellent beauty, and not to cast herself away, etc. But she again so replied to them with reasons and godly exhortations, that, by the grace of Almighty God, their hearts began to kindle, and at length to yield to that religion which before they did persecute. Which thing she perceiving, desired of the judge Almachius a little respite; which being granted, she sendeth for Urban, the bishop, home to her house, to stablish and ground them in the faith of Christ. And so were they, with divers others, at the same time baptized, both men and women, to the number (as the story saith) of four hundred persons; among whom was one Gordian a nobleman. This done, this blessed martyr was brought before the judge, where she was condemned; then, after, was brought to the house of the judge, where she was enclosed in a hot bath. But she, remaining there a whole day and night without any

hurt, as in a cold place, was brought out again, and commandment given that in the bath she should be beheaded. The executioner is said to have had four strokes at her neck; and yet her head being cut off, she (as the story goeth) lived three days after. And so died this holy virgin martyr, whose body, in the night season, Urban the bishop took and buried among the other bishops.”

Ado, the compiler of this Martyrology, addeth that this was done in the time of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. But that cannot be, forso much as Urban, by all histories, was long after those emperors, and lived in the days of this Alexander, as is above declared. Antoninus, Bergomensis, and Equilinus, with such other writers, set forth this history with many strange miracles wrought by the said Cecilia, in converting her husband Valerian and his brother, in showing them the angel which was the keeper of her virginity, and of the angel putting on crowns upon their heads. <sup>F1147</sup> But as touching these miracles, as I do not dispute whether they be true or fabulous, so, because they have no ground upon any ancient or grave authors, but are taken out of certain new legends, I do therefore refer them thither from whence they came.

Under the same Alexander divers other there be, whom Bergomensis mentioned to have suffered martyrdom, as one Agapitus of the age of fifteen years, who, being apprehended and condemned at Preneste in Italy, because he would not sacrifice to idols, was assailed with sundry torments; first with whips scourged, then hanged up by the feet; after, having hot water poured upon him; at the last cast to the wild beasts: with all which torments when he could not be hurt, finally, with sword he was beheaded. <sup>F1148</sup> The executer of these punishments (as by Henry of Herford may be gathered) was one Antiochus; who, in the executing of the foresaid torments, suddenly fell down from his judicial seat, crying out, that all his inward bowels burned within him, and so gave up the breath. <sup>f1149</sup>

Also with the same Agapitus is numbered Calepodius, a minister of Rome, whose body first was drawn through the city of Rome, and afterwards cast into the Tiber. <sup>F1150</sup>

Then followeth Palmatus, a senator of Rome, with his wife and children, and others both men and women, to the number of forty and two; also another noble senator of Rome named Simplicius; all which together, in one

day, had their heads smitten off, and their heads afterwards were hanged up on divers gates of the city for a terror of others, that none should profess the name of Christ. Besides these suffered also Quiritius, a nobleman of Rome, who, with his mother Julitta, and a great number more, were put likewise to death. Also Tiberius and Valerian [before-mentioned], citizens of Rome and brothers, suffered (as Bergomensis saith) the same time; who, first being bruised and broken with bats, afterwards were beheaded. Also Vincentius, Bergomensis, and Henry of Herford, make mention of Martina, a christian virgin, who, after divers bitter punishments, being constant in her faith, suffered in like manner by the sword.

Albeit, as touching the time of these aforementioned martyrs, as I find them not in older writers, so do I suppose them to have suffered under Maximin or Decius, rather than under Alexander.

### **THE SIXTH PERSECUTION.**

After the death of the emperor Alexander, who, with his mother Mammaea (as is said), was murdered in Germany, followed Maximin, chosen by the will of the soldiers, rather than by the authority of the senate, about the year of our Lord 235; who, for the hatred he had to the house of Alexander (as Eusebius recordeth), raised up the sixth persecution against the Christians, especially against the doctors and leaders of the church; thinking thereby the sooner to vanquish the rest, if the captains of them were removed out of the way. For which reason I suppose the martyrdom of Urban, the bishop of Rome, and of the rest above specified, to have happened rather under the tyranny of this Maximin than under Alexander. In the time of this persecution Origen wrote his book, "De Martyrio;" which book, if it were extant, would give us some knowledge, I doubt not, of such as in this persecution did suffer, who now lie in silence unknown: and no doubt but a great number they were, and more should have been, had not the provident mercy of God shortened his days, and bridled his tyranny; for he reigned but three years. After whom succeeded Gordian III. in the year of our Lord 238, a man no less studious of the welfare of the commonwealth, than mild and gentle to the Christians. This Gordian, after he had governed with much peace and tranquillity the monarchy of Rome the space of six years, was slain of Philip, the emperor after him.

In the days of these emperors above recited was Pontian bishop of Rome, who succeeded next after Urban above rehearsed, about the year A.D. 230; or in the twelfth year of Alexander, A.D. 233, as Eusebius noteth, <sup>f1151</sup> declaring him to sit six years. <sup>F1152</sup> Contrary, Damasus and Platina write, that he was bishop nine years and a half, and that in the time of Alexander he, with Philip <sup>f1153</sup> a priest, was banished into Sardinia, and there died. But it seemeth more credible, that he was banished rather under Maximin, and died in the beginning of the reign of Gordian. In his Epistles Decretal (which seem likewise to be feigned) he appeareth very much bent, after the common example of other bishops, to uphold the dignity of priests, and of clergymen; saying, “that God hath them so familiar with him, that by them he accepteth the offerings and oblations of others, he forgiveth their sins, and reconcileth them unto him:” also, “that they do make the body of the Lord with their own mouth, and give it to others,” etc.; which doctrine, how it standeth with the glory of God and testament of Christ, let the reader use his own judgment. <sup>F1154</sup>

Other notable fathers also in the same time were raised up in the church, as Philetus bishop of Antioch, who succeeded after Asclepiades afore mentioned, in the year of our Lord 221; and after him Zebinus, bishop of the same place, in the year of our Lord 233.

**Of Hippolytus,** <sup>a70</sup> also, both Eusebius and Jerome make mention that he was a bishop; but where, they make no relation. And so likewise doth Theodoret witness him to be a bishop and also a martyr, but naming no place. Gelasius <sup>f1155</sup> saith, he died a martyr, and that he was metropolitan of Arabia. Nicephorus writeth, that he was bishop of Porto, a port-town near to Rome. <sup>F1156</sup> Certain it is, he was a great writer, and left many works in the church, which Eusebius and Jerome do recite. By the computation of Eusebius, he was about the year of our Lord 230. Prudentius, in his **Περὶ Στεφάνων** making mention of great heaps of martyrs buried by threescore together, speaketh also of Hippolytus, <sup>f1157</sup> and saith that he was drawn with wild horses through fields, dales, and bushes, and describeth thereof a pitiful story.

To these also may be added Ammonius the schoolmaster of Origen, as Suidas supposeth, also the kinsman of Porphyry, the great enemy of Christ: notwithstanding, this Ammonius, indued with better grace, as he

left divers books in defense of Christ's religion, so did he constantly persevere (as Eusebius reporteth) <sup>f1158</sup> in the doctrine of Christ, which he had in the beginning received; who was about the days of Alexander.

Julius Africanus also, about the time of Gordian aforesaid, is numbered among the ancient writers; <sup>f1159</sup> of whom Nicephorus writeth, that he was the scholar of Origen, and a great writer of histories of that time.

Unto these doctors and confessors may be adjoined the story of Natalius, mentioned in the fifth book of Eusebius. <sup>F1160</sup> This Natalius had suffered persecution before, like a constant confessor; but was seduced and persuaded by Asclepiodotus and Theodorus (who were disciples of Theodotus the tanner <sup>f1161</sup>), to take upon him to be bishop of their sect; promising to give him every month a hundred and fifty pieces of silver. And so, joining himself to them, he was admonished [of his error] by frequent visions from the Lord; for such was the great mercy of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, that he would not have his martyr, who had suffered so much for his name before, now to perish out of his church: "For the which cause," saith Eusebius, "God, by certain visions, did admonish him. But he, not taking great heed thereunto, being blinded partly with lucre, partly with honor, was at length all the night long scourged of the angels; insomuch that he, being made thereby very sore, and early on the morrow putting on sackcloth, with much weeping and lamentation went to Zephyrinus, the bishop above mentioned; where he, falling down before him and all the christian congregation, showed them the stripes of his body, and prayed them, for the mercies of Christ, that he might be received into their communion again, from which he had sequestered himself before; and so was admitted according as he desired."

After the decease of Pontian, bishop of Rome, afore mentioned, succeeded next in that place Anterus, <sup>f1162</sup> of whom Isuardus writeth, that Pontian, leaving Rome, did substitute him in his room: but Eusebius writeth that he succeeded immediately after him. Damasus saith, that because he caused the acts and deaths of the martyrs to be written, therefore he was put to martyrdom himself by Maximin. Concerning the time of this bishop our writers do greatly jar. <sup>F1163</sup> Eusebius and Marianus Scotus affirm that he was bishop but one month; Sabellicus saith that not to be so; Damasus assigneth to him twelve years and one month; Volateran, Bergomensis, and

Henry of Herford, give to him three years and one month; Nauclerus writeth that he sat one year and one month. All which are so far discrepant one from another, that which of them most agreeth with truth, it lieth in doubt. Next to this bishop was Fabian, of whom more is to be said hereafter.

After the emperor Gordian III. the empire fell to Philip, in the year of our Lord 244, who, with Philip his son, governed the space of six years. This Philip, with his son and all his family, were converted and christened by Fabian <sup>f1164</sup> and Origen, who by letters exhorted him and Severa his wife to be baptized, being the first of all the emperors that brought Christianity into the imperial seat. Howsoever Pomponius Letus reporteth him to be a dissembling prince. This is certain, that for his Christianity, he, with his son, was slain of Decius, one of his captains. Sabellicus <sup>f1165</sup> and Bergomensis <sup>f1166</sup> show this hatred of Decius against Philip to be conceived, for that the emperor Philip, both the father and the son, had committed their treasures unto Fabian, then bishop of Rome.

### THE SEVENTH PERSECUTION.

Thus Philip being slain, after him Decius invaded the crown about the year of our Lord 249; by whom was moved a terrible persecution against the Christians, which Orosius noteth to be the seventh persecution. The first occasion of this hatred and persecution of this tyrant, conceived against the Christians, was chiefly (as is before touched) because of the treasures of the emperor which were committed to Fabian the bishop.

This Fabian, first being a married man (as Platina writeth), was made bishop of Rome after Anterus above-mentioned, by the miraculous appointment of God; which Eusebius doth thus describe: <sup>f1167</sup> “When the brethren,” saith he, “were congregated together in the church about the election of their bishop, and divers of them had nominated divers noble and worthy personages of Rome, it chanced that Fabian, among others, was there present; who of late before was newly come out of the country to inhabit in the city. The brethren thinking of nothing less than of choosing this Fabian, there suddenly cometh a dove flying from above, and sitteth upon his head; whereupon all the congregation were moved, with one mind and one voice, to choose him for their bishop;” in the which function he

remained the space of thirteen years, as Eusebius writeth; Damasus, Marianus, and Sabellicus say fourteen years, unto the time of Decius; who, whether for that Philip had committed to him his treasures, or whether for the hatred he bare to Philip, in the beginning of his reign caused him to be put to death; sending out moreover his proclamation into all quarters, that all who professed the name of Christ should be slain.

To this Fabian be ascribed certain ordinances; as, of consecrating new oil for baptism once every year, and burning the old; of accusations against bishops; of appealing to the see apostolic; of not marrying within the fifth degree; of communicating thrice a year; of offering every Sunday; with such other things more in his three Epistles Decretal: which epistles, as by divers other evidences may be supposed to be untruly named upon him, giving no signification of any matter agreeing to that time; so do I find the most part of the third epistle word for word standing in the epistle of Sixtus III., who followed almost two hundred years after him; beside the unseemly doctrine also in the end of the said epistles contained, where he, contrary to the tenor of the gospel, applieth remission of sins (only due to the blood of Christ) unto the offerings of bread and wine by men and women every Sunday in the church.

To this Fabian wrote Origen “De orthodoxia suae fidei,” that is, “Of the orthodoxy of his faith:” whereby is to be understood, that he continued to the time of Decius: some say also to the time of Gallus. Of this Origen partly mention is touched before, declaring how bold and fervent he was in the days of Severus, in assisting, comforting, exhorting, and kissing the martyrs that were imprisoned, and suffered for the name of Christ; with such danger of his own life, that had it not been for the singular protection of God, he had been stoned to death many times of the heathen multitude. Such great concourse of men and women was daily at his house to be catechised and instructed in the christian faith by him, that soldiers were hired on purpose to defend the place where he taught them. <sup>F1168</sup> Again, such search sometimes was set for him, that scarce any shifting of place or country could cover him; in whose laborious travails and affairs of the church, in teaching, writing, confuting, exhorting, and expounding, he continued about the space of fifty-two years, unto the time of Decius and Gallus. Divers and great persecutions he sustained, but especially under Decius, as testifieth Eusebius, <sup>f1169</sup> declaring that, for the doctrine of

Christ, he sustained bands and torments in his body, rackings with bars of iron, dungeons, besides terrible threats of death and burning. All this he suffered in the persecution of Decius, as Eusebius recordeth of him, and maketh no relation of any further matter. But Suidas and Nicephorus, following the same, say further concerning him, that the said Origen, after divers and sundry other torments which he manfully and constantly suffered for Christ, at length was brought to an altar, where a foul filthy Ethiopian was appointed to be, and there this option or choice was offered unto him; whether he would sacrifice to the idols, or have his body polluted with that foul and ugly Ethiopian. Then Origen, saith he, who, with a philosophical mind, ever kept his chastity undefiled, much abhorring that filthy villany to be done to his body, condescended to their request. Whereupon the judge, putting incense in his hand, caused him to set it to the fire upon the altar; for the which impiety he afterward was excommunicated of the church. Epiphanius writeth that he, being urged to sacrifice to idols, and taking the boughs in his hand, wherewith the heathen were wont to honor their gods, called upon the Christians to carry them in the honor of Christ. The which fact the church of Alexandria misliking, removed him from their communion; <sup>f1170</sup> whereupon Origen, driven away with shame and sorrow out of Alexandria, went into Jewry, where, being in Jerusalem among the congregation, and there requested of the priests and ministers (he being also a priest) to make some exhortation in the church, he refused a great while to do. At length, by importunate petition being constrained thereunto, he rose up, and turning the book, as though he would have expounded some place of the Scripture, he only read the verse of the fiftieth Psalm: “But to the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do, to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my covenant in thy mouth?” which verse being read, he shut the book, and sat down weeping and wailing, the whole congregation also weeping and lamenting with him. <sup>F1171</sup> What more became of Origen, it is not found in history, but only that Suidas addeth, he died and was buried at Tyre. Eusebius affirmeth, that he departed under the emperor Gallus, about the year of our Lord 255; and in the seventieth year of his age, in great misery (as appeareth) and poverty.

In this Origen divers blemishes of doctrine be noted, whereupon Jerome sometimes doth inveigh against him; albeit in some places again he doth extol and commend him for his excellent learning, as in his Apology against

Ruffinus, and in his epistle to Pammachius and Ocean; where he praiseth Origen, although not for the perfection of his faith and doctrine, nor for an apostle, yet for an excellent interpreter, for his wit, and for a philosopher: and yet in his Prologue upon the Homilies of Origen on Ezekiel, he calleth him the second master of the churches after the apostle; and, in the preface to his Questions upon Genesis, he wisheth to himself the knowledge of the Scriptures, which Origen had; also with the envy of his name. Athanasius, moreover, calleth him admirable and laborious, and useth also his testimonies against the Arians. <sup>F1172</sup>

After Origen, the congrue order of history requireth next to speak of Heraclas his usher; a man singularly commended for his knowledge, not only in philosophy, but also in such faculties as, to a christian divine do appertain. This great towardness of wit and learning when Origen perceived in him, he appointed him above all others to be his usher, or under-teacher, to help in his school or university of Alexandria in the reign of Antoninus Caracalla, son of Severus. And after, in the tenth year of Alexander, Origen departing unto Caesarea, he succeeded in his room to govern the school in Alexandria. Further also, in the time of Alexander <sup>f1173</sup> after the decease of Demetrius bishop of Alexandria, this Heraclas succeeded to be bishop of the said city; in which function he ministered the term of sixteen years. <sup>F1174</sup> Of this Heraclas writeth Origen himself, that he, although he was a priest, yet ceased not to read over and peruse the books of the Gentiles, to the intent he might the better, out of their own books, confute their errors. <sup>F1175</sup>

After Heraclas succeeded Dionysius of Alexandria in the bishopric of Alexandria, like as he succeeded him in the school before; which Dionysius also writeth of the same Heraclas unto Philemon a priest of Rome, saying thus: "This canon and type I received of blessed Heraclas our pope," etc. <sup>f1176</sup> This Heraclas was no martyr, who died three years before Decius, about the year of our Lord, 247. After whom succeeded next in the same see of Alexandria, Dionysius Alexandrinus, who also suffered much under the tyranny of Decius; as hereafter shall be showed (Christ willing) when we come to the time of Valerian.

Nicephorus in his first book, <sup>f1177</sup> and others who write of this persecution under Decius, declare the horribleness thereof to be so great, and such

innumerable martyrs to suffer in the same, that he saith, it is as easy to number the sands of the sea, as to recite the particular names of them whom this persecution did devour; in which persecution the chiefest doers and tormentors under the emperor appear, in the history of Vincentius, to have been these: Optimus the proconsul, Valerian, and Quartus Promotus, <sup>f1178</sup> etc. Although therefore it be hard here to infer all and singular persons, in order, that died in this persecution, yet such as remain most notable in stories, I will briefly touch by the grace of Him for whose cause they suffered.

In the former tractation of **the fifth persecution**, <sup>a71</sup> mention was made of Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem, and of his troubles suffered under Severus; and how, afterward, by the miracle of God, he was appointed bishop of Jerusalem, where he continued governor of that church above the term of forty years, till the time of the first year of Decius; at what time he, being brought from Jerusalem to Caesarea into the judgment place, after a constant and evident confession of his faith made before the judge, was committed unto prison, and there finished his life a very aged man; as testifieth Dionysius Alexandrinus in the sixth book of Eusebius. <sup>F1179</sup> After whom succeeded in that see Mazabanes, the thirty-and-fourth bishop of that city after James the apostle.

Mention was made also before of Asclepiades, bishop of Antioch, who succeeded after Serapion, and in the persecution of Severus did likewise persevere in a constant confession; and, as Vincentius <sup>f1180</sup> testifieth, suffered martyrdom at last under this Decius. But this computation of Vincentius can in no wise agree with the truth of time; forsomuch as by probable writers, as Zonaras, Nicephorus, and others, the said Asclepiades, after Serapion, entered the bishop's seat of Antioch, in the year of our Lord 214, and sat seven years before the time of **Alexander**; <sup>a72</sup> after whom succeeded Philetus, A.D. 221, governing the function twelve years. And after him Zebinus followed, A.D. 233; and so after him Babylas; which Babylas, if he died in this persecution of Decius, then could not Asclepiades also suffer in the same time, who died so long before him, as is declared. Of this Babylas, bishop of Antioch, Eusebius and Zonaras record, that under Decius he died in prison, as did Alexander, bishop of Jerusalem above rehearsed.

We read in a certain treatise of Chrysostom, intituled “Contra Gentiles,” a noble and long history of one Babylas a martyr, who, about these times, was put to death for resisting a certain emperor, not suffering him to enter into the temple of the Christians after a cruel murder committed; the story of which murder is this:

There was a certain emperor, who, upon conclusion of peace made with a certain nation, had received for hostage, or surety of peace, the son of the king, being of young and tender age; with conditions upon the same, that neither he should be molested of them, nor that they should ever be vexed of him. Upon this the king’s son was delivered, not without great care and fear of the father, unto the emperor; whom the cruel emperor, contrary to promise, caused in short time, without all just cause, to be slain. This fact so horrible being committed, the tyrant with all haste would enter into the temple of the Christians, where Babylas, being bishop or minister, withstood him that he should not into that place approach. The emperor therewith not a little incensed, in great rage bade him forthwith to be laid in prison with as many irons as he could bear, and from thence shortly after to be brought forth to death and execution. Babylas, going constantly and boldly to his martyrdom, desired after his death to be buried with his irons and bands, and so he was.

The story proceedeth moreover, and saith;

In the continuance of time in the reign of Constantine, Gallus, then made the overseer of the east parts, caused his body to be translated into the suburbs of Antioch, called Daphne, <sup>f1181</sup> where was a temple of Apollo, famous with devilish oracles and answers given by that idol, or by the devil rather in that place. In the which temple, after the bringing of the body of Babylas, the idol ceased to give any more oracles, saying, that for the body of Babylas he could give no more answers, and complaining that that place was wont to be consecrated unto him, but now it was full of dead men’s bodies. And thus the oracles there ceased for that time till the coming of Julian; who, inquiring out the cause why the oracles ceased, caused the bones of the holy martyr to be removed again

from thence by the Christians, whom he then called Galileans. They, coming in a great multitude, both men, maidens, and children, to the tomb of Babylas, transported his bones according to the commandment of the emperor, singing by the way as they went, the verse of the Psalm, in words as followeth: “Confounded be all that worship images, and all that glory in idols;” which, coming to the emperor’s ear, set him in great rage against the Christians, stirring up persecution against them. <sup>F1182</sup>

Albeit Zonaras declareth the cause something otherwise, saying, that so soon as the body of him and [those of] other martyrs were removed away, incontinent the temple of the idol, with the image, in the night was consumed with fire: for the which cause, saith Zonaras, Julian, stirred up with anger, persecuted the Christians; <sup>f1183</sup> as shall be showed (Christ willing) in his order and place hereafter.

And thus much of Babylas, <sup>f1184</sup> who, whether it was the same Babylas bishop then of Antioch, or another of the same name, it appeareth not by Chrysostom, who neither maketh mention of the emperor’s name, nor of the place where this Babylas was bishop. Again, the stopping of the emperor out of the church importeth as much as that emperor to have been a Christian: for otherwise, if he had come in as a heathen, and as a persecutor, it was not then the manner of christian bishops violently to withstand the emperors, or to stop them out. Over and besides the testimony of Eusebius, Zonaras doth witness contrary, that this Babylas, who was then bishop of Antioch after Zebinus, was not put to death by the tormentors, but died in prison: <sup>f1185</sup> wherefore it is not impossible, but this Babylas, and this emperor of whom Chrysostom speaketh, may be another Babylas than that which suffered under Decius. **Nicephorus maketh mention** <sup>a73</sup> of another Babylas beside this, that suffered under Decius, who was bishop of Nicomedia. <sup>F1186</sup>

Vincentius <sup>f1187</sup> speaketh of forty virgins, martyrs, in the forenamed city of Antioch, who suffered in the persecution of Decius.

The same Vincentius also speaketh of one Peter, who was apprehended, and suffered bitter torments for Christ’s name in the country of Hellespont, and in the town of Lampsacus, <sup>f1188</sup> under Optimus the

proconsul: and likewise of other martyrs that suffered in Troas, whose names were, Andrew, Paul, Nicomachus, and Dionysia a virgin. <sup>F1189</sup>

Also in Babylon, saith he, divers christian confessors were found of Decius, who were led away into Spain, <sup>f1190</sup> there to be executed.

In the country of Cappadocia, at the city Caesarea, in like manner of the said author it is testified, that Germanus, Theophilus, Caesarius, and Vitalis, suffered martyrdom for Christ. <sup>F1191</sup> And in the same book mention is also made of Polychronius, bishop of Babylon, <sup>f1192</sup> and of Nestor bishop of Perga in Pamphylia, that died martyr there. <sup>F1193</sup>

In Persia, at the town of Corduba, Olympiades and Maximus; in Tyre also, Anatolia a virgin, and Audax, gave their lives likewise to death for the testimony of Christ's name. <sup>F1194</sup>

Eusebius moreover, in his sixth book reciteth out of the epistles of Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, divers that suffered diversely at Alexandria, which places of Dionysius, as they be cited in Eusebius, I thought here good for the ancientness of the author, to insert and notify in his own words, as he wrote them to Fabius bishop of Antioch, and rendered in our language as followeth: <sup>f1195</sup>

This persecution began not with the proclamation set forth by the emperor, but a whole year before, by the occasion and means of a wicked person, a soothsayer and poet; who, coming to our city here, stirred up the multitude of the heathen against us, and incited them to maintain their own country superstition; whereby they, being set agog, and obtaining full power to prosecute their wicked purpose, so thought, and no less declared, all piety and religion to consist only in their idolatrous worship of devils, and in destruction of us. And first, flying upon a venerable old man, named Metra, they apprehended him and commanded him to speak blasphemous words; which when he would not do, they laid upon him with staves and clubs, and with sharp reeds pricked his face and eyes; and afterward bringing him out into the suburbs, there they stoned him to death. Then they took a faithful woman, called Quinta, and brought her to the temple of their idols, to compel her to worship with them; which when she refused to do, and

expressed abhorrence thereof, they tied her by the feet, and dragged her through the whole city over the rough pavement, and dashed her against millstones, at the same time scourging her with whips; and having finally brought her to the same place of the suburbs, as they did the other before, they stoned her likewise to death. After this, they all with one accord rushed to the houses of the godly, and, each singling out those of his own neighborhood, spoiled and plundered them, purloining the more valuable goods; the refuse and every thing made of wood they threw out and burnt in the roads; and thus they exhibited the appearance of a city taken and sacked in war. The brethren fled and withdrew themselves, taking no less joyfully the spoiling of their goods than did they of whom St. Paul doth testify; and I am not aware that any person who fell into their hands — except perhaps one — has revolted from his profession and denied the Lord, to this day.

Among others, they seized a most surprising old woman, a virgin, named Apollonia, and dashed out all her teeth; and having made up a pile outside the city, they threatened to burn her alive, unless she would join them in blaspheming Christ: she begged and was allowed a little respite, and shortly after leaped into the fire and was consumed.

There was also one Serapion, whom they laid hands on in his own house, and having racked him with excruciating tortures, and broken all his joints, they threw him down headlong from the top loft. No way, public or private, was passable by us, night or day; the people always and everywhere crying out, if we would not repeat their blasphemies, that we should be dragged to the fire and burnt; and these evils continued a long time. A sedition and civil war then succeeded among the wretches themselves, which averted their fury from us against one another; and so we had a little breathing time, from their wanting leisure to persecute us.

Shortly after this, news came that the government which had been somewhat favorable toward us was changed, and great terror was excited among us by what was threatened against us. At length the edict came; the very thing (one would almost imagine) predicted by

our Lord, so exceedingly terrible, as “to seduce if it were possible the very elect.” All were seized with consternation: many Christians of quality came running to sacrifice immediately through fear; others who held public offices were constrained by their office to appear. Others were brought up by their Gentile connexions, and, being called on by name, approached the impure and profane sacrifices: — some of them pale and trembling, not as if they were going to sacrifice but to be themselves the victims, so that they were derided by the multitude who stood round, as being manifestly afraid either to die or to do sacrifice; but others of them ran more readily to the altars, affirming boldly that they never had been Christians; of such our Lord affirmed most truly, that they should be saved with great difficulty. Of the rest, some followed one or other of the examples just mentioned, and others fled. Many were taken, whereof some persevered unto bonds and imprisonment, enduring them perhaps for many days, and then, just before they were led to the tribunal, they abjured; others, after having endured torments for some time, then lost heart. But the firm and blessed pillars of the Lord, being strengthened by him and having received vigor and courage proportionate and correspondent to the strong faith which was in them, became admirable martyrs of his kingdom. The first of these was Julian, a gouty person, who could neither stand nor walk; he was brought forth with two others who used to carry him, one of whom immediately denied Christ; the other, called Cronion the benevolent, and old Julian himself, having confessed the Lord, were led through the whole city — very large as you know it is — sitting on camels, and in that conspicuous situation were scourged: at last they were burnt in a very hot fire in the view of surrounding multitudes.

As these aforesaid were going to their martyrdom, a soldier, named Besas, stood by them and defended them from the insults of the mob; on which they raised an outcry, and this most manful champion for his God was brought forward, and, after behaving himself nobly in the great cause of true religion, had his head struck off.

Another person, a Libyan by birth, named Macar, <sup>f1196</sup> and truly meriting the appellation, having resisted much importunity of the judge to deny Christ, was burnt alive. After these Epimachus and Alexander, who had long sustained imprisonment and undergone infinite tortures with razors and scourges, were burnt to death; and along with them four women; — viz. Ammonarion, a holy virgin, who, though she was long and grievously tormented by the judge, for having declared beforehand, that she would not repeat the blasphemy which he dictated, yet was true to her word, and was led off to execution. The other three, viz. the venerable matron Mercuria — and Dionysia, a mother indeed of many children, but a mother who did not love her children more than the Lord — and another Ammonarion, — these were slain by the sword without being first exposed to torments: for the judge was ashamed of torturing them to no purpose, and of being baffled by women; which had been remarkably the case in his attempt to overcome the first of the four, Ammonarion, who had undergone what might have been esteemed sufficient torture for them all.

Heron, Ater, and Isidore, Egyptians, and with them Dioscorus, a boy of fifteen, were presented to the judge, who first began with the boy as most likely from his tender years to yield; but the boy resisted both the blandishments and the tortures which were applied to him: the rest, after most barbarous torments still persevering, were burnt. The boy having answered in the wisest manner to all questions, and excited the admiration of the judge, was dismissed by him from regard to his extreme youth, with an intimation of hope that he might afterwards repent. And now the excellent Dioscorus is, with us, reserved to a greater and longer conflict.

Nemesion, another Egyptian, was first accused as a partner of robbers, but he cleared himself of this charge before the centurion: an information that he was a Christian was then brought against him, and he came bound before the president, who most unjustly tortured and scourged him with twice the severity used in the case of malefactors, and then burnt him among robbers. <sup>F1197</sup> Thus was he honored in resembling Christ in suffering.

And now some of the military guard, Ammon, Zeno, Ptolemy, and Ingenuus, and with them an old man named Theophilus, stood before the tribunal; when a certain person being interrogated whether he was a Christian, and appearing disposed to deny the imputation, they made the most lively signs of aversion, gnashing their teeth, writhing their countenances, lifting up their hands, and throwing themselves into various attitudes, so as to attract general observation; but before they could be seized, they ran up voluntarily to the tribunal and owned themselves Christians, so that the president and his assessors were astonished: the accused in fact seemed to wax bolder at the prospect of suffering, and the judges were quite daunted. God triumphed gloriously in these, for they went from the judgment-seat to execution in a sort of ovation, glorying in their testimony.

Many others, throughout the various cities and villages, were torn to pieces by the Gentiles. For example — Ischyrius was agent to a certain magistrate. His employer ordered him to sacrifice; on his refusal he scolded him; persisting, he grossly abused him; till at length, seizing a large stake, he ran it through his body and killed him. But what shall we say of the multitude of those who wandered in deserts and mountains, and were at last destroyed by famine, and thirst, and cold, and diseases, and robbers, and wild beasts? Those who have survived, are witnesses of their faithfulness and victory. Suffice it to relate one fact: There was a very aged person named Chaeremon, bishop of the city of Nilus. He, together with his wife, fled into an Arabian mountain, and did not return; nor could the brethren, after much searching, discover them alive or dead. Many other persons were caught about this Arabian mountain and made slaves by the barbarian Saracens, some of whom were afterwards redeemed for money with difficulty; — others have never regained their liberty to this day.

Thus much out of the epistle of Dionysius to Fabius.

Moreover, the aforesaid Dionysius in another place <sup>f1198</sup> writing to Germanus, <sup>f1199</sup> of his own and others' dangers sustained in this

persecution, and before this persecution, of Decius, thus inferreth as followeth:

I say it before God, who knows that I lie not — I did not betake myself to flight, of my own accord or without a providential leading. On the contrary, when the persecuting edict was put forth under Decius, Sabinus, the Roman governor, the same hour sent an officer to seek me, and I remained four days at home, expecting his coming: he made the most accurate search in the roads, the rivers, and the fields where he suspected I might be hid or pass along. A dulness seems to have seized him, that he never inquired for my house, for he had no idea that a man in my circumstances should stay at home. At length after four days, God ordered me to remove; and having opened me a way contrary to all expectation, I and my servants and many of the brethren went out together. The event showed that the whole was the work of Divine Providence.

Again, shortly after, the aforesaid Dionysius, proceeding in the narrative of himself, thus inferreth:

About sunset, I was seized, together with my whole company, by the soldiers and was led to Taposiris. But my friend Timotheus, by the providence of God, was not present, nor was he seized. He came afterwards to my house and found it uninhabited and guarded; and he then learned that we were taken captive. How wonderful was the dispensation! but it shall be related precisely as it happened.

And again shortly after it followeth:

A countryman met Timotheus as he was flying in confusion, and asked the cause of his hurry: he told him the truth: the peasant heard the story and went away to a nuptial feast, at which it was the custom to sit up merry-making all night. He informed the guests of what he had heard. At once they all started up, as by a signal, and ran quickly to find us, bawling and shouting: our guards, struck with a panic, fled; and the party came upon us, just as we were, lying on unfurnished beds. I first thought they must have been a company of robbers, in pursuit of their prey, and continued

lying still in my shirt as I was, and offered them the rest of my clothes which lay at my side. They ordered me to rise and go out quickly; at length I understood their real designs, and I cried out and entreated them earnestly to depart, and to let us alone. But, if they really meant any kindness to us, I requested them to strike off my head at once, and so to deliver me from my persecutors. They compelled me to rise by downright violence, as my companions can testify: and then I threw myself on the ground. They then seized me by my hands and feet, and pulled me out by force. Gaius, Faustus, Peter, and Paul, followed me (who also are my witnesses), and taking me up carried me out of the place on a chair, and setting me on the back of an ass, conducted me away.

Thus much writeth Dionysius of himself, the example of whose epistle is cited in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. <sup>F1200</sup>

Nicephorus, in his fifth book, <sup>f1201</sup> maketh mention of one named Christopher, who also suffered in this persecution of Decius; of which Christopher, whether the fable riseth <sup>f1202</sup> of that mighty giant set up in churches, wading through the seas with Christ on his shoulder, and a tree in his hand for a walking-staff, etc., it is uncertain. Georgius Wicelius <sup>f1203</sup> allegeth out of Ruggerus of Fulde and mentioneth one Christopher, born of the nation of Canaanites, who suffered under Decius, being, as he saith, twelve cubits high. But the rest of the history painted in churches, the said Wicelius derideth as fables of centaurs, or other poetical fictions. <sup>F1204</sup>

Bergomensis <sup>f1205</sup> maketh relation of divers martyred under Decius, as Meniatius, who suffered at Florence; Agatha, a holy virgin of Sicily, who is said to have suffered divers and bitter torments at Catania under Quintian the proconsul; with imprisonment, with beatings, with famine, with racking; rolled also upon sharp shells and hot coals; having moreover her breasts cut from her body, as Bergomensis and the martyrology of Ado record. In which authors as I deny not but that the rest of the story may be true, so again, concerning the miracles of the aged man appearing to her, and of the young man clothed in a silken vesture, with a hundred young men after him, and of the marble table with the inscription, “Mentem sanctam,” etc., I doubt.

Hard it is to recite all that suffered in this persecution, when whole multitudes went into wildernesses and mountains, wandering without succor or comfort; some starved with hunger and cold, some with sickness consumed, some devoured of beasts, some with barbarous thieves taken and carried away. Vincentius, in his eleventh book, speaking of Asclepiades, writeth also of forty virgins martyrs, who, by sundry kinds of torments, were put to death at Antioch about the same time, in the persecution of this tyrant.

Likewise, in the said Vincentius, mention is made of Trypho, a man of great holiness, and constant in his suffering; who being brought to the city of Nicaea, before the president Aquilinus,<sup>f1206</sup> for his constant confession of Christ's name was afflicted with divers and grievous torments, and at length with the sword put to death.

At what time Decius had erected a temple in the midst of the city of Ephesus, compelling all that were in the city there to sacrifice to the idols, seven Christians were found, whose names were Maximian, Malchus, Martinian, Dionysius, Johannes, Serapion, and Constantine, who, refusing the idolatrous worship, were accused for the same unto the emperor to be Christians. Which when they constantly professed and did not deny notwithstanding, because they were soldiers pertaining to the emperor's service, respite was given them for a certain space, to deliberate with themselves, till the return again of the emperor, who then was going to war. In the mean space, the emperor being departed, they, taking counsel together, went and hid themselves in secret caves of the mount Caelius. The emperor returning again, after great inquisition made for them, hearing where they were, caused the mouth of the place where they were to be closed up with heaps of stones; that they, not able to get out, should be famished within. And thus were those good men martyred. The story (if it be true) goeth further, that they, between fear and sorrow, fell asleep, in which sleep they continued the space of certain ages after, till the time of Theodosius the emperor, before they did awake, as report Vincentius, Nicephorus,<sup>f1207</sup> and partly also Henry of Herford. But of their awaking, that I refer to them that list to believe it. Certain it is, that at the last day they *shall* awake indeed, without any fable.

Jerome, in the life of Paul the hermit, reciteth a story of a certain youth, whom when the praetor could not otherwise with torments remove from his Christianity, he devised another way, which was this:

He commanded the youth to be laid upon a soft bed in a pleasant garden, among the flourishing lilies and red roses; which done, all others being removed away, and himself there left alone, a beautiful harlot came to him, who embraced him, and with all other incitements of an harlot labored to provoke him to her naughtiness. But the godly youth, fearing God more than obeying flesh, bit off his own tongue with his teeth, and spit it in the face of the harlot, as she was kissing him; and so got he the victory, by the constant grace of the Lord assisting him. <sup>F1208</sup>

Another like example of singular chastity is written of the virgin Theodora, and a soldier, by Ambrose. <sup>F1209</sup>

At Antioch this Theodora, refusing to do sacrifice to the idols, was condemned by the judge to the stews; and notwithstanding, by the singular providence of God, was well delivered. For as there was a great company of wanton young men ready at the door to press into the house where she was, one of the brethren [named Didymus, as Ado saith], moved with faith and motion of God, putting on a soldier's habit, made himself one of the first that came in, who, rounding her in the ear, told her the cause and purpose of his coming, being a Christian as she was: his counsel was, that she should put on the soldier's habit, and so slip away; and he, putting on her garments, would there remain to abide their force, and so aid, whereby the virgin escaped unknown. Didymus, left unto the rage and wondering of the people, being found a man instead of a woman, was presented unto the president, unto whom, without delay, he uttered all the whole matter as it was done, professing himself, so as he was, to be a Christian; and thereupon was condemned to suffer. Theodora understanding thereof, and thinking to excuse him by accusing herself, offered herself, as the guilty party, unto the judge; claiming and requiring the condemnation to light upon her, the other, as innocent, to be discharged. But the cruel judge (crueller than Dionysius, who spared Damon and

Pythias), neither considering the virtue of the persons, nor the innocency of the cause, unjustly and inhumanly proceeded in execution against them both; who, first, having their heads cut off, after were east into the fire. <sup>F1210</sup>

At what time, or in what persecution these did suffer, in the authors of this narration it doth not appear. <sup>F1211</sup> Agathon, a man of arms in the city of Alexandria, for rebuking certain lewd persons scornfully deriding the dead bodies of the Christians, was cried out of, and railed on, of the people; and afterwards, accused to the judge, was condemned to lose his head. <sup>F1212</sup>

Henry of Herford maketh mention also of Paul and Andreas, whom the proconsul at Troas gave to the people; who, being scourged, and after drawn out of the city, were trodden to death with the feet of the people.

Among others that suffered under this wicked Decius, Bergomensis also maketh mention of one Justin a priest of Rome, and of another, Nicostratus a deacon. To these Vincentius also addeth Portius a priest of Rome, whom he reporteth to be the converter of Philip the emperor aforementioned.

Of Abdon and Sennas <sup>f1213</sup> we read also in the aforesaid Bergomensis and Vincentius, two noble men; who, because they had buffed the Christians whom Decius had brought from Babylon to Corduba, and there put them to death, were therefore accused to Decius, and brought to Rome, where they, being commanded to sacrifice to dead idols, would not obey; and, for the same, were given to the wild beasts to be devoured. But when the wild beasts, more gentle than the men, would not touch them, they were at length with the sword beheaded. <sup>F1214</sup> Albeit to me it seemeth not impossible nor unlike this Abdon and Sennas to be the same, whom in other stories we find, and before have mentioned to be Ammon and Zeno.

One Secundian was accused to Valerian, a captain of Decius, to be a Christian; which profession when he stoutly and constantly did maintain, he was commanded to prison. By the way, as the soldiers were leading him to the gaol, Verian and Marcellian, seeing the matter, cried to the soldiers, asking them whither they drew the innocent? At the which word, when they also confessed themselves to be Christians, they were likewise

apprehended, and brought to a city named Centum-Cellae; <sup>f1215</sup> where being willed to sacrifice, they did spit upon the idols. And so after sentence and judgment given, first they were beaten with wasters or truncheons; after that they were hanged and tormented upon the rack, having fire set to their sides. Vincentius addeth moreover that some of the tormentors falling suddenly dead, others being taken with wicked spirits, the martyrs with the sword at length were beheaded. <sup>F1216</sup>

To prosecute in length of history the lives and sufferings of all them, which in this terrible persecution were martyred, it were too long, <sup>f1217</sup> and almost infinite: briefly therefore to rehearse the names of such as we find alleged out of a certain brief treatise of Bede, intituled, “De Temporibus,” cited by Henry of Herford, it shall be at this time sufficient. <sup>F1218</sup> **Under Decius suffered** <sup>a74</sup> — at Rome, Hippolytus and Concordia, Irenaeus and Abundus, Victoria a maiden, Miniates, and Tryphonia, wife of Decius, eldest son of the emperor: <sup>f1219</sup> at Antioch, Babylas the bishop: at the city of Apollonia in Pontus, Leucius, Thyrsus, and Callinicus: at the city of Thmuis in Egypt, Phileas the bishop, and Philoromus a military tribune, with many others: in Persia, Polychronius bishop of Babylon and Ctesiphon: <sup>f1220</sup> at Perga in Pamphylia, Nestor the bishop: at Corduba in Persia, Parmenius a priest, with divers more: <sup>f1221</sup> at Cirta in Numidia, Marianus and Jacobus: in Africa, Nemesian and Felix, bishops, Rogatian a priest, and Felicissimus: at Rome, Jovinus and Basilius, Ruffina and Secunda, virgins, Tertullian and Valerian; also Nemesius, Symphronius, and Olympius: in Spain at Tarragona, Fructuosus the bishop, with Augurius and Eulogius, deacons: at Verona, Zeno the bishop: at Caesarea in Palestine, Marinus and Astyrius: in France at the town of Mende, <sup>f1222</sup> Privatus the bishop. <sup>F1223</sup>

Vincentius, in his eleventh book, maketh mention of certain children suffering martyrdom under the same persecution, in a city of Tuscany, called Arezzo, <sup>f1224</sup> **whose names** <sup>a75</sup> were Pergentinus and Laurentinus; they are also mentioned in Equilinus. <sup>F1225</sup>

Now that I have recorded of those sufficiently, who under this tempest of Decius constantly gave their lives to martyrdom for the testimony of Christ, it remaineth that a few words also be spoken of such as for fear or frailty in this persecution did shrink and slide from the truth of their

confession: In the number of whom first cometh in the remembrance of Serapion, an aged old man; of whom writeth Dionysius bishop of Alexandria unto Fabius bishop of Antioch, declaring that this Serapion was an old man, who lived amongst them a sincere and upright life of long time, but at length fell. <sup>F1226</sup> This Serapion oft and many times desired to be received again; but no man listened to him, because he had sacrificed. After this, not long after, he fell into sickness, wherein he remained three days dumb, and benumbed of all senses. The fourth day following, beginning a little to recover, he called to him his daughter's son, and said, "How long, how long, my son, do ye hold me here? Make haste, I pray you, that I may be absolved. Call hither one of the presbyters to me." And so, saying no more, held his peace as dumb and speechless. The boy ran (it was then night.) unto the presbyter, who, at the same time being sick, could not come with the messenger: but — forsomuch as Dionysius had previously ordered that such as lay a dying, if they coveted to be received and reconciled, and especially if they required it earnestly, should be admitted, whereby with the better hope and confidence they might depart hence — therefore he gave to the boy a little of the Eucharist, <sup>f1227</sup> willing him to moisten it in water, and so to drop it into the mouth of the old man. With this the boy returned, bringing with him the Holy Eucharist. As he was now near at hand, before he had entered in, Serapion the old man, speaking again, said, "Thou art come, my son: the priest is sick and cannot come, but do as he willeth you, and let me go." Then the boy moistened the Eucharist in water, and dropped it softly into the mouth of the old man, who, after he had swallowed it by little and little, immediately gave up the ghost. <sup>F1228</sup>

In the city of Troas, as the proconsul was grievously tormenting one Nicomachus, he cried out, "That he was no Christian;" and so was let down again. And after, when he had sacrificed, he was taken eftsoons with a wicked spirit, and so thrown down upon the ground, where he, biting off his tongue with his teeth, so departed. <sup>F1229</sup>

Dionysius in his epistles also, writing to Fabius, and lamenting the great terror of this persecution, declareth, how that many worthy and notable Christians, for fear and horror of the great tyranny thereof, did show themselves feeble and weak men. Of whom some for dread, some of their own accord, others after great torments suffered, yet afterwards revolted

from the constancy of their profession. Also St. Cyprian, in his treatise “De Lapsis,” reciteth with great sorrow, and testifieth how that a great number, at the first threatening of the adversary, neither being compelled nor thrown down with any violence of the enemy, but of their own voluntary weakness, fell down themselves. “Not even,” saith he, “tarrying while the judge should put incense in their hands, but before any stroke stricken in the field, they turned their backs, and played the cowards; not only coming to their sacrifices, but preventing the same, and pretending to come without compulsion; bringing moreover their infants and children, either put into their hands, or taking them with them of their own accord; and exhorting moreover others to do the like after their example.”

Of this weakness and falling the said author showeth two causes, either love of their goods and patrimony, or fear of torments: and addeth, moreover, examples of the punishments of them which revolted; affirming, that many of them were taken and vexed with wicked spirits; and that one man among others, after his voluntary denial, was suddenly stricken dumb. Again, another after his abjuration, as he should communicate with others, instead of bread, received ashes in his hand. *Item*, a certain maiden, being taken and vexed with a spirit, did tear her own tongue with her teeth, and tormented with pain in her belly and inward parts, so deceased.

Amongst others of this sort, St. Cyprian, in his Epistles, <sup>f1230</sup> maketh also mention of one Evaristus, a bishop, who, leaving his proper charge, and making shipwreck of his faith, went wandering about in other countries, forsaking his own flock. In like manner, he maketh also mention of Nicostratus a deacon, who, forsaking his deaconship and taking the goods of the church with him, fled away into other countries. Albeit Bergomensis affirmeth, that this Nicostratus the deacon afterward died a martyr. Thus then, although some did relent, yet a very great number (saith he) there were, whom neither fear could remove, nor pain could overthrow, to cause them to betray their confession; but they stood like glorious martyrs unto the end.

The same Cyprian also, in another book, “De Mortalitate,” <sup>f1231</sup> reciteth a notable story of one of his own colleagues and fellow-priests, who, being oppressed with weakness and greatly afraid, with death drawing at hand, prayed for a longer furlough ere he departed. <sup>f1232</sup> As he was thus

entreating, and almost now dying, there appeared by him a young man, of an honorable and reverent majesty, of a tall stature and comely behavior, so bright and clear to behold, that scarce any man's carnal eyes were able to bear it, unless he were now ready to depart this world. This young man, speaking to him with a certain indignation of mind and voice, thus said, "To suffer ye dare not; to depart ye wish not; what would ye have me to do for you?" <sup>f1233</sup>

Upon the occasion of these and such others, who were a great number, that fell and did renounce, as is aforesaid, in this persecution of Decius, rose up first the quarrel and heresy of Novatus, who, in these days, made a great disturbance in the church, holding this opinion, that they which once renounced the faith, and for fear of torments had offered incense to the idols, although they repented there-for, yet could not afterward be reconciled, nor admitted to the church of Christ. This Novatus, being first priest under Cyprian at Carthage, afterward by stirring up discord and factions, began to disturb the bishopric of Cyprian, to appoint there a deacon called Felicissimus, against the bishop's mind or knowledge; also to allure and separate certain of the brethren from the bishop; all which Cyprian <sup>f1234</sup> doth well declare. After this the said Novatus going to Rome, kept there the like stir with Cornelius (as the same Cornelius in Eusebius <sup>f1235</sup> doth testify), setting himself up as bishop of Rome against Cornelius, who was the lawful bishop of Rome before which to bring to pass, he used this practice: first, he had allured to him, to be his adherents, three or four good men and holy confessors, who had suffered before great torments for their confession, whose names were Maximus, Urban, Sidonius, and Celerinus. After this he enticed three simple bishops about the coasts of Italy to repair to Rome, under pretense to make an end of certain controversies then in hand. This done, he caused the same, whether by making them drunk, or by other crafty counsel, to lay their hands upon him, and to make him bishop; and so they did. Wherefore the one of those three bishops hardly was received to the communion, by the great intercession of his people: the other two, by discipline of the church, were displaced from their bishoprics, and others possessed with their rooms. Thus then were there two bishops together in one church of Rome, Novatian and Cornelius, which was unseemly, and contrary to the discipline of the church. And hereupon riseth the true cause and meaning

of St. Cyprian, writing in his epistles so much of one bishop, and of the unity to be kept in ecclesiastical regiment. <sup>f1236</sup> And in like sort writeth also Cornelius himself of one bishop, saying of Novatian, “He knows not that there ought to be one bishop in a catholic church.” <sup>f1237</sup>

This by the way (not out of the way I trust) I have touched briefly, to detect or refute the caviling wresting of the papists, who falsely apply these places of Cyprian and Cornelius to maintain the pope’s supreme mastership alone, over the whole universal church of Christ in all places; when their meaning is otherwise, how that every one catholic church or diocese ought to have one bishop over it, not that the whole world ought to be subject to the dominion of him only that is bishop of Rome. Now to the story again.

Novatian, being thus bishop, took not a little upon him, going about by all means to defeat Cornelius, and to allure the people from him. Insomuch that (as in the aforesaid book of Eusebius appeareth) when Novatian came to the distributing of the offerings, and should give every man his part, he compelled the simple persons every man to swear, before they should receive of the benediction and of the collects or oblations, holding both their hands in his, and holding them so long (speaking these words unto them, “Swear to me by the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou wilt not leave me and go to Cornelius”), till that they, swearing unto him, instead of “Amen” (to be said at the receiving of the bread) <sup>f1238</sup> should answer, “I will not return to Cornelius.” Where note by the way, that the Latin book of Christopherson’s translation, <sup>f1239</sup> in this place, craftily leaveth out the name of “bread.” This story being written in Eusebius, and also contained in Nicephorus (although not in the same order of words, yet in effect drawn out of him), doth declare in plain words in both the authors (whoso will mark the same), that the sacrament of the body of Christ is termed with the plain name of “bread,” after the consecration.

It followeth moreover in the story, that Maximus, Urban, Sidonius, and Celerinus, before mentioned, perceiving at length the crafty dissimulation and arrogancy of Novatian, left him, and with great repentance returned again to the church, and were reconciled to Cornelius; as they themselves, writing to Cyprian, and Cyprian likewise writing to them an epistle

gratulatory, do declare; <sup>f1240</sup> and Cornelius, also, in his epistle to Fabius witnesseth the same. In this epistle the said Cornelius, moreover, writeth of one Moses, a worthy martyr, who once being also a follower of Novatian, afterwards perceiving his wickedness, forsook him, and refused communion with him. Of whom Cyprian also maketh mention, and calleth him “a blessed confessor.” <sup>F1241</sup> Damasus, in his “Pontifical” saith, “That he was apprehended with Maximus and Nicostratus above mentioned, and was put with them in prison, where he ended his life.” And thus much of Novatian, against whom (as Eusebius testifieth) a synod was holden at Rome of threescore sundry bishops in the time of Cornelius, under the reign of Decius, in the year of our Lord 251; whereby it may be supposed that the heat of the persecution at that time was somewhat calmed.

After Fabian (or, as Zonaras calleth him, Flavian) next succeeded into the bishopric of Rome Cornelius, whom Cyprian noteth to be a worthy bishop, and for his great virtue and maidenly continency much commendable, chosen to that room not so much by his own consent, as by the full agreement, both of the clergy and also of the people. <sup>F1242</sup> Jerome addeth also, that he was a man of great eloquence: whereby it may appear those two epistles decretal, which go in his name, not to be his, both for the rudeness of the barbarous and gross style, and also for the matter therein contained, nothing tasting of that time, nor of that age, nor doings then of the church. Whereof in the first, he writeth to all his brethren of the holy church, concerning the lifting up of the bodies and bones of Peter and Paul from the catacombs, and transferring them to the Vatican and the Appian Way, at the instance of a certain devout woman named Lucina, having no great argument or cause to write thereof unto the churches, but only that he, in that letter, doth desire them to pray unto the Lord, that, through the intercession of those apostolical saints, their sins might be forgiven them, etc. In the second epistle, written to Rufus, a bishop of the eastern church, he decreeth and ordaineth, that no oath ought to be required or exacted of any bishop or clergyman, for any cause or by any power; also, that no cause of priests or ministers ought to be handled in any strange or foreign court, without the precinct, except only in the court of Rome by appellation: wherein who seeth not the train of our later bishops, going about craftily to advance the dignity of the court of Rome, under and by the pretended title of Cornelius, and of such ancient bishops? If

Cornelius did write any epistles to any indeed in those turbulent times of persecution, no doubt but some signification thereof he would have touched in the said his letters, either in ministering consolation to his brethren, or in requiring consolation and prayers of others. Neither is there any doubt, but he would have given some touch also of the matter of Novatian, with whom he had so much to do: as he did elsewhere; for so we find it recorded both in Eusebius and Jerome, that he wrote unto Fabius, bishop of Antioch, of “the decrements of the council of Rome;” and another letter “of the manner of the council;” the third also, of “the cause of Novatian;” and again of the “repentance of such as fell,” whereof there is no word touched at all in these aforesaid epistles decretal. <sup>F1243</sup>

What trouble this Cornelius had with Novatian, sufficiently is before signified. In this persecution of Decius, he demeaned himself very constantly and faithfully, and sustained great conflicts with the adversaries, as St. Cyprian giveth witness. <sup>F1244</sup> Jerome testifieth that he remained bishop after the death of Decius, to the time of Gallus, and so appeareth also by St. Cyprian, who hath these words: “Et tyrannum armis et bello postmodum victum, prior sacerdotio suo vicit.” But Damasus and Sabellicus, his followers, <sup>f1245</sup> affirm, that he was both exiled, and also martyred, under the tyrannous reign of Decius. Of whom Sabellicus writeth this story, taken out (as it seemeth) of Damasus, and saith, “that Cornelius, by the commandment of Decius, was banished to a town called Centum-Cellae, <sup>f1245</sup> bordering on Etruria, from whence he sent his letters to Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, and Cyprian again to him.” This coming to the ears of Decius the emperor, he sendeth for Cornelius, asking him, “How he durst be so bold to show such stubbornness; that he, neither caring for the gods, nor fearing the displeasure of his princes, durst, against the commonwealth, give and receive letters from others?” To whom Cornelius answering again, thus purged himself, declaring to the emperor, “That letters indeed he had written, and received again, concerning the praises and honoring of Christ and the salvation of souls; but nothing as touching any matter of the commonwealth.” And it followeth in the story, “Then Decius, moved with anger, commanded him to be beaten with plumbats <sup>f1247</sup> (which, as saith Sabellicus, is a kind of scourging), and so to be brought to the temple of Mars; either there to do sacrifice, or to suffer the extremity. But he, rather willing to die than to commit such iniquity,

prepared himself to martyrdom, being sure that he should die. And so, commending the charge of the church unto Stephen, his archdeacon, he was brought to the Appian Way, where he ended his life in faithful martyrdom.” Eusebius, in one place, saith that he sat two years; in another place, he saith that he sat three years; and so doth Marianus Scotus, following also the diversity of the said Eusebius. Damasus giveth him only two years.

In this aforesaid persecution of Decius, it seemeth by some writers also that Cyprian was banished; but I suppose rather his banishment to be referred to the reign of Gallus, next emperor after Decius, whereof more shall be said (Christ willing) in his place hereafter. In the meantime the said Cyprian in his epistles <sup>f1248</sup> maketh mention of two that suffered, either in the time of this Decius, or much about the same time. Of whom one was Aurelius, a worthy and valiant young man, who was twice in torments for his confession, which he never denied, but manfully and boldly withstood the adversary till he was banished, and also after; and therefore was commended of Cyprian to certain brethren, to have him for their “lector;” as in the aforesaid epistle of Cyprian appeareth. The other was named Mappalicus, who, on the day before he suffered, declaring to the proconsul in the midst of his torments, and saying, “To-morrow you shall see a struggle for a prize,” <sup>f1249</sup> was brought forth, according as he forespoke, to martyrdom; and there, with no less constancy than patience, did suffer.

And thus much of the tyranny of this wicked Decius against God’s saints. Now to touch also the power of God’s vengeance and punishment against him. Like as we see commonly a tempest that is vehement not long to continue, so it happened with this tyrannical tormentor; who, reigning but two years, as saith Eusebius, <sup>f1250</sup> or three at most, as writeth Orosius, among the middle of the barbarians, with whom he did war, was there slain with his son. <sup>F1251</sup> Like as he had before slain Philip and his son, his predecessors, so was he with his son slain by the righteous judgment of God himself. Pomponius affirmeth, that he, warring against the Goths and being by them overcome, lest he should fall into their hands ran into a whirlpit, where he was drowned, and his body never found afterwards.

Neither did the just hand of God plague the emperor only, but also revenged, as well, the heathen Gentiles and persecutors of his word throughout all provinces and dominions of the Roman monarchy; amongst whom the Lord, immediately after the death of Decius, sent such a plague and pestilence, lasting for the space of ten years together, that horrible it is to hear, and almost incredible to believe. Of this plague or pestilence testifieth Dionysius to Hierax, a bishop in Egypt, <sup>f1252</sup> where he declareth the mortality of this plague to be so great in Alexandria, where he was bishop, that there was no house in the whole city free. And although the greatness of the plague touched also the Christians somewhat, yet it scourged the heathen idolaters much more: besides that the order of their behavior in the one and in the other was much diverse. For, as the aforesaid Dionysius doth record, the Christians, through brotherly love and piety, did not refuse one to visit and comfort another, and to minister to him what need required, notwithstanding it was to them great danger; for divers there were, who, in closing up their eyes, in washing their bodies, and in interrings them in the ground, were next themselves who followed them in their graves: yet all this stayed not them from doing their duty, and showing mercy one to another. Whereas the Gentiles, contrarily, being extremely visited by the hand of God, felt the plague, but considered not the striker, neither yet considered they their neighbor; but, every man shifting for himself, nothing cared one for another; but such as were infected, some they would cast out of the doors, half dead, to be devoured of dogs and wild beasts; some they let die within their houses without all succour; some they suffered to lie unburied, for that no man durst come near them. And yet, notwithstanding, for all their voiding and shifting, the pestilence followed them whithersoever they went, and miserably consumed them. Insomuch that Dionysius, bishop the same time of Alexandria, thus reporteth of his own city; that such a mortality was then among them, that the said city of Alexandria had not in number so many altogether, both old and young, from fourteen to fourscore years of age, as it was wont to contain before of the old men only from the age of forty to seventy. <sup>F1253</sup> Pomponius Laetus also, and other Latin writers, making mention of the said pestilence, declare how the beginning thereof first came (as they think) out of Ethiopia, and from the hot countries; and so, invading and wasting first the south parts, from thence spread into the east; and so further running and increasing into all other quarters of the

world, especially wheresoever the edicts of the emperor went against the Christians, it followed after and consumed the most part of the inhabitants; whereby many places became desolate and void of all concourse. It continued the term of ten years together.

This pestiferous mortality (by the occasion whereof Cyprian took the ground to write his book “De Mortalitate”) began (as is said) immediately after the death of Decius the persecutor, in the beginning of the reign of Vibius Gallus, and Volusian his son; who succeeded through treason next unto Decius, about the year of our Lord 251, and continued their reign but two years.

This Gallus, although the first beginning of his reign was something quiet, yet shortly after, following the steps of Decius by whom rather he should have taken warning, set forth edicts in like manner for the persecution of the Christians; albeit we find no number of martyrs to have suffered in consequence thereof, but all this persecution to rest only in the exilement of bishops and guides of the flock. Of other sufferings or executions we do not read; for the terrible pestilence following immediately, kept the barbarous heathen otherwise occupied. Unto this time of Gallus, rather than to the time of Decius, I refer the banishment of Cyprian, who was then bishop of Carthage; of the which banishment he himself testifieth in divers of his epistles, declaring the cause thereof to rise upon a commotion or sedition among the people, out of the which he withdrew himself, lest the sedition should grow greater: notwithstanding, the said Cyprian, though being absent, yet had no less care of his flock and of the whole church, than if he had been present with them, and therefore never ceased in his epistles continually to exhort and call upon them to be constant in their profession, and patient in their afflictions. Amongst divers others whom he doth comfort in his banishment, although he was in that case to be comforted himself, writing to certain that were condemned to mining for metals, whose names were Nemesian, Felix, and Lucius, with other bishops, priests, and deacons, he declareth unto them —

How it was no shame, but a glory, not to be feared, but to be rejoiced at, when they suffered banishment, or other pains, for Christ. And, confirming them in the same, or rather commending them, he signifieth how nobly they distinguished themselves as

valiant captains of virtue; and that they stirred up, both by the confessions of their mouth and by the suffering of their bodies, the hearts of their brethren to christian martyrdom; and that their example was a great confirmation to many, even maids and children, to follow the like. “That you have been grievously beaten with clubs (saith he), and have been initiated by that punishment in your christian confession, is a thing not to be lamented. The body of a Christian trembles not on account of clubs: all his hope is in wood. <sup>F1254</sup> The servant of Christ acknowledges the emblem of his salvation: redeemed by wood to eternal life, by this wood he is advanced to his crown. O happy feet, shackled indeed at present with fetters, ye will quickly finish a glorious journey to Christ! Let malice and cruelty bind you as they please, ye will soon pass from earth and its sorrows to the kingdom of heaven. In the mines ye have not a bed on which the body may be refreshed; nevertheless, Christ is your rest and consolation: your limbs are fatigued with labor, and have only the ground to lie on; but so to lie down, when you have Christ with you, is no punishment: filth and dirt defile your limbs, and ye have no baths at hand; but remember, ye are inwardly washed from all uncleanness: your allowance of bread is but scanty; be it so, ‘man doth not live by bread alone, but by the word of God:’ ye have no proper clothes to defend you from the cold; but he who has put on Christ, is clothed abundantly. How will all these deformities be compensated with honor proportioned to the disgrace! What a blessed exchange will be made of this transient punishment for an exceeding and eternal glory! And if this do grieve you, that the priests of the Lord are not permitted now to present your oblations and celebrate divine sacrifices among you after the wonted manner, yet you do indeed offer that which is most precious and glorious in the sight of the Lord, of which he saith,

‘The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise’ (Psalms 51:17).

You also cease not day and night offering yourselves as victims, according to the exhortation of the apostle,

‘I beseech you, therefore, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service: and be not conformed to this world, but be ye transformed in the renewing of our minds, that ye may know what is that good and acceptable, and perfect will of God:’  
(Romans 12:1, 2)

this is of all sacrifices the most acceptable to God. And though your travail be great, yet is the reward greater, which is most certain to follow: for God, beholding and looking down upon them that confess his name, in their willing mind approveth them, in their striving helpeth them, in their victory crowneth them; rewarding that in us which he hath performed, and crowning that which he hath perfected in us.” <sup>F1255</sup> With these and such like comfortable words he doth animate his brethren, admonishing them that they are now in a joyful journey, hasting apace to the mansions of the martyrs, there to enjoy after this darkness a light and brightness, greater than all their passions, according to the apostle’s saying, “The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared to the glory that shall be revealed in us.”

<sup>F1256</sup>

And, after the like words of sweet comfort and consolation, writing to Seagrius and Rogatian, who were in prison and bonds for the testimony of truth, “he doth encourage them to continue steadfast and patient in the way wherein they have begun to run; for that they have the Lord with them as their helper and defender, who promiseth to be with us to the world’s end; and therefore willeth them to set before their eyes, in their death, the immortality to follow; in their pain, everlasting glory; remembering that it is written, ‘Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.’ *Item*, ‘Though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their hope full of immortality: and having been a little chastised, they shall be greatly rewarded: for God proved them, and found them worthy for himself; as gold in the furnace hath he tried them, and received them as a burnt-offering. And in the time of their visitation they shall shine, and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble: they shall judge the nations, and have dominion over the people, and their Lord shall reign for ever.’” (Wisdom 3:4-8.) He writeth moreover, admonishing them, that

“it is appointed from the beginning of the world, that righteousness here should suffer in conflicts with the powers of this world; for so just Abel was slain in the beginning of the world, and, after him, a long train of righteous men and prophets, down to the apostles sent of the Lord himself; unto whom the Lord gave an example in himself, teaching that there is no coming to his kingdom, but by that same way by which he entered himself, and telling them, ‘He that loveth his life in this world, shall lose it,’ etc. And again, ‘Fear ye not them that slay the body, but have no power to slay the soul,’ etc. And St. Paul, likewise, admonishing all them whosoever covet to be partakers of the promises of the Lord, to follow his example, saith, ‘If we suffer together with him, we shall reign together,’ <sup>f1257</sup> etc.”

Furthermore, as the same Cyprian doth encourage here the holy martyrs, who were in captivity, to persist, so likewise, writing to the priests and deacons who were free, he exhorteth them to be serviceable and obsequious, with all care and love to cherish and embrace them that were in bonds. <sup>F1258</sup> Whereby may appear the fervent zeal and care of this good bishop toward the church of Christ, although being now in exile in the time of this emperor Gallus.

In the same time, and under the said Gallus, reigning with his son Volusian, was also Lucius, bishop of Rome, sent into banishment; who next succeeded after Cornelius in that bishopric, about the year of our Lord 252. Albeit, in this banishment he did not long continue, but returned home to his church, as by the epistles of St. Cyprian <sup>f1259</sup> may appear. As to all the other bishops of Rome in those primitive days certain decretal epistles with several ordinances be ascribed, bearing their names and titles, as hath been before declared; so also hath Lucius one epistle fathered upon him, in the which epistle he, writing to the brethren of France and of Spain, appointeth such an order and form of the church as seemeth not to agree with the time then present: for so he decreeth in that epistle, that a bishop in all places, whithersoever he goeth, should have **two priests with three deacons** <sup>75A f1260</sup> waiting upon him to be witnesses of all his ways and doings. Which ordinance, although I deny not but it may be and is convenient, yet I see not how that time of Lucius, A.D. 252, could serve then for a bishop to carry such a pomp of priests and deacons about him, or to study for any such matter; forso much as bishops commonly in those

days were seldom free to go abroad, went they never so secret, but either were in houses close and secret, or in prison, or else in banishment. Moreover in the said epistle how pompously writeth he of the church of Rome! “This holy and apostolical church of Rome,” saith he, “the mother of all churches of Christ, through the grace of God omnipotent, hath never been proved to swerve out of the path of apostolical tradition, neither hath ever been depraved and degraded with heretical innovations: but even as, in the beginning, she received the rule of the apostolical faith from its first teachers, the princes of the apostles, so she continueth ever immaculate and undefiled unto the end.”

Unto this Lucius also is referred, in the decrees of Gratian, this constitution, that no minister whatsoever, after his ordination, should at any time re-enter into the chamber of his own wife, on pain of losing his ministry in the church. <sup>f1261</sup> Eusebius, in his seventh book, making mention of the death of Lucius, and not of his martyrdom, saith, that he sat but eight months: but Damasus, in his Martyrology, holdeth that he sat three years, and was beheaded the second year of Valerian and Gallien, emperors; <sup>f1262</sup> and so do also Marianus Scotus and Nauclerus, with others that follow Damasus, affirm the same.

After him came Stephen, next bishop of Rome following Lucius, whom Damasus, Platina, and Sabellicus affirm to have sat seven years and five months, and to have died a martyr. <sup>f1263</sup> Contrary, Eusebius, and Volaterran holding with him, give him but two years: which part cometh most near to the truth, I leave to the reader’s judgment. Of his two epistles decretal, and of his ordinances out of the same collected, I need not much to say, for two respects; either for that concerning these decretal epistles, suspiciously entituled by the names of the fathers of the primitive church, sufficiently hath been said before; or else because both the phrase is so barbarous and incongruous, and also the matter itself therein contained is such, that although no testimony came against them, yet they easily refell themselves. As where, in the second epistle, he decreeth: “That no bishop, being expulsed out of his see, or deprived of his goods, ought to be accused of any, or is bound to answer for himself, before that by the law regularly he be restored again fully to his former state; and that the primate and the synod render unto him again all such possessions and fruits as were taken from him before his accusation, as is agreeing both to the laws canon and

also secular.” First, here I would desire the reader a little to stay, and this to consider with himself, who be these here meant, who either used to or might, despoil these bishops of their goods, and expulse them from their sees for such wrongful causes, but only kings and emperors? who at this time were not yet christened, nor used any such proceedings against these bishops, in such sort as that either primates or synods could restore them again to their places and possessions. Again, what private goods or possessions had bishops then to be taken from them? whereas, neither were churches yet endowed with patrimonies or possessions; and if any treasures were committed to the church, they pertained not properly to the bishop, but went in general to the subvention of the poor in the church, as appears in the epistle of Cornelius to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, alleged in Eusebius; <sup>f1264</sup> wherein he, speaking of his own church, and declaring how there ought to be but one bishop in the same, inferreth mention of forty and six priests, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolyths, fifty-two exorcists, readers, and janitors, of widows and indigent persons to the number of fifteen hundred and above, found and nourished in the same, by the merciful benignity and providence of God. <sup>F1265</sup> It followeth, moreover, in the end of the said canon, “Which thing is forbidden both by the laws ecclesiastical, and also secular.” Now what laws secular were in the time of Stephen, for bishops not to be charged with any accusation before they were restored again to their state, let any reader, marking well the state of the heather laws that then were, judge; and, in judging, I doubt not but this matter alone, though there were no other, will be enough to describe the untruth hereof.

Moreover, by divers other probable notes and arguments in the said second epistle of Stephen, it may be easily espied, that this epistle is feigned and misauthorized; especially by the sixth canon of the said epistle, wherein he so solemnly entreateth of the difference between primates, metropolitans, and archbishops: which distinction of degrees and titles, savouring more of ambition than of persecution, giveth me verily to suppose this epistle not to be written by this Stephen, but by some other man either of that name, or of some other time, when the church began to be settled in more prosperity, and orders therein to be taken for every man to know his degree and the limits of his authority; according as is specified

by the sixth and seventh canons of the Nicene council, decreeing of the same matter.

The like estimation may be conceived also of the seventh canon of the said epistle, wherein he willeth and appointeth all causes judiciary to be decided and determined within the precinct of their own proper province, and not to pass over the bounds thereof, “unless,” saith he, “the appeal be made to the apostolical see of Rome;” which savoureth in my nose rather of a smack of popery, than of the vein of Christianity, especially in these times, during this terrible persecution among the bishops of Christ. And thus much of the second decretal epistle of Stephen; although of the first epistle, also, written to Hilary, something may be said — as where he speaketh in the said epistle of holy vestments, and holy vessels, and other ornaments of the altar serving to divine worship; and therefore not to be touched nor handled of any man, saving of priests alone — concerning all which implements my opinion is this: I think the church of Rome not to have been in so happy a state then, that either Stephen, or Sixtus before him, being occupied about other more serious matters, and scarce able to hide their own heads, had any mind or cogitation to study upon such unnecessary inventions serving in public churches. Neither do I see how the heathen in those days would have suffered those ornaments to be unconsumed, who would not suffer the bishops themselves to live amongst them, notwithstanding Isidore and Polydore judge the contrary. Between this Stephen and Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, was a great contention about re-baptizing heretics, whereof more hereafter (Christ willing) shall be said.

Besides these bishops above specified, divers others there were also sent into banishment under the aforementioned emperors, Gallus and Volusian, as appeareth by Dionysius, writing to Hermammon on this wise: that Gallus, not seeing what was Decius’s destruction, nor foreseeing the occasion of his own ruin, stumbled himself also at the same stone, lying openly before his eyes: for whereas, at the first beginning, his empire went prosperously forward, and all things went luckily with him, afterward he drave out the holy men who prayed for his peace and safeguard, and so with them rejected also the prayers by which they interceded for him. <sup>F1266</sup> Otherwise, of any bloodshed, or any martyrs that in the time of this emperor were put to death, we do not read.

After the reign of which emperor Gallus and of his son Volusian being expired (who reigned but two years), AEmilian, who slew them both by civil sedition, succeeded in their place; who reigned but three months, and was also slain: next to whom, Valerian and his son Gallien were advanced to the empire.

About the changing of these emperors, the persecution which first began at Decius, and afterward slacked in the time of Gallus, was now extinguished for a time, partly for the great plague reigning in all places, partly for the change of the emperors, although it was not for very long. For Valerian, in the first entrance of the empire, for the space of three or four years was right courteous and gentle to the people of God, and well accepted of the senate. Neither was there any of all the emperors before him, no not of those who are openly reported to have been Christians, that showed himself so loving and familiar toward the Christians as he did: insomuch that (as Dionysius, writing to Hermammon, doth testify) his whole household was replenished with holy saints and servants of Christ and godly persons, and was seemingly a church of God. But, by the malice of Satan, through wicked counsel, these quiet days endured not very long. For, in process of time, this Valerian — being mis-advised by a certain Egyptian, a chief ruler of the heathen synagogue of the Egyptians, a master of the charmers or enchanters (who indeed was troubled, because that he could not for the Christians <sup>f1267</sup> do his magical feats) — was so far infatuated and bewitched, that, through the detestable provocations of that devilish Egyptian, he was wholly turned unto abominable idols, and to execrable impiety, in cutting the throats of young infants, and sacrificing the children of unhappy parents, and ripping open the bowels of new-born children; and so, proceeding in his fury, he moved the eighth persecution against the Christians, whom the wicked Egyptian could not abide, as being the hinderers and destroyers of his magical enchantings, about the year of our Lord 257. <sup>F1268</sup>

### THE EIGHTH PERSECUTION.

In this persecution the chief administrators and executors were AEmilian, president of Egypt, and Paternus and Galerius Maximus, proconsuls in Africa. Bergomensis also maketh mention of Paternus, prefect of Rome,

and of Perennis. <sup>F1269</sup> Vincentius speaketh also of Nicerius and Claudius, presidents.

What was the chief original cause of this persecution partly is signified before, where mention was made of the wicked Egyptian; but as this was the outward and political cause, so St. Cyprian showeth other causes more special and ecclesiastical in his fourth book, <sup>f1270</sup> and fourth epistle, whose words be these:

“But we,” saith he, “must understand and confess that this turbulent oppression and calamity, which hath wasted, for the most part, all our flock, and doth still waste it, hath come upon us for our sins; while we walk not in the way of the Lord, nor observe his heavenly precepts, given to guide us to salvation. Our Lord observed the will of his Father in all points, but, we observe not the will of the Lord; being wholly set upon lucre and the improvement of our fortunes, given to pride, full of emulation and dissension, void of simplicity and faithful dealing; renouncing this world in word only, and not in deed; every man pleasing himself, and displeasing all others. And therefore are we thus scourged, and worthily: for what stripes and scourges do we not deserve, when the very confessors themselves, who ought to be an example to the rest of well-doing, keep no discipline? Wherefore, because some grew insolent and elated on their confession, and made swelling and unmannerly bragging thereof, these tortures came — tortures which are not soon at an end — tortures not intended to dismiss them easily to their crown, but to keep them on the rack till they prevail against them to betray their profession; except perhaps in the case of a very few, who through the peculiar mercy of God sank under the pressure, and so went straight to glory, not by bearing the full measure of their punishment, but by expiring before its completion. These things do we suffer for our sins and deserts, as holy scripture long since forewarned us, saying:

‘If they shall forsake my law, and will not walk in my judgments; if they shall profane my institutions, and will not observe my precepts, I will visit their iniquities with the rod, and their transgressions with scourges’ (Psalms 89:30-32).

This rod and these scourges,” saith he, “we feel, who neither please God by good deeds, nor make penitential satisfaction for our evil deeds.”

Wherefore the said Cyprian addeth this exhortation withal:

“Let us, therefore, from the bottom of our hearts and with our whole soul entreat the mercy of God, who hath subjoined to the former commination this comfortable promise — ‘Nevertheless, my loving-kindness will I not utterly take from him.’ Let us ask and we shall receive: and if, in regard to the grievousness of our offenses, it be long ere we receive, yet let us knock, provided our knocking consist in genuine prayer, sighs, and tears, offered with perseverance, and with brotherly unanimity.”

Moreover, what vices were then principally reigning among the Christians, he further specifieth in the said epistle, which chiefly were division and dissension among the brethren.

“What hath moved me more particularly to write in this manner to you is, an admonition which I received in a vision from the Lord, saying unto me, ‘Ask and ye shall have.’<sup>F1271</sup> Next, my people were in the same vision directed to pray for certain persons there described to them: but they could not agree in asking; which exceedingly displeased him who had said, ‘Ask and ye shall have;’ seeing it is written, that ‘God maketh men to be of one mind in a house;’ and we read in the Acts of the Apostles, that ‘the multitude of them that believed were of one heart;’ and the Lord with his own mouth hath told us saying, ‘This is my commandment, that ye love one another.’”

And so, by the occasion hereof, he writeth unto them in the aforesaid epistle, and moveth them to prayer and mutual agreement.

“It is promised,” saith he, “in the gospel — ‘If two of you shall agree on earth touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.’ — Now if the agreement of two be so prevailing, what would not the agreement of all accomplish? Certainly, we should have obtained long ago what we had asked; and our faith and salvation would not have

been in the danger they now are, of shipwreck. Nay, and — I may add — these calamities would not have befallen the brethren, if they had continued like-minded.” <sup>F1272</sup>

After the causes thus declared of this and other persecutions, the said St. Cyprian moreover, in the aforementioned epistle (worthy to be read of all men), describeth likewise a certain vision, wherein was showed unto him by the Lord before the persecution came, what should happen. The vision was this:

“There seemed to be a certain aged father sitting, at whose right hand sat a young man sad and pensive, with indignation in his looks, resting his cheek upon his hand, his countenance heavy and uncheerful. On the left hand sat another person, having in his hand a net, with which he seemed to threaten to catch the people that stood round about. And as he was marvelling that saw all this, it was said unto him: ‘The young man, whom thou seest sitting on the right hand, is sad and sorry that his orders were not observed. But he on the left hand is exulting, for that opportunity is given him by the aged father to vent his fury without control.’ And this vision was vouchsafed long before this tempest of persecution arose. But we have since seen fulfilled what was therein revealed; viz. that whilst we keep not the Lord’s commandments, but despise his precepts, the enemy should have power to hurt us, to cast his net over us (as it were), while we were naked and defenceless, and unprepared for such a sudden onset. And all, because we foreslack our praying, or be not so vigilant therein as we should be. Wherefore, the Lord, because he loveth, chasteneth; chasteneth, to amend; amendeth, to save us.”

Furthermore, the same Cyprian, and in the same epistle, writing of his own revelation or message sent to him, thus saith:

“Finally, to the least of his servants, both sinful and unworthy” [meaning himself,] “God, of his tender goodness, hath vouchsafed to direct this word: ‘Tell him,’ saith he, ‘that he be easy and of good comfort, for that peace is coming; albeit a little delay there is for a while longer, because some yet remain to be proved and tried.’”

And he showeth also in the same place of another revelation, wherein he was admonished to be spare in his feeding, and sober in his drink, lest his mind, now given to heavenly meditation, should be carried away with worldly allurements; or, oppressed with too much surfeit of meats and drinks, should be less apt or able for prayer and spiritual exercise. Finally, in the latter end of the aforesaid epistle mention also followeth of other revelations or showings:

“Wherein the Lord,” saith Cyprian, “doth vouchsafe to foreshow to his servants the restoration of his church; the security of our salvation; fair weather to succeed the present rain; light after darkness; peaceable calm after stormy tempest; the helps of his fatherly love; the wonted displays of his divine majesty, whereby both the blasphemy of the persecutor shall be repressed, and such as have fallen be renewed to repentance, and the strong and stable confidence of them that stand shall rejoice and glory.”

Thus much hath St. Cyprian written of these things to the clergy. <sup>F1273</sup>

As touching now the crimes and accusations in this persecution laid to the charge of the Christians, these were the principal: first, for that they refused to do worship to the idols and to the emperors; then, for that they professed the name of Christ. Besides, all the calamities and evils that happened in the world, as wars, famine and pestilence, were imputed only to the Christians. Against all which quarrelling accusations Cyprian doth eloquently defend the Christians in his book “Ad Demetrianum,” like as Tertullian had done before, writing “Ad Scapulam.” And first touching the objection, for not worshipping idols, he clearth the Christians both in his book “Ad Demetrianum,” and also “De Vanitate Idolorum,” proving —

Those idols to be no true Gods, but images of certain dead kings, which neither could save themselves from death, nor such as worship them. The true God to be but one, and that, by the testimony of Hostanes, <sup>f1274</sup> Plato, and Hermes Trismegistus; the which God the Christians do truly worship. And as concerning that the Christians were thought to be the cause of public calamities, because they worshipped not the Gentiles’ idols, he purgeth the Christians thereof; proving, that if there be any defect in increase of things, it is not to be ascribed to them, but rather to the decrease of

nature, languishing now towards her age and latter end. Again, for that it hath been so foresaid and prophesied, that towards the end of the world should come wars, famine, and pestilence. Moreover, if there be any cause thereof more proper than another, it is most reasonably to be imputed to their vain idolatry, and to their contempt of the true God. Also that such evils be increased by the wickedness of the people, so that (to speak in his own words) “Famine cometh more by avarice of men monopolizing the corn, than by drought of the air.” <sup>F1275</sup> But, especially, the cause thereof proceeded of the cruel shedding of the innocent blood of the Christians. <sup>F1276</sup>

Thus, with many other more probations, doth Cyprian defend the Christians against the **barbarous accusations** <sup>a76</sup> of the heathen Gentiles. Of which Cyprian, forsomuch as he suffered in the time of this persecution, I mind (Christ willing) to recapitulate here, in ample discourse, the full sum, first of his life and bringing up, then of his death and martyrdom, as the worthiness of that man deserveth to be remembered. <sup>F1277</sup> Of this Cyprian therefore, otherwise named Thascius, thus writeth Nicephorus, Nazianzen, Jerome, and others; that he, being an African, and born in Carthage, first was an idolater and Gentile, altogether given to the study and practice of the magical arts; <sup>f1278</sup> of whose parentage and education in letters during his youth no mention is made, but that he was a worthy rhetorician in Africa: of whose conversion and baptism he himself, in his **second** <sup>a78</sup> book and second epistle, writeth a flourishing and eloquent history. Which his conversion unto the christian faith, as Jerome affirmeth in his “Catalogus” and his commentary upon Jonas, was through the grace of God, and the means of Caecilius a priest (whose name afterward he bare), and through the occasion of hearing the history of the prophet Jonas. <sup>F1279</sup> The same Jerome moreover testifieth, that he, immediately upon his conversion, distributed among the poor all his substance, and, after that, being ordained a priest, was not long after constituted bishop of the church of Carthage. But whether he succeeded Agrippinus (of whom he often maketh mention, who also was the first author of re-baptization), or some other bishop of Carthage, it remaineth uncertain. But this is most true, he himself shined in his office and dignity with such good gifts and virtues, that, as Nazianzen writeth, he had the

government of all the churches throughout the East and in Spain; and was called in the edict for his banishment “the bishop of the Christians.”

And, to the further setting forth (to the praise of God) of his godly virtues wherewith he was endued, appearing as well in his own works to them that list to peruse the same, as also described by other worthy writers, he was courteous and gentle, loving and full of patience, and therewithal sharp and severe, according as the cause required, and always in his office; as appeareth in his first book and third epistle. Furthermore, he was most loving and kind toward his brethren, and took much pains in helping and relieving the martyrs, as appeareth by his letters to the elders and deacons of his bishopric, charging them that, with all study and endeavor, they should gently entertain and show pleasure unto the martyrs in his absence, as partly is touched before.

The third epistle of his first book doth declare of what stomach and godly courage he was in executing his office, and handling his matters. Neither was he void of prudence and circumspection, but was adorned with marvellous modesty, whereby he attempted nothing upon his own head and judgment, but with the consent of his fellow-bishops and other inferior ministers; and that chiefly (among others) doth the tenth epistle of his third book witness. He was of a marvellous liberal disposition towards the poor brethren of other countries; for so often as he had cause of absence, he committed the care of those poor men to his fellow-officers, and wrote to them, that of their own proper goods they should help their banished brethren to that which was necessary for them, as witnesseth the twenty-fourth epistle of his third book. He reciteth among other gifts wherewith he was endued, the visions and heavenly admonitions concerning the persecutions that should follow, and concerning other matters touching the government of the church, in his first book and third epistle, and fourth book and fourth epistle, where he reciteth and expoundeth the form or manner of a certain vision, which we have before sufficiently expressed.

He had, moreover, great skill in the foreknowledge of things that should chance, as may be gathered in the sixth epistle of his fourth book. Also Augustine doth attribute unto him many worthy virtues, who writeth much in setting forth his gifts of humility in the second book of his “*De Baptismo contra Donatistas*,” the fourth chapter; and in his seventh book

and eleventh chapter, of his long sufferance and patience; also, of his candour and meekness, by which virtues he concealed nothing that he thought, but [yet] uttered the same meekly and patiently. Also, that he kept the ecclesiastical peace and concord with those that were of another opinion than he was of. Lastly, that he neither dictated nor overbore any man, but allowed him to follow that thing which seemed good in his judgment, it is manifest in the fifth book of St. Augustine's "De Baptismo contra Donatistas." Neither is this to be passed over, which Jerome writeth, that he was very diligent in reading, especially the works of Tertullian: for he saith, that he once saw at Concordia in Italy a certain old man whose name was Paul, who told him he had seen at Rome the notary of blessed Cyprian, the said notary being then an old man, when he himself was but a springal; <sup>f1280</sup> who told him that it was Cyprian's wont, never to let one day pass without reading some of Tertullian, and that he was accustomed oftentimes to say unto him, "Give me my master;" meaning thereby Tertullian. <sup>F1281</sup>

Now a few words touching his exile and martyrdom. Of his epistles which he wrote back to his congregation, leading his life in exile, mention is made above; wherein he showeth the virtue beseming a faithful pastor, in that he took no less care when absent, as well of his own church, as of those of other bishops, than he did being present: wherein also he himself doth signify that voluntarily he absented himself, lest he should do more hurt than good to the church by reason of his presence; as is likewise declared before. Thus from the desolate places of his banishment, wherein he was oftentimes sought for, he writeth unto his brethren, as in his third book and tenth epistle is manifest; which thing seemeth to be done in the reign of Decius or Gallus. But after that he returned again out of exile in the reign of this Valerian; he was also, after that, the second time banished by Paternus, the proconsul of Africa, into the **city of Curubis**, <sup>a81 f1282</sup> as the oration of Augustine touching Cyprian showeth; or else, as Pontius the deacon saith, into a city named Furabilitana, or Curubitana. But when Paternus, the proconsul, was dead, Galerius Maximus succeeded in his room and office; who, finding Cyprian in a garden, caused him to be apprehended by his serjeants, and to be brought before the idols to offer sacrifice. Which when he would not do, then the proconsul, breaking forth in these words, said, "Long hast thou lived in a sacrilegious mind, and hast

gathered together [very many] men of a wicked conspiracy, and hast showed thyself an enemy to the gods of the Romans, and to their holy laws: neither could the sacred emperors Valerian and Gallien recall thee to the profession of their ceremonies.” At length the wicked tyrant condemning him to have his head cut off, he patiently and willingly submitted his neck to the stroke of the sword, as Jerome affirmeth. <sup>F1283</sup> And so this blessed martyr ended this present life in the Lord, Sixtus then being bishop of Rome (as Eusebius noteth), in the year of our Lord 258. Sabellicus saith that he was martyred in the reign of Gallus and Volusian, Lucius being bishop of Rome: but that seemeth not likely.

Now remaineth to speak something likewise of his works and books left behind him, although all, peradventure, that he wrote do not remain; whereof some are missing, some again, in the livery of his name and title, are not his: but such as be certainly his, by the style and sense may soon be discerned; such is the eloquence of his phrase, and gravity of his sentence, vigor of wit, power in persuasion, so much differing from many others, as he can lightly be imitated but of few. Of the which his books with us extant, as the flourishing eloquence is worthily commended, proceeding out of the school of rhetoricians, so is the authority thereof of no less reputation, not only among us of this age of the church, but also among the ancient fathers. Whereof St. Augustine, speaking in his commendation, saith, “Ego literas Cypriani non ut canonicas habeo, sed eas ex canonicis considero: et quod in eis divinarum scripturarum authoritati congruit cum laude ejus accipio; quod autem non congruit, cum pace ejus respuo, etc.” <sup>f1284</sup> By which words it may appear, that Augustine, although he did not repute the books and writings of Cyprian to be equivalent with the holy Scripture, yet notwithstanding, next after the holy Scriptures he had the same in exceeding great admiration.

Vincentius and Laziardus Celestinus, <sup>f1285</sup> reciting the names of divers books bearing the title of Cyprian (more, perchance, than be truly his), do collect out of them a certain extract of his most pithy sentences, all which here to repeat were too tedious. To give a taste of the special, I thought it not impertinent: as where he, speaking of the treasures of a rich man, exhorteth, saying: <sup>f1286</sup>

Let not that sleep in thy treasures, which may profit the poor. <sup>F1287</sup>

Two things never wax old in man; the heart, ever imagining new cogitations, the tongue, ever uttering the vain conceptions of the heart. <sup>F1288</sup>

That which a man must of necessity lose, it is wisdom for him voluntarily to distribute, so that God may everlastingly reward him. <sup>F1289</sup>

Discipline is an orderly amendment of manners present, and a regular observation of evils past. <sup>F1290</sup>

There can be no integrity, where they are ever wanting, who should condemn the wicked; and they only are ever present, who are to be condemned. <sup>F1291</sup>

A covetous man possesseth his goods only for this: — that another should not possess them. <sup>F1292</sup>

Women that pride themselves in putting on silks and purple, cannot put on Christ. <sup>F1293</sup>

Women who dye their locks with red and yellow, begin betime to give unlucky presage of the fiery locks which they will wear in hell. <sup>F1294</sup>

They who love to paint themselves in this world of a different colour from what God created them of, have reason to fear, lest, when the day of resurrection cometh, the Creator should not know his own creatures. <sup>F1295</sup>

He that giveth an alms to the poor, offereth a sacrifice to God of sweet-smelling savor. <sup>F1296</sup>

All the injury of evils present is to be disregarded, in faith of good things to come. <sup>F1297</sup>

It is useless to set out virtue in words, and to destroy the same in deeds. <sup>F1298</sup>

The more children thou hast at home, the more cause hast thou not to hoard up, but to disperse abroad; for that there are so many who

have sins to be redeemed, so many who have consciences to be purged. <sup>F1299</sup>

Moreover, lest the papists here should take an occasion by this text, grounded upon the text of Tobit, cap. 4, “Alms delivereth from all sin and death,” to build up the works of satisfaction, the said Cyprian more plainly expoundeth both himself and that place of Scripture, writing in these words:

“‘Alms do deliver from all sin and from death.’ (Tob. 4.) Not from that death which the blood of Christ hath once for all extinguished, and from which the saving grace of our baptism and of our Redeemer hath delivered us; but from that death which afterwards creepeth in by our failings.” <sup>F1300</sup>

**By which words** <sup>a82</sup> it is apparent, that Cyprian meaneth this death, from which deliverance cometh by alms-giving, not to be expounded nor to be taken for death everlasting, from which only the blood of Christ doth save us; but for temporal or transitory punishment, which is wont to be inflicted in this body of sin. For so it is nothing repugnant, but that temporal virtues may have their temporal rewards in this life, and likewise sins committed may have temporal punishments both in us and in our families; our eternal salvation standing evermore firm in Christ, yet notwithstanding.

The aforesaid Vincentius, moreover, speaking of another book of Cyprian (although the said book be not numbered in the catalogue of his works), maketh mention of twelve abuses or absurdities in the life of man, which in order be these:

1. A wise man without good works. —
2. An old man without religion.
3. A young man without obedience. —
4. A rich man without alms-giving.
5. A woman without modesty. —
6. A guide without virtue. —
7. A christian man contentious. —
8. A poor man proud. —
9. A king unrighteous. —

- 10. A bishop negligent. —
- 11. A multitude without discipline. —
- 12. A people without law. <sup>F1301</sup>

As we have hitherto set forth the commendation of Cyprian, this blessed martyr, so must we now take heed again that we do not here incur the old and common danger which the papists are commonly accustomed to run into; whose fault is, always almost to be immoderate and excessive in their proceedings, making too much almost of every thing. So, in speaking of the holy sacraments, they make more of them than doth the nature of sacraments require; not using them, but abusing them; not referring or applying them, but adoring them; not taking them in their kind for things godly, as they are, but taking them for God himself; turning religion into superstition, and the creature into the Creator; the things signifying into the things themselves signified. To the church, likewise, and ceremonies of the church, to general councils, to the blessed Virgin Mary mother of Christ, to the bishop of Rome, and to all others in like case — not contented to attribute [to them] that which is sufficient, they exceed, moreover, the bounds of judgment and verity; judging so of the church, and general councils, as though they could never, or did never, err in any jot. That the blessed mother of Christ amongst all women was blessed, and a virgin full of grace, the Scripture and truth do give: but, to say that she was born without all original sin, or to make of her an advocate, or mother of mercy, there they run further than truth will bear. The ceremonies were first ordained to serve but only for order' sake; unto the which they have attributed so much at length, that they have set in them a great part of our religion, yea, and also of salvation. And what thing is there else almost, wherein the papists have not exceeded?

Wherefore, to avoid this common error of the papists, we must beware, in commending the doctors and writers of the church; and so commend them, that truth and consideration go with our commendation. For though this cannot be denied, but that holy Cyprian and other blessed martyrs were holy men, yet notwithstanding, they were *men*; that is, such as might have, and had, their falls and faults; men, I say, and not angels, nor gods; saved by God, not saviours of men, nor patrons of grace. And though they were also men of excellent learning, and worthy doctors, yet with their learning they had their errors also annexed. And though their books be (as they

ought to be) of great authority, yet ought they not to be equal with the Scriptures. And albeit they said well in most things, yet it does not therefore hold, that what they said, it must stand for a truth. That pre-eminence of authority only belongeth to the word of God, and not to the pen of man: for of men and doctors, be they never so famous, there is none that is void of reprehension. In Origen, although in his time the admiration of his learning was singular, yet how many things be there, which the church now holdeth not? But, examining him by Scripture, where he said well, they admit him; where otherwise, they leave him. In Polycarp, the church hath corrected and altered that which he did hold in celebrating the Easter-day after the Jews. Neither can holy and blessed Ignatius be defended in all his sayings; as where he maketh the fasting upon Sundays or Saturdays (except the Saturday before Easter-day) as great an offense, as to kill Christ himself; <sup>f1302</sup> **contrary to this saying of St. Paul,** <sup>a83</sup> “Let no man judge you in meat and drink.” Also where the said Ignatius speaketh “De Virginitate,” and of other things more. Irenaeus did hold, that man was not made perfect in the beginning. He seemeth also to defend free-will in man, in those things also that be spiritual. He saith that Christ suffered after he was fifty years old, abusing this place of the gospel, “Quinquaginta annos nondum habes.” Tertullian (whom St. Cyprian never laid out of his hands almost) is noted to be a Chiliast: <sup>f1303</sup> also to have been of Montanus’s sect. The same did hold also, with Justin, Cyprian, and others, that the angels fell first for the concupiscence of women. <sup>f1304</sup> He defendeth free-will of man after the corruption of nature, inclining also to the error of them which defend the possibility of keeping God’s law. Concerning marriage; “We know,” saith he, “one marriage as we know one God;” <sup>f1305</sup> condemning the second marriage. Divers other things of like absurdity in him be noted. Justin also seemeth to have inclined unto the error of the Chiliasts; of the fall of certain angels by women; of free-will of man; of possibility of keeping the law; and such other things. Neither was this our Cyprian, the great scholar of Tertullian, utterly exempt from the blot of them, who, contrary to the doctrine of the church, did hold with rebaptizing of such as were before baptized of heretics; whereof speaketh St. Austine, misliking the same error of Cyprian, in these words contained in his second book “contra Cresconium.”

“Cypriani laudem assequi non valeo, cuius multis literis mea scripta non comparo, cuius ingenium diligo, cuius ore delector, cuius charitatem miror, cuius martyrium veneror: — non accipio quod de baptizandis haereticis et schismaticis sensit.”

Upon the which matter there was a great contention between the said Cyprian and Stephen bishop of Rome, as partly afore is noted. Of Augustine himself likewise, of Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, the same may be said, that none of them all so dearly passed away, but their peculiar faults and errors went with them, whereof it were too long, and out of our purpose, at this present to treat. And thus much concerning the story of Cyprian, the holy learned martyr of Christ.

**Albeit**, <sup>a84</sup> here is to be noted by the way, touching the life and story of Cyprian, that, whereas the narration of Nazianzen (as is above mentioned) declareth that he, from art magic, was converted to be a Christian, this is rather to be understood of another Cyprian; which Cyprian was a citizen of Antioch, and afterward bishop of the same city, and was martyred under Dioclesian, at Nicomedia: <sup>f1306</sup> whereas this Cyprian was bishop of Carthage, and died under Valerian, as is said. By the decrees of Gratian <sup>f1307</sup> it appeareth, moreover, that there was also a third Cyprian, in the time of the emperor Julian the Apostate, long after both these afore-named: for so giveth the title prefixed before the said distinction, “Cyprianus Juliano Imperatori:” the distinction beginning, “Quoniam idem Mediator Dei et hominum, homo Christus Jesus, sic actibus propriis et dignitatibus distinctis officia potestatis utriusque discrevit.” Upon the which distinction the gloss cometh in with these words, saying, “that the popedom and the seat imperial have both one beginning of one, that is Christ, who was both Bishop, and King of kings;” and “that the said dignities be distinct:” albeit the pope, notwithstanding, hath both the swords in his hand, and may exercise them both sometimes.

“And therefore, although they be distinct, yet in exercise the one standeth lineally under the other, so that the imperial dignity is subject under the papal dignity, as the inferior is subject under the superior: that as there is one ruler over the whole world, which is God; so in the church there is one monarch, that is, the pope, to

whom the Lord hath committed the power and lawful right both of the heavenly and terrene dominion.” <sup>F1308</sup>

Thus much I thought here to note by the way, because this distinction is fathered upon Cyprian, which is false: for this Cyprian was not in the time of Julian, not by two hundred years; and so likewise the other Cyprian, who died martyr under Dioclesian. Of any Cyprian besides these two we read not; neither is it credible, that, if there were any such Cyprian, he would ever have written of any such matter, as the difference and yet mutual need of christian emperors and christian popes; when that emperor, being an apostate, <sup>f1309</sup> neither regarded Christ, nor cared for any pope.

About this time, and under the same emperor Valerian, suffered also Xistus, or Sixtus, the second of that name, bishop of Rome, who, being accused of his adversaries to be a Christian, was brought with his six deacons to the place of execution, where he, Nemesus, and other his deacons, were beheaded and suffered martyrdom. Laurence in the same time, being also deacon, followed after, complaining to Sixtus (as one being aggrieved) that he might not also suffer with him, but was secluded as the son from the father. To whom the bishop, answering again, declared that within three days he should follow after. In the mean time he willed him to go home, and to distribute his treasures, if he had any, unto the poor. The judge, belike hearing mention to be made of treasures to be given to the poor, and thinking that Laurence had great store of treasure in his custody, commanded him to bring the same unto him, according as in the discourse of the story hereunder written more fully may appear. Which history, because it is set forth more at large in Prudentius, Ambrose, and other writers, and containeth in it more things worthy to be noted of the reader, we have therefore with the more diligence here inserted the more ample description of the same, to the further admiration of his patience, and God’s glory showed in him.

Now then, as order requireth, let us enter the story of that most constant and courageous martyr of Christ, St. Laurence, whose words and works deserve to be as fresh and green in christian hearts, as is the flourishing laurel-tree. <sup>F1310</sup> This thirsty hart, longing after the water of life, desirous to pass unto it through the strait, door of bitter death, when on a time he saw

his vigilant shepherd Sixtus, led as a harmless lamb, of harmful tyrants, to his death, cried out with open mouth and heart invincible, saying,

“O dear father! whither goest thou, without the company of thy dear son? Whither hastenest thou, O reverend priest, without thy deacon? Never wast thou wont to offer sacrifice without thy minister. What crime is there in me, that offendeth thy fatherhood? Hast thou proved me unnatural? Now try, sweet father, whether thou hast chosen a faithful minister or not? Deniest thou unto him the fellowship of thy blood, to whom thou hast committed the distribution of the Lord’s blood? See that thy judgment be not mistaken, whilst thy fortitude is liked and lauded. The abasing of the scholar is the disgracing of the master. What! have we not learned that worthy masters have obtained most worthy fame by the worthy acts of their disciples and scholars? Finally, Abraham sacrificed his only-begotten Isaac; stoned Stephen prepared the way for preaching Peter: even so, father, declare thy manifold virtues by me thy son. Offer thou him that proffereth himself; grant that the body of thy scholar may be sacrificed, whose mind with good letters thou hast beautified.”

These words with tears Saint Laurence uttered, not because his master should suffer, but because he might not be suffered to taste of death’s cup which he thirsted after. Then Sixtus to his son shaped this answer:

“I forsake thee not, O my son; I give thee to wit, that a sharper conflict remaineth for thee. A feeble and weak old man am I, and therefore run the race of a lighter and easier death: but lusty and young art thou, and more lustily, yea more gloriously, shalt thou triumph over this tyrant. Thy time approacheth; cease to weep and lament; three days after thou shalt follow me. Decent it is that this space of time come between the priest and the levite. It may not beseem thee, O sweet pupil! to triumph under thy master, lest it be said, he wanted, a helper. Why cravest thou to be partaker with me in my passion? I bequeath unto thee the whole inheritance. Why requirest thou to enjoy my presence? Let weak scholars go before, and the stronger come after, that those without master may get the victory, which have no need by master to be governed. So Elias left

behind him his beloved Eliseus. I yield up into thy hands the succession of my virtues.”

Such was their contention, not unmeet for so godly a priest, and so zealous a minister; striving with themselves who should first suffer for the name of Christ Jesus.

In tragical histories we have it mentioned, that through joy and admiration people clapped their hands, when Pylades named himself Orestes, and Orestes (as truth it was) affirmed himself to be Orestes: Pylades wishing to die for Orestes, but Orestes not suffering Pylades to lose his life for his sake. But neither of them might escape death; for both these lovers were guilty of blood, the one committing the fact, the other consenting. But this our Laurence, the martyr most constant, was by no means enforced to make this proffer, saving only by his ardent zeal and fervent spirit; who, thirsting after the cup of martyrdom, had it shortly after filled to the hard brim.

Now let us draw near to the fire of martyred Laurence, that our cold hearts may be warmed thereby. The merciless tyrant, <sup>f1311</sup> understanding this virtuous levite not only to be a minister of the sacraments, but a distributor also of the church riches (whereof mention is made before in the words of Sixtus), promised to himself a double prey, by the apprehension of one silly soul. First, with the rake of avarice to scrape to himself the treasure of poor Christians; then with the fiery fork of tyranny, so to toss and turmoil them, that they should wax weary of their profession. With furious face and cruel countenance, the greedy wolf demanded where this deacon Laurence had bestowed the substance of the church: who, craving three days' respite, promised to declare where the treasure might be had. In the mean time, he caused a good number of poor Christians to be congregated. So, when the day of his answer was come, the persecutor strictly charged him to stand to his promise. Then valiant Laurence, stretching out his arms over the poor, said:

“These are the precious treasure of the church; these are the treasure indeed, in whom the faith of Christ reigneth, in whom Jesus Christ hath his mansion-place. What more precious jewels can Christ have, than those in whom he hath promised to dwell? For so it is written, ‘I was hungry and ye gave me to eat; I was

thirsty, and ye gave me to drink; I was harbourless, and ye lodged me.’ And again; ‘Look, what ye have done to the least of these, the same have ye done to me.’ What greater riches can Christ our Master possess, than the poor people, in whom he loveth to be seen?”

O, what tongue is able to express the fury and madness of the tyrant’s heart! Now he stamped, he stared, he ramped, he fared as one out of his wits: his eyes like fire glowed, his mouth like a boar foamed, his teeth like a hellhound grinned. Now, not a reasonable man, but a roaring lion, he might be called.

“Kindle the fire (he cried) — of wood make no spare. Hath this villain deluded the emperor? Away with him, away with him: whip him with scourges, jerk him with rods, buffet him with fists, brain him with clubs. Jesteth the traitor with the emperor? Pinch him with fiery tongs, gird him with burning plates, bring out the strongest chains, and the fire-forks, and the grated bed of iron: on the fire with it; bind the rebel hand and foot; and when the bed is fire-hot, on with him: roast him, broil him, toss him, turn him: on pain of our high displeasure do every man his office, O ye tormentors.”

The word was no sooner spoken, but all was done. After many cruel handlings, this meek lamb was laid, I will not say on his fiery bed of iron, but on his soft bed of down. So mightily God wrought with his martyr Laurence, so miraculously God tempered his element the fire; not a bed of consuming pain, but a pallet of nourishing rest was it unto Laurence. Not Laurence, but the emperor, might seem to be tormented; the one broiling in the flesh, the other burning in the heart. When this triumphant martyr had been pressed down with fire-picks for a great space, in the mighty Spirit of God he spake to the vanquished tyrant:

***This side is now roasted enough; turn up, O tyrant great!  
Essay whether roasted or raw, thou thinkest the better meat.”***

O rare and unaccustomed patience! O faith invincible! that not only dost not burn, but by means unspeakable dost recreate, refresh, stablish, and strengthen those that are burned, afflicted, and troubled. And why so mightily comfortest thou the persecuted? Because through thee they

believe in God's promises infallible. By thee this glorious martyr overcometh his torments, vanquisheth this tyrant, confoundeth his enemies, confirmeth the Christians, sleepeth in peace, and reigneth in glory. The God of might and mercy grant us grace, by the life of Laurence to learn in Christ to live, and by his death to learn for Christ to die, Amen.

Such is the wisdom and providence of God, that the blood of his dear saints, like good seed, never falleth in vain to the ground, but it bringeth some increase: so it pleased the Lord to work at the martyrdom of this holy Laurence, that, by the constant confession of this worthy and valiant deacon, a certain soldier of Rome being therewith compuncted, and converted to the same faith, desired forthwith to be baptized of him: for the which he, being called for of the judge, was scourged, and afterward beheaded. <sup>F1312</sup>

Under the same Valerian, suffered also Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, much affliction and banishment, with certain other brethren: of the which he writeth himself in his letter to Germanus, a bishop of those times; which is alleged in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, <sup>f1313</sup> the words whereof tend to this effect: Dionysius with Maximus, one of his priests, and three of his deacons, to wit, Faustus, Eusebius, and Chaeremon, also with a certain brother of Rome, came before AEmilian, the prefect of Alexandria; who declared unto them in circumstance of words, how he had signified unto them the clemency of his lords the emperors, who had granted them pardon of life, so that they would return to them, and worship the gods who were the protectors (as he called them) of their empire; asking them what answer they would give him to these proposals, and trusting, as he said, that they would not show themselves ungrateful towards the clemency of those who so gently did exhort them. To this Dionysius answering, said, "All men worship not all gods, but divers men divers gods; so as every one hath in himself a mind or fantasy to worship. But we worship only that one God, who is the Creator of all things, and hath committed to our lords, Valerian and Gallien, the government of their empire; making to him our prayers incessantly for the permanency and stability of their empire." Then the prefect said, "And what hinders but that you may both worship your God (what God soever he be), and these our gods also? For you are commanded to worship such gods, as all men own to be gods." Dionysius answered, "We worship none other but as we

have said.” AEmilian the prefect said, “I see you are ungrateful men, and consider not the benignity of the emperors; wherefore you shall remain no longer in this city, but shall be sent out to the parts of Libya, unto a place called Cephro; for that place by the commandment of the emperors I have chosen for you. Neither shall it be lawful for you to convent your assemblies, or to resort as ye are wont to your burial places. And if any of you shall be found out of your places whereunto you are appointed, at your peril be it. And think not contrary, but ye shall be watched well enough. Depart therefore to the place, as is commanded you.” And it followeth more in the said Dionysius, speaking of himself: “And as for me, although I was sick, yet he urged me so strictly to depart, that he would not give me one day’s respite. And how then could I have leisure to congregate, or not congregate, any assemblies?” <sup>f1314</sup> And after a few lines it followeth,

“And yet neither was I altogether absent from the corporal society of the Lord’s flock; but I collected them together which were in the city, being absent, as though I had been present; ‘absent in body, yet present in spirit.’ And in the same Cephro, a great congregation assembled with me, as well of those brethren who followed me out of the city, as also of those who resorted to us from the rest of Egypt. And there the Lord opened to me a door [to preach] his word. Although at the first entrance I was persecuted and stoned among them, yet afterward a great number of them fell from their idols, and were converted unto the Lord. And so by us the word was preached to those who before were infidels; which ministry after that we had accomplished there, the Lord removed us to another place. For AEmilian resolved to translate us thence to more uncomfortable places, wretched even for Lybia, and commanded us to repair all together to Mareotis, thinking there to separate us severally into sundry villages, and ordering us to reside near the high road, that we might be the more easily apprehended at any time. After we were come thither, it was assigned to me (saith Dionysius) to go to the parts of Colluthio; which was a great grief to me; yet some solace it was to me, that (as the brethren suggested to me) it was rather near to the city; for as my being at Cephro brought us many new brethren out of Egypt, so my hope was, that

the vicinity of that place (where I should be) to the city, might procure the familiarity and concourse of certain loving brethren, who would resort and assemble with us; and so it came to pass, etc.” <sup>f1315</sup>

Moreover, the said Dionysius in his epistle “Ad Domitium et Didymum,” making mention of them which were afflicted in this persecution of Valerian, recordeth in these words, saying:

“It were superfluous here to recite the particular names of all our brethren slain in this persecution, who were many, but to you unknown. But this is certain, that there were men and women, young men and old, maidens and old wives, soldiers, simple innocents, and persons of all sorts and ages: of whom some with scourgings and fire, some with sword, obtained victory, and got the crown [of martyrdom]. Some continued a great time, and yet have been reserved; in the which number am I reserved hitherto, to some other opportune time known unto the Lord, who saith: ‘In the time accepted I have heard thee, and in the day of salvation I have helped thee.’ Now as concerning ourselves, in what state we are, if thou desirest to know — how I and Gaius, and Faustus, Peter, and Paul, being apprehended by the centurion and the magistrates of Alexandria and their officers, were forcibly taken away by certain of Mareotis, you have fully heard. <sup>F1316</sup> At present, I and Gaius, and Peter, are here alone, shut up in a desert and most uncomfortable place of Lybia, distant the space of three days’ journey from Paraetionium, etc.”

And in process further he addeth:

“In the city (saith he) are certain which privily visit the brethren: of priests, Maximus, Dioscorus, Demetrius, and Lucius. For they who are more eminent in the world, Faustinus and Aquila, do travel up and down Egypt. Of the deacons, besides them which died in the plague, <sup>f1317</sup> Faustus, Eusebius, and Chaeremon are yet alive. Eusebius hath God raised up and furnished with great rigour to minister to the confessors lying in bonds, and to bury the bodies of the blessed martyrs, not without great peril. Neither doth the prefect cease yet to this day, cruelly murdering such as be brought

before him, tearing some with tortures, imprisoning and wasting some in prisons, commanding that no man should come to them, inquiring also who resorted unto them. Yet notwithstanding, God through the cheerfulness and daily resort of the brethren doth comfort the afflicted.” <sup>F1318</sup>

Concerning these deacons above recited, here is to be noted, that Eusebius afterward was made bishop of Laodicea in Syria. Maximus, the priest aforesaid, had the government of the church of Alexandria after Dionysius. Faustus long after continued in great age, unto the later persecution; wherein he, being a very old man, at length was beheaded, and died a martyr.

As touching Dionysius himself, the stories report, that he, surviving all these troubles and persecutions, by the providence of God, continued after the death of Valerian, unto the twelfth year of the reign of Gallien, which was about the year of our Lord 265; and so departed in peace in great age, after he had governed the church of Alexandria the space of seventeen years, before which he had taught the school of the said city of Alexandria the term of sixteen years; after whom succeeded Maximus, as is above specified. And thus much touching the full story of Dionysius Alexandrinus, and of other martyrs and confessors of Alexandria.

At Caesarea in Palestine suffered also, about the same time, Priscus, Malchus, and Alexander; the which three good men, dwelling in the country, seeing the valiant courage of the Christians, so boldly to venture and constantly to stand and patiently to suffer in this persecution, as men being grieved with themselves, began to repent and accuse their own so great sluggishness and cowardly negligence, to see others so zealous and valiant, and themselves so cold and fainthearted, in laboring for the crown of christian martyrdom. And first consulting and agreeing with themselves, they came to Caesarea; and there, stepping up before the judge, declared themselves what they were, and obtained the end they came for, being given to the wild beasts. After which manner also, and in the same city of Caesarea, a certain woman, whose name Eusebius expresseth not, who had been before of the sect of Marcion, was brought before the prefect, and likewise obtained the same martyrdom. <sup>F1319</sup>

Neither was the city of Carthage all this while free from the stroke of this persecution, if credit should be given to the “Speculative Glass” <sup>f1320</sup> of Vincentius, who recordeth of three hundred martyrs, of which three hundred martyrs the story saith thus; that the president setting before them coals and incense to do sacrifice by a lime-kiln, which was there near at hand, offered unto them this condition; either to set incense to the coals for sacrifice to Jupiter, or else to go into the furnace of lime: whereupon they all together, with a general motion, suddenly rushed into the kiln, and there with the dusty smoke of the lime were smothered. <sup>F1321</sup>

In Africa also, in the city of Tuburba, the said Vincentius out of the Martyrology inferreth mention of three constant virgins, Maxima, Donatilla, and Secunda; who, in the persecution of this Valerian and Gallien, first had given them for their drink vinegar and gall; then with scourges were tried; after that upon the rack were tormented, and rubbed with lime; then were scorched upon the fiery gridiron; at last were cast to the wild beasts; who, being not touched of them, finally with the sword were beheaded. <sup>F1322</sup>

In Cimele, a city in France, <sup>f1323</sup> under the Alps, one Pontius being there apprehended, by the commandment of Claudius the prefect, was first hanged upon the rack, then cast to the wild beasts, of whom being nothing hurt, he was after committed to the fire; and finally not touched therewith (if the story of Vincentius be true), he was beheaded by the river’s side, and his body thrown into the flood; where immediately, the same hour, the aforesaid Claudius and his assessor Anabius were taken with wicked spirits, by whom they were **so miserably vexed** <sup>a85</sup> that Claudius bit his own tongue in pieces, and Anabius’s eyes started from their sockets through the pain he was in; and so they died. <sup>F1324</sup>

Zeno, bishop of Verona, is said also in the same persecution to have sustained martyrdom. <sup>F1325</sup>

Moreover, Bergomensis, in his eighth book, <sup>f1326</sup> writing of the story of Valerian the emperor, maketh mention of Philip, bishop of the see of Alexandria aforesaid; who (as he saith) was under the said Valerian beheaded. But that is not to be found in any approved story, nor standeth it with the truth of time that any such Philip was then bishop of Alexandria, or any other, except only Dionysius.

After whom next succeeded Maximus, who remained eighteen years, and after him Theonas, etc.: so that, by the ancient records of old writers, it appeareth not that Philip, or any other of that name, <sup>f1327</sup> was bishop of Alexandria, during this time signified by Bergomensis.

Although in some other later writers, as Equilinus, Antoninus, and Bergomensis, I find a certain history of one Philip, prefect of Alexandria about the same time of Valerian and Gallien, elected by the emperor and senate of Rome, to govern those quarters, where he was at length converted to the christian faith, and after made priest or bishop (as they say) of Alexandria; but that not to be so, the testimony of ancient writers doth manifest. The history of this Philip, witnessed in our later chronicles, is this: Philip, being promoted to the prefecture of Alexandria, came down with his wife Claudia, and his two sons, Avitus and Sergius, and with his daughter, named Eugenia; of the which Eugenia a long history, full of strange and prodigious miracles, is written by Antoninus and others, whereof many things I will cut off, and briefly touch the effect of the story; leaving to the judgment of the reader the credit of mine authors, as he shall see cause. <sup>F1328</sup>

This Eugenia, daughter of Philip, being of singular beauty, and diligently brought up by her parents in the study of science and learning, was by occasion of hearing Christians reduced and brought up to Christianity, with two others, eunuchs, her school-fellows, called Protus and Hyacinthus, with whom she taking counsel, upon occasion (whether to avoid the danger of persecution, or refusing to marry with a pagan), unknown to her parents and friends did fly away; and because the more boldly she might resort to hear the readings of Helenus, then an aged bishop, and of others, she changed herself into man's apparel, and named herself Eugenius, under the which name she was at length admitted unto a certain monastery, or a society of Christians, in the suburbs of Alexandria (although I hardly believe that any monastery of Christians was then in the suburbs of Alexandria permitted); where also, at the last, for her excellency of learning and virtue, she was made head of the place.

Here, by the way I omit the miracles of the aforesaid Helenus, bishop (as the story saith) of Heliopolis, <sup>f1329</sup> how he carried burning coals in his lap, and how he adventured himself to go in the burning fire, to refel wicked

Zereas, a pagan, remaining in the same unburnt. Here also I omit the careful search of her parents for her, and of the answer of the Pythoness again unto them, that she was taken up to heaven among the goddesses. I omit, moreover, the miracles done by the said Eugenia, in healing the diseases and sicknesses of such as came to her, etc. The story proceedeth thus: Among others which were by this Eugenius cured and restored, there was a certain matron of Alexandria, named Melancia, who, after she had used the help and acquaintance of Eugenius, supposing her to be a man, fell into an inordinate love of her, seeking by all means how to accomplish the lust of her concupiscence; insomuch that in her daily visiting of her, at length she began secretly to break her mind, and to entice her to her lewdness. Eugenius, contrarily, exhorted her to virtue and honesty, showing her the miseries of this life, and the peril of that folly. Melancia, seeing that by no means she would be allured, nor by force drawn to her desire, and fearing moreover, that she, in detecting of her, would bring her to shame, beginning first to make an outcry of Eugenius, declared how that she went about corruptly to deflower her; and so presented her accusation before Philip the prefect as well against Eugenius, as also against the rest of that company. This matter being heard, and the woman well known, the crime began to seem suspicious; and so much the more, because it was objected against the Christians. By reason whereof Eugenius, with her fellow-christians, was now not only in great hatred, but also in danger of present death and destruction. Then Eugenius, although purging herself and her honesty with sufficient probation, yet notwithstanding, perceiving that whatsoever she said could take no place, and seeing no time now to dissemble any longer, for the danger as well of her own self, as specially of her brethren (which troubled her more), she desired of the judge place and time to make manifest to him the truth; and so showed herself what she was, and how she was his daughter, the others to be Protus and Hyacinthus, the two eunuchs, her school-fellows; uttering moreover to him and to her brothers the cause of her departing from them. At the narration whereof, Philip her father, **Claudia her mother**,<sup>a86</sup> and her two brothers, coming to the knowledge of her, conceived no little joy in receiving their Eugenia again, whom they thought to have been lost. No less gladness was among the people, to see the evidence of the matter so plainly to try out the truth of the one, and the falseness of the other; whereat the malignant accuser was with double shame confounded, first, for her dishonesty

falsely cloaked; secondly, for the untruth of her accusation openly detected. Bergomensis addeth, moreover, that the said accuser was stricken presently with lightning. Thus Eugenia, trying her honesty to her parents and friends, was not only received of them again, but also, by the grace of the Lord working with her, in the space of time did win them to Christ. Whereby Philip, the father of her by nature, now by grace was begotten of his own daughter to a more perfect life; and whom once he thought to have been lost, not only he found again, but also with her found his own soul, and his own life, which before he had lost indeed. This Philip (saith the story) was made afterward bishop of Alexandria, and there suffered martyrdom; concerning whose martyrdom I deny not but it may be true; but that he was bishop of Alexandria, that cannot be admitted, as is before sufficiently proved out of Eusebius and other ancient historians.

Likewise, it is said, that Eugenia, after the martyrdom of her father, returning to Rome with Protus and Hyacinthus, by occasion of converting Basilla (who should have been married to a pagan husband, and was then beheaded) to the christian faith, was assailed with sundry kinds of death; first, being tied to a great stone and cast into the Tiber, where she was carried up from drowning; then, put in the hot baths, which were extinguished, and she preserved; afterward, by famishment in prison, where they say she was fed at the hand of our Savior: all which legendary miracles I leave to the reader to judge of them, as shall seem good unto him. At last, the story saith, she was with the sword beheaded. <sup>F1330</sup>

And because in this present history mention was made of Helenus, whom Antoninus with his fellows noteth to be the bishop of Heliopolis, here is to be understood and observed, by the way, that as Philip in the aforesaid history is falsely said to be bishop of Alexandria; so likewise untrue it is, that Helenus was bishop of Heliopolis. For by Eusebius it appeareth, alleging the words of Dionysius, that he was bishop of Tarsus, in Cilicia; <sup>f1331</sup> and there he had oversight of that church from the time of our Lord God 254, to the year of our redemption 274. <sup>F1332</sup>

Under the sixth year of Valerian and Gallien, we read in the History of Herfordiensis (who cites Isuardus) of Victor and Victorinus, who, lying in prison the space of three years with Claudian and Bassa his wife, are said

to have sustained great torments and martyrdom for the testimony and name of Christ. <sup>F1333</sup>

Aurelius Prudentius, in his book intituled *Περὶ Στεφάνων* inferreth mention of Fructuosus, bishop of Tarragona in Spain, who, with his two deacons, Augurius and Eulogius, suffered also martyrdom, being burnt after six days' imprisonment under the aforesaid emperors in this persecution. The cause of their punishment was for the profession of Christ's name; their judge and condemner was AEmilian; their imprisonment endured six days; the kind of death ministered unto them was fire; wherein they, being altogether cast with their arms bound behind them, their bands (as Prudentius writeth) were dissolved, their hands untouched with the fire, and their bodies remaining whole. The charge of this judge unto the bishop was this: "That he should worship the gods whom the emperor Gallien worshipped." To whom Fructuosus the bishop answering: "Nay," saith he, "I worship no dumb god of stocks and blocks, whom Gallien doth worship, but I worship the Lord and Master of Gallien, the Father and Creator of all times, and his only Son sent down to us, of whose flock I am here the pastor and shepherd." At this word AEmilian answering again, "Nay," saith he, "say not thou art, but say thou wast." And forthwith commanded them to be committed to the fire, where (as is said) their bands and manacles being loosed by the fire, they lifted up their hands to heaven, praising the living God, to the great admiration of them that stood by, praying also that the element, which seemed to fly from them, might work its full force upon them, and speedily dispatch them; which was after their request obtained. In the mean space, as they were in the fire, there was a certain soldier in the house of AEmilian, who did see the heavens above to open, and these aforesaid martyrs to enter into the same; which soldier likewise showed the sight the same time unto the daughter of AEmilian the prefect, who, beholding the same sight with the soldier, was a present witness of the blessedness of them whom her cruel father had condemned.

As this godly bishop was preparing to his death (saith Prudentius) the brethren approaching to him, brought him drink, desiring him with much weeping to receive and drink with them; but that he refused to do, requiring them moreover to refrain their tears. With like readiness the brethren also were diligent about him to pluck off his shoes and hose, as he

was addressing himself to the fire; but neither would he suffer any servant's help in that, wherein he was no less willing than able to help himself. And thus this blessed and fruitful bishop Fructuosus, with his two deacons, Augurius and Enlogius, being brought to the fire, witnessed the constant confession of the name of Christ with the shedding of their blood. <sup>F1334</sup>

And thus far continued wicked Valerian in his tyranny against the saints of Christ. But as all the tyrants before, and oppressors of the Christians, had their deserved reward at the just hand of God, who rendereth to every man according to his works; so this cruel Valerian, after he had reigned with his son Gallien the term of six or seven years, and about two years had afflicted the church of Christ, felt the just stroke of his hand, whose indignation before he had provoked, whereof we have to witness Eutropius, Pollio, <sup>f1335</sup> Sabellicus, Volateran. <sup>F1336</sup> For, making his expedition against the Persians, whether by the fraud and treason of some about him, or whether by his own rashness, it is doubtful; but this is certain, that he fell into the hands of his enemies, being about the age of fourscore years; where he spent his wretched age in a more wretched captivity: insomuch that Sapor, the king of the Persians, used him (and well worthy) not for his riding-fool, but for his riding-block; for whensoever the king should light upon his horse openly in the sight of the people, Valerian, emperor quondam, was brought forth instead of a block, for the king to tread upon his back in going to his horseback. And so continued this blockish butcherly emperor with shame and sport enough unto his final end, as witness Laetus and Aurelius Victor. <sup>F1337</sup>

Albeit Eusebius, in a certain sermon "Ad conventum Sanctorum," declareth a more cruel handling of him, affirming that he was slain, writing in these words: "And thou Valerian, forasmuch as thou hast exercised the same cruelty in murdering of the subjects of God, hast proved unto us the righteous judgment of God, in that thyself hast been bound in chains, and carried away for a captive slave with thy gorgeous purple, and thy imperial attire; and at length also, being commanded of Sapor, king of the Persians, to be flayed and powdered with salt, hast set up unto all men a perpetual monument of thy wretchedness." <sup>F1338</sup>

The like severity of God's terrible judgment is also to be noted in Claudius, the prefect, and minister of his persecutions. Of which Claudius Henry of Herford thus writeth, that he was possessed and vexed of the devil, in such sort, that he biting off his own tongue in many small pieces, so ended his life.

Neither did Gallien, the son of Valerian, after the captivity of his father, utterly escape the righteous hand of God: for beside the miserable captivity of his father, whom he could not rescue, such portents strange and out of the course of nature, such earthquakes did happen, <sup>f1339</sup> also such tumults, commotions, and rebellions did follow, that Trebellio doth reckon up to the number of thirty together, which in sundry places, all at one time, took upon them to be tyrants and emperors over the monarchy of Rome, by the means whereof he was not able to succor his father, though he would. Notwithstanding, the said Gallien, being (as is thought) terrified by the example of his father, did remove, at least did moderate, the persecution stirred up by the edicts of Valerian his father, directing forth his imperial proclamation, the tenor whereof proceedeth after this effect, as is to be seen in Eusebius. <sup>F1340</sup>

Emperor and Caesar, Publius Licinius Gallien, Pius, Felix, Augustus, to Dionysius, Pinna, Demetrius, and the rest of the bishops. I have commanded that the indulgence of my gracious bounty be published through the whole world, viz. that all should depart from <sup>f1341</sup> the places devoted to religious worship. And for this cause I have here sent to you the copy of my rescript for you to peruse and keep, that no man may molest you. And that, which you may now lawfully enjoy, hath been long since by me granted. And therefore, for your more warrant in the same, I have committed the copy hereof to the custody of Aurelius Cyrenius, my high steward.

This mandate above prefixed did Gallien send to Dionysius Alexandrinus, and other bishops, as is premised. Another rescript also the said emperor sent to other christian bishops, permitting to them full liberty to receive again their wonted places <sup>f1342</sup> where they were wont to associate together, called of them Coemeteria.

By this it may appear that some peace was granted then under this Gallien to the church of Christ: albeit not so, but that some there were who suffered, of whom was one Marinus, mentioned in Eusebius. <sup>F1343</sup> This Marinus, being a warrior and a nobleman at Caesarea in Palestine, stood for the dignity of a certain order, which by all order of course was next to fall upon him by fight, had not the envious ambition of him, that should follow next after him, supplanted him both of office and life; for he accused him to be a Christian, and therefore said that he was not to be admitted unto their offices, he being against their religion. Whereupon Achaeus, then being judge, examined him of his faith; who, finding him to be a Christian indeed, and constantly to stand to his profession, gave him three hours to deliberate and advise with himself. There was about the same time bishop at Caesarea, one named Theotecnus; <sup>f1344</sup> who, perceiving him to stand in doubtful deliberation and perplexity in himself, took him by the hand, and brought him into the church of the Christians, laying before him a sword (which he had under his cloak for the same purpose) and a book of the New Testament; and so willed him to take his free choice which of them he would prefer. The soldier immediately, without delay, ran to the book of the gospel, taking that before the sword. And thus he, being animated by the bishop, presented himself boldly before the judge, by whose sentence he was beheaded, and died a martyr. <sup>F1345</sup> Whose dead body one Astyrius, a noble senator of Rome, a man very wealthy and among the chief of that order (who in the same time was there present at his martyrdom), took up and bare upon his own shoulders, wrapping it in a rich and sumptuous weed, and so honourably committed it to burial. <sup>F1346</sup>

Of which Astyrius the said author writeth moreover this story; how that in the aforesaid city of Caesarea, the Gentiles used there, of an ancient custom, to offer up a certain sacrifice by a fountain side, the which sacrifice, by the working of the devil, was wont suddenly to vanish out of their eyes, to the great admiration of the bystanders. Astyrius seeing this, and pitying the miserable error of the simple people, lifting up his eyes to heaven, made his prayer to Almighty God in the name of Christ, that the people might not be seduced of the devil any longer: by the virtue of whose prayer the sacrifice was seen to swim in the water of the fountain; and so the strange wonder of that sight was taken away, and no such matter could be there wrought any more. <sup>F1347</sup>

And because mention is made here of Caesarea, there followeth in the next chapter of the same author a strange miracle, if it be true, which he there reporteth; how that out of the same city was the woman who in the gospel came to our Savior, and was healed of her bloody issue, her house being in the city of Caesarea. Before the door thereof was set up a certain pillar of stone, and upon the pillar was an image, made of brass, of a woman meekly kneeling on her knees, and holding up her hands, as one that had some suit. Against the which there was another image of a man, proportioned of the same metal; standing upright, dressed decently in a short vesture, and stretching forth his hand to the woman. At the foot of which pillar grew up a certain herb of a strange kind, but of a more strange operation; which growing up to the hem of his vesture, and once touching the same, is said to have had such virtue, that it was able to cure all manner of diseases. This image of the man (they say) represented our Savior. The history is written in Eusebius, as is said; the credit whereof I refer to the reader, whether he will think it true or false. If he think it false, yet I have showed him mine author: if he think it true, then must he think withal that this miraculous operation of the herb proceeded neither by the virtue of the one image, nor by the prayer of the other (being both dumb figures, and engraven no doubt at that time by the hand of infidels); but to be wrought by some secret permission of God's wisdom, either to reduce the infidels at that time to the belief of the story, or to admonish the Christians to consider with themselves what strength and health was to be looked for only of Christ and no other advocate; seeing the dumb image, engraven in brass, gave his efficacy to a poor herb, to cure so many diseases. This image (saith Eusebius) remained also to his time, which was under Constantine the Great. <sup>F1348</sup>

As touching the line and order of the Roman bishops hitherto intermitted; after the martyrdom of Sixtus above specified, the government of that church was committed next to one Dionysius, about the year of our Lord 259; who continued in the same the space of nine years, as Eusebius saith: as Damasus recordeth, but only six years and two months. Of his decretal epistles, because sufficient hath been said before concerning that matter, I omit to speak. After whom succeeded Felix, toward the first year of Aurelian the emperor, about the year of our Lord 269, who governed that church five years, and died, as Platina saith, a martyr. After him followed

Eutychian, and then Caius, both martyrs, as the histories of some do record.

About the time of these bishops lived Theodore bishop of Neocaesarea [in Pontus], who is otherwise called Gregory the Great, whom also Nicephorus, for his miracles, calleth **θαυματουργην**.

Thus Gallien the aforesaid emperor reigned, as is declared, with his father Valerian seven years, after whose captivity he ruled the monarchy alone about eight years, with some peace and quietness granted to the church.

The days of this Gallien being expired, followed Claudius II. a quiet emperor, as most histories do record. Although Vincentius affirmeth that he was a mover of persecution against the Christians, and maketh mention of two hundred sixty and two martyrs, who in his time did suffer; but because no such record remaineth to be found in Eusebius (who would not have omitted some memorial thereof, if it had been true), therefore I refer the same to the free judgment of the reader, to find such credit as it may. This Claudius reigned but two years, after whom came Quintillus his brother, next emperor, and a quiet prince, who continued but only seventeen days, and had to his successor Aurelian; under whom Orosius, in his seventh book, doth number the ninth persecution against the Christians. <sup>F1349</sup>

### THE NINTH PERSECUTION.

Hitherto from the captivity of Valerian, the church of Christ was in some quietness till the death of Quintillus, as hath been declared; after whom Aurelian the next successor possessed the crown; who in the first beginning of his reign (after the common manner of all princes) showed himself a prince moderate and discreet, much worthy of commendation, if his good beginning had continued in a constant course agreeing to the same. Of nature he was severe, and rigorous in correcting, dissolute in manners; insomuch as it was said of him in a vulgar proverb, "That he was a good physician, saving that he gave too bitter medicines." This emperor when sick, never sent for a physician, but cured himself with abstinence. And as his beginning was not unfruitful to the commonwealth, so neither was he any great disturber of the Christians, whom he did not only tolerate in their religion, but also their councils; and they, being the same time

assembled at Antioch, he seemed not to be against them. Notwithstanding, in continuance of time, through sinister motion and instigation of certain about him (as commonly such are never absent in all places from the ears of princes), his nature, somewhat inclinable to severity, was altered to a plain tyranny; which tyranny first he showed, beginning with the death of his own sister's son, as witnesseth Eutropius. After that he proceeded either to move, or at least to purpose, persecution against the Christians; albeit that wicked purpose of the emperor the merciful working of God's hand did soon overthrow. For when the edict or proclamation should have been published for the persecuting of the Christians, and the emperor was now ready to subscribe the edict with his hand, the mighty stroke of the hand of the Lord suddenly from above did stop his purpose, binding (as a man might say) the emperors hands behind him, declaring (as Eusebius saith) to all men, how there is no power to work any violence against the servants of God, unless his permission do suffer them, and give them leave. <sup>F1350</sup> Eusebius in his **Chronicle and Orosius affirm, that, as the said Aurelian** <sup>a88</sup> was beginning to raise persecution against us, he was suddenly terrified with lightning; and that not long after, about the fifth or sixth year of his reign, he was slain between Byzantium and Heraclea (as also **Eutropius and Vopiscus affirm**) <sup>a89</sup>, in the year of our Lord 275. Thus Aurelian rather intended than moved persecution; neither is there any more than this found concerning this persecution in ancient histories and records of the church: wherefore I marvel the more, that Vincentius, collecting out of the Martyrologies, hath comprehended such a great catalogue of so many martyrs, which in France and in Italy (saith he) suffered death and torments under this emperor Aurelian; whereunto Orosius also seemeth to agree in numbering this, under the said Aurelian, to be the ninth persecution. <sup>F1351</sup>

Next after Aurelian the succession of the empire fell to Publius Annus Tacitus, who reigned but six months; him succeeded his brother Florian, who reigned but threescore days; and after him followed Marcus Aurelius, surnamed Probus. <sup>F1352</sup> Of whom more hereafter (God willing) shall appear. In the mean time, within the compass of these emperors falleth in a story recorded of Eusebius, and not unworthy here to be noted, whereby to understand the faithful diligence of good ministers, what good it may do in a commonwealth.

Mention is made before of Eusebius the deacon of Dionysius, whom God stirred up to visit and comfort the saints that were in prison and bands, and to bury the bodies of the blessed martyrs departed, not without great peril of his own life, who after was made bishop (as is said) of Laodicea. But before he came to Laodicea, to be bishop there, it chanced, while the said Eusebius was remaining as yet at Alexandria, the city was besieged of the Romans, in that part of it called Bruchium. <sup>F1353</sup> In which siege part of the city did hold with the Romans, the other part withstood them. In that part which went with the Roman captain was Eusebius, being also in great favor with the captain for his worthy fidelity and service showed. With the other part, that resisted the Romans, was Anatolius, governor or moderator then of the school of Alexandria, who also was bishop, after the said Eusebius, of Laodicea. This Anatolius, perceiving the citizens to be in miserable distress of famine and [peril of] destruction, by reason of penury and lack of sustenance, sendeth to Eusebius being then with the Romans, and certifieth him of the lamentable penury and peril of the city, instructing him moreover what to do in the matter. Eusebius, understanding the case, repaireth to the captain, desiring of him so much favor, that so many as would fly out of the city from their enemies, might be licensed to escape and freely to pass, which was to him eftsoons granted. As Eusebius was thus laboring with the captain, on the other side Anatolius for his part labored with the citizens, moving them to assemble together, and persuading them to give themselves over, in yielding to the force and might of the Romans. But when the citizens could not abide the hearing thereof, “yet,” said Anatholius, “with this I trust you will be contented, if I shall counsel you in this miserable lack of things to void out of your city all such persons as are superfluous and unnecessary incumbrances about you, as old women, young children, aged men, with such others as be feeble and impotent; and not suffer them here to perish with famine, whose presence can do no stead to you if they die, and less if they live, for spending the victuals which otherwise might serve them that be more able to defend the city.” The senate hearing this counsel, and understanding moreover the grant of the captain promising them their safety, were well consenting thereunto. Then Anatolius, having a special care to them that belonged to the church of Christ, calleth them together with the rest of the multitude, and persuading them what they should do, and what had been obtained for them, caused them to void the city; and

not only them, but also a great number of others more, who persuaded by him, under that pretense, changing themselves in women's apparel, or feigning some impotency, so escaped out of the city. At whose coming out, Eusebius on the other side was ready to receive them, and refreshed their hungry and pined bodies; whereby not only they, but the whole city of Alexandria was preserved from destruction. <sup>F1354</sup>

By this little history of Eusebius and Anatolius, described in Eusebius, and briefly here set forth to thee (gentle reader) thou mayst partly understand the practice of the prelates, what it was in those days in the church; which was then only employed in saving of life, and succouring the commonwealths wherein they lived, as by these two godly persons Eusebius and Anatolius may well appear. Unto the which practice if we compare the practice of our later prelates of the church of Rome, I suppose no little difference will appear.

The next emperor to Florian (as is said) was Marcus Aurelius Probus, a prince both wise and virtuous, and no less valiant in martial affairs, than fortunate in the success of the same. During his time we read of no persecution greatly stirring in the church, but much quietness as well in matters of religion as also in the commonwealth. Insomuch that, after his great and many victories, such peace ensued, that his saying was: "There needed no more soldiers, seeing there were no more enemies for the commonwealth to fight against." It was his saying also, "that his soldiers need not to spend corn and victual, except they labored to serve the commonwealth." And for the same cause he caused his soldiers to be set at work about certain mountains at Sirmium in Pannonia and in Moesia, to be planted with vines, and not so much as in winter suffered them to be at rest; therefore by them at length he was slain, after he had reigned the space of six years and four months, in the year of our Lord 282. <sup>F1355</sup>

Carus, with his two sons Carinus and Numerian, succeeded next after Probus in the empire; the reign of which emperors continued in all but three years. Of the which three, first Carus, warring against the Persians, was slain with lightning. Of Numerian his son, being with his father in his wars against the Persians, we find much commendation in Eutropius, Vopiscus, and other writers, who testify him to be a valiant warrior; and an eloquent orator, as appeareth by his declamations and writings sent to

the senate; and thirdly, to be an excellent poet. This Numerian, sorrowing and lamenting for the death of his father, through immoderate weeping fell into a great soreness of his eyes; by reason whereof he, keeping close, was slain not long after of his father-in-law, named Aper; who, traitorously aspiring to the empire, dissembled his death with a false excuse to the people asking for him, saying, “For the pain of his eyes he kept in from the wind and weather;” till at length, by the stench of his body being carried about, his death was uttered.

In the life of this emperor Carus aforesaid, written by Eutropius in the later edition set forth by Frobenius, <sup>f1356</sup> I find (which in other editions of Eutropius doth not appear), that Numerian, the son of this Carus, was he that slew Babylas the holy martyr, whose history before we have comprehended. But that seemeth not to be likely, both by the narrative of Chrysostom, and also for that Urspergensis (declaring the same history, and in the same words, as it is in Eutropius) saith that it was Cyril whom Numerian killed; the story whereof is this: “What time Carus the emperor, in his journey going toward the Persians, remained at Antioch, Numerian his son would enter into the church of the Christians, to view and behold their mysteries. But Cyril their bishop would in no wise suffer him to enter into the church, saying, “that it was not lawful for him to see the mysteries of God, who was polluted with sacrifices of idols.” Numerian, full of indignation at the hearing of these words, not suffering that repulse at the hands of Cyril, in his fury did slay the godly martyr. And therefore justly (as it seemed) was he himself slain afterward by the hands of Aper.

<sup>F1357</sup>

Thus Carus with his son Numerian being slain in the East parts, as is declared, Carinus the other son reigned alone in Italy; where he overcame Sabinus striving for the empire, and reigned there with much wickedness, till the returning home of the army again from the Persians, who then set up Dioclesian to be emperor; by whom the aforesaid Carinus, for the wickedness of his life being forsaken of his host, was overcome, and at length slain with the hand of the tribune, whose wife before he had deflowered. Thus Carus with his two sons, Numerian and Carinus, ended their lives, whose reign continued not above three years.

All this mean space we read of no great persecution stirring in the church of Christ, but it was in mean quiet state and tranquillity, unto the nineteenth year of the reign of Dioclesian; so that in counting the time from the latter end of Valerian unto this aforesaid year of Dioclesian, the peace of the church, which God gave to his people, seemeth to continue about four and forty years; during the which time of peace and tranquillity, the church of the Lord did mightily increase and flourish, so that the more bodies it lost by persecution, the more honor and reverence it won daily among the Gentiles in all quarters, both Greeks and barbarous; insomuch that (as Eusebius in his eighth book describeth) <sup>f1358</sup> amongst the emperors themselves, divers there were who not only bare singular good-will and favor to them of our profession, but also did commit unto them offices and regiments over countries and nations; and so well were they affected to our doctrine, that they privileged the same with liberty and indemnity. What needeth to speak of those who not only lived under the emperors in liberty, but also were familiar in the court with the princes themselves, entertained with great honor and special favor beyond the other servitors of the court: as was Dorotheus, with his wife, children, and whole family, highly accepted and advanced in the palace of the emperor; also Gorgonius in like manner; with divers others more, who, for their doctrine and learning which they professed, were with their princes in great estimation. In like reverence also were the bishops of cities and dioceses with the prefects and rulers where they lived; who not only suffered them to live in peace, but also had them in great price and regard, so long as they kept themselves upright, and continued in God's favor. Who is able to number at that time the mighty and innumerable multitudes and congregations assembling together in every city, and the notable concourses of such as daily flocked to the common oratories to pray? For the which cause they, being not able to be contained in their old edifices, had large and great churches, new builded from the foundation, for them to frequent together. In such increasement (saith Eusebius) by process of time did the church of Christ grow and shoot up daily more and more, profiting and spreading through all quarters, which neither envy of men could infringe, nor any devil could enchant, neither the crafty policy of man's wit could supplant, so long as the protection of God's heavenly arm went with his people, keeping them in good order, according to the rule of christian life.

But as commonly the nature of all men, being of itself unruly and untoward, always seeketh and desireth prosperity, and yet can never well use prosperity; always would have peace, and yet having peace always abuseth the same: so here likewise it happened with these men, who through this so great liberty and prosperity of life began to degenerate and languish into idleness and delicacy, and one to work spite and contumely against another, striving and contending amongst themselves, for every occasion, with railing words after most despiteful manner; bishops against bishops, and people against people, moving hatred and sedition one against another; besides also cursed hypocrisy and simulation with all extremity increasing more and more. By reason whereof the judgment of God, after his wonted manner (the multitude of the faithful as yet meeting in their assemblies), began by little and little to visit the people with persecution, falling first upon the brethren who were abroad in warfare. But when that touched the others nothing or very little, neither did they seek to appease God's wrath, and call for his mercy, but wickedly thought with themselves, that God neither regarded nor would visit their transgressions, they heaped iniquities daily more and more one upon another; and they who seemed to be pastors, rejecting the rule of piety, were inflamed with mutual contentions one against another. And thus, whilst they were given only to the study of contentions, threatenings, emulations, envy and mutual hatred, every man seeking for himself the first place in the church of Christ, as if it were secular principality: then, then, (saith Eusebius) according to the voice of Jeremy,

“the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel, and remembered not his footstool in the day of his anger: the Lord hath drowned all the beauty of Israel, and thrown down all his strongholds.” (Lamentations 2:1, 2.)

And as it is predicted in the Psalms, “He hath made void the covenant of his servant, and profaned his sanctuary in the earth [to wit, by the destruction of the churches]. He hath broken down all his hedges, he hath made his strongholds fear. All the multitudes of the people that pass by the way spoil him, and further, he is a reproach to his neighbors. For he hath exalted the right hand of his enemies, and hath turned away the help of his sword, and hath not assisted him in the war. But he hath put an end

to his purification, and hath broken his throne by casting it to the ground. The days of his life hath he shortened, and, lastly, covered him with ignominy.” <sup>F1359</sup> All these things were fulfilled upon us, when we saw the temples razed from the top to the ground, and the sacred Scriptures to be burnt in the open market-place; and the pastors of the church to hide themselves, some here, some there; others of them ignominiously apprehended, and exposed to the scorn of their enemies; when also, according to the saying of the prophet in another place,

“Contempt was poured upon the princes, and he caused them to wander in the wilderness, where there was no way.” (Psalm 107:40.)

### THE TENTH PERSECUTION.

By reason whereof the wrath of God being kindled against his church, ensued the tenth and last persecution against the Christians, so horrible and grievous, that it maketh the pen almost to tremble to write upon it; so tedious that never was any persecution before or since comparable to it for the time it continued, lasting the space of ten years together. This persecution, although it passed through the hands of divers tyrants and workers more than one or two, yet principally it beareth the name of Dioclesian, who was emperor, as is above noted, next after Carinus and Numerian. This Dioclesian, ever having an ambitious mind, aspired greatly to be emperor, <sup>f1360</sup> To whom, when serving in Gaul as a common soldier, a Druidess foretold, “that after he had killed a wild boar, he should be emperor.” He, taking effect at these words, used much to kill with his hands wild boars; but seeing no success to come thereof, he used this proverb: “Ego aptos occido, altus pulpamento fruitur,” that is, “I kill the boars, but others eat the flesh.” At length the said Dioclesian, being nominated to be emperor, and seeing Aper (who had killed Numerian the emperor) standing thereby, sware to the soldiers that Numerian was wrongfully killed; and forthwith, running upon Aper with his sword, slew him. <sup>F1361</sup> After this, he being stablished in the empire, and seeing on every side divers and sundry commotions rising up against him, which he was not well able himself to sustain, in the first beginning of his reign he chooseth for his colleague Maximian, surnamed Herculus, father of Maxentius. Which two emperors, because of divers wars that rose in many

provinces, chose to them two other noblemen, Galerius and Constantius, whom they called Caesars; of whom Galerius was sent into the east parts against the Persians. Constantius was sent over to Britain, to this our country of England, to recover the tribute, where he took to wife Helena the daughter of king Coel, who was a maiden excelling in beauty, and no less famously brought up in the study of learning, <sup>f1362</sup> of whom was born Constantine the Great.

All this while hitherto no persecution was yet stirred of these four princes against the church of Christ, but quietly and moderately they governed the commonwealth; wherefore accordingly God prospered their doings and affairs, and gave them great victories: Dioclesian in Egypt, Maximian in Africa and in France, Galierus in Persia, Constantine in England, and in France also. By reason of which victories, Dioclesian and Maximian, puffed up in pride, ordainer a solemn triumph at Rome: after which triumph Dioclesian gave commandment that he should be worshipped as God, saying, that he was brother to the sun and moon; and adorning his shoes with gold and precious stones, commanded the people to kiss his feet.

And not long after, by the judgment of God for certain enormities used in the church (above touched), began the great and grievous persecution of the Christians, moved by the outrageous cruelty of Dioclesian, which was about the nineteenth year of his reign, who in the month of March, when the feast of Easter was nigh at hand, <sup>f1363</sup> commanded all the churches of the Christians to be spoiled and east to the earth, and the books of holy Scripture to be burnt.

**The most violent edicts** <sup>a90</sup> and proclamations, as is said, were set forth throughout all the Roman empire, for the overthrowing of the Christian temples. Neither did there want in the officers any cruel execution of the same proclamations; for their temples were [already] defaced when they celebrated the feast of Easter. The same proclamations contained orders for the burning of the books of the holy Scripture; which thing was done in the open market-place, as before stated: *Item*, for the displacing of such as were magistrates, and all others whosoever bare any office, and that with great ignominy: *Item*, for imprisoning such as were of the common sort, if they would not abjure Christianity, and subscribe to the heathen religion.

And this was the first edict given out by Dioclesian. And these were the beginnings of the Christians' evils. <sup>F1364</sup>

It was not long after, but that new edicts were sent forth (nothing for their cruelty inferior to the first), for the casting of the elders and bishops into prison, and then constraining them with sundry kinds of punishments to offer unto their idols. By reason whereof ensued a great persecution against the governors of the church; amongst whom many stood manfully, passing through many exceeding bitter torments, neither were overcome therewith, being tormented and examined divers of them diversely; some were scourged all their bodies over with whips and scourges, some were cruciated with racks and razings of their flesh that were intolerable; some one way, some another way put to death. Some again violently were drawn to the impure sacrifice, and as though they had sacrificed, when indeed they did not, were let go. Others, neither coming at all to their altars, nor touching any piece of their sacrifices, yet were borne in hand of them that stood by, that they had sacrificed, and so suffering that false infatuation of their enemies quietly went away. Others, as dead men, were carried and cast away, being but half dead. Some they cast down upon the pavement, and trailing them a great space by the legs, made the people believe that they had sacrificed. Furthermore, others there were who stoutly withstood them, affirming with a loud voice that they had done no such sacrifice; of whom some said they were Christians, and gloried in the profession of that name: some cried, saying, that neither they had nor ever would be partakers of that idolatry. And these, being buffeted on the face and mouth with the hands of the soldiers, were made to hold their peace, and so thrust out with violence. And if the saints did seem never so little to do what the enemies would have them, they were made much of: albeit, all this purpose of the adversary did nothing prevail against the holy and constant servants of Christ. Notwithstanding, of the weak sort innumerable there were, who for fear and infirmity fell and gave over, even at the first burnt. <sup>F1365</sup>

On the first publishing of the edict against the churches at Nicomedia, there chanced a deed to be done much worthy of memory, of a Christian, who was no obscure person, but eminently illustrious for secular honor and esteem; who, moved by a zeal of God, after the proclamation was set up, by and by ran and took down the same, and openly tare and rent it in

pieces, not fearing the presence of the two emperors, then being in the city. For which act he was put to a most bitter death, which death he with great faith and constancy endured, even to the last gasp. <sup>f1366</sup>

After this, the furious rage of the malignant emperors, being let loose against the saints of Christ, proceeded more and more, making havoc of God's people throughout all quarters of the world. Dioclesian (who had purposed with himself to subvert the whole christian religion) executed his tyranny in the East, and Maximian in the West. But wily Diocletian began very subtilly; for he put the matter first in practice in the camp, where his lieutenant <sup>f1367</sup> (as Eusebius affirmeth) put the christian soldiers to this choice; whether they would obey the emperor's commandment in that manner of sacrifice he commanded, and so both to keep their offices, and lead their bands, or else to lay away from them their amour and weapons. Whereunto the christian men courageously answered, that they were not only ready to lay away their armor and weapons, but also to suffer death, if it should with tyranny be enforced upon them, rather than they would obey the wicked decrees and commandments of the emperor. There might a man have seen very many who were desirous to live a simple and poor life, and who regarded no estimation and honor in comparison of true piety and godliness. And this was no more but a subtle and wily flattery in the beginning, to offer them to be at their own liberty, whether they would willingly abjure their profession or not; as also this was another, that in the beginning of the persecution, there were but a few tormented with punishment, but afterward, by little and little, the enemy began more manifestly to burst out into persecution. <sup>f1368</sup> After the second edict, commanding that all the governors of churches should be committed to prison; the sight of what was then done, no expressions are sufficient to describe; when infinite multitudes were every where committed to custody, and the prisons, which had formerly been provided for murderers and robbers of the dead, were then filled with bishops, priests, and deacons, readers and exorcists; insomuch that there was now no place left therein for those who had been condemned for their crimes. Again, when another edict offered the choice to the imprisoned, of liberty on sacrificing, or a thousand tortures on refusal, it can hardly be expressed with words what number of martyrs, and what blood was shed, throughout all cities and regions for the name of Christ. <sup>f1369</sup>

Eusebius saith, that he himself knew some worthy martyrs that suffered in Palestine; and others in Tyre of Phoenicia. He declareth, in the same place, of a marvellous martyrdom made at Tyre, where certain Christians being given to most cruel wild beasts, were preserved without hurt of them, to the great admiration of the beholders; and those bears, boars, leopards and bulls (kept hungry for that purpose, and stimulated with hot irons), had no desire to devour them; which, notwithstanding, most vehemently raged against those by whom they were brought into the stage, who, standing (as they thought) out of danger of them, were first devoured; but the christian martyrs, because they could not be hurt of the beasts, being slain with the sword, were afterward thrown into the sea. <sup>f1370</sup> At that time was martyred the bishop of Tyre, whose name was **Tyrannio**, <sup>a91</sup> who was made meat for the fishes at Antioch; and Zenobius, a presbyter of Sidon and a skillful physician, who died under the torments at the same place. Sylvanus, bishop of Emisa, a notable martyr, together with certain others, was thrown to the wild beasts at Emisa. But Sylvanus, the bishop of Gaza, was slain with nine and thirty others at the copper mines of Phaeno. <sup>f1371</sup> At Caesarea, Pamphilus a presbyter, who was the glory of that church, died a most worthy martyr; <sup>f1372</sup> whose life Eusebius hath written in a book by itself, and whose commendable martyrdom (as he had promised in his eighth book and thirteenth chapter) he hath declared in another treatise. <sup>f1373</sup>

Furthermore, he maketh mention in the same book of others at Antioch who were broiled on gridirons set over the fire—yet not to death, but so as to protract their punishment; of some others that were brought to the sacrifices, and commanded to do sacrifice, who would rather thrust their right hand into the fire, than touch the profane or wicked sacrifice; also of some others, that, before they were apprehended, would cast down themselves from steep places, lest that, being taken, they should commit any thing against their profession. Also of two virgins very fair and proper, with their mother also, who had studiously brought them up, even from their infancy, in all godliness, being long sought for, and at the last found, and strictly kept by their keepers; who, whilst they made their excuse to do that which nature required, threw themselves down headlong into a river. Also of two other young maidens, being sisters, and of a worshipful stock, indued with many goodly virtues, who were cast of

persecutors into the sea; and these things were done at Antioch, as Eusebius, in his eighth book and twelfth chapter, affirmeth.

Divers and sundry torments were the Christians in Mesopotamia molested with; where they were hanged up by the feet, and their heads downwards, and with the smoke of a small fire strangled; and also in Cappadocia, where the martyrs had their legs broken. <sup>f1374</sup>

Henry of Herford <sup>f1375</sup> maketh mention of the martyrs of Tarsus in Cilicia, as Taracus, Probus, and Andronicus: but yet the martyrs in, the region of Pontus suffered far more passing and sharper torments, whereof I will hereafter make mention. <sup>F1376</sup> So outrageous was the beginning of the persecution which the emperor made in Nicomedia in Bithynia, as before is said, that he refrained not from the slaughter of the most chief princes and pages of his court, whom a little before he made as much of, as if they had been his own children. Such an one was Peter, who among divers and sundry torments as a victorious martyr ended his life; who, being stripped naked, was lifted up, and, his whole body so beaten and torn with whips, that a man might see the bare bones; and after they had mingled vinegar and salt together, they poured it upon the most tender parts of his body, and lastly, roasted him at a slow fire, as a man would roast flesh to eat. Dorotheus and Gorgonius, being in a great authority and office under the emperor, after divers torments were strangled with a halter; both which being of his privy chamber, when they saw and beheld the grievous punishment of Peter their household companion, “Wherefore,” say they, “O emperor, do you punish in Peter that opinion which is in all us? Why is this accounted in him an offense, that we all confess? We are of that faith, religion, and judgment that he is of.” Therefore he commanded them to be brought forth, and almost with like pains to be tormented as Peter was, and afterwards hanged. <sup>F1377</sup> After whom Anthimus, the bishop of Nicomedia, after he had made a notable confession, bringing with him a great company of martyrs, was beheaded. To this end came Lucian, a presbyter of the church of Antioch, who also was martyred after he had made his apology [at Nicomedia] before the emperor. These men being thus dispatched, the emperor vainly thought that he might cause the rest to do whatever him listed. <sup>F1378</sup>

**Hermannus** <sup>a92</sup> Gigas <sup>f1379</sup> hath reported Serena, the wife of Dioclesian the emperor, to be martyred for the christian religion: <sup>f21380</sup> so much did the rage of persecution utterly forget all natural affection. Other martyrs doth Nicephorus recite, as Eulampius and Eulampia, at Nicomedia; Agape, Irene, Chionia, [at Thessalonica]; <sup>f1381</sup> and Anastasia, a Roman lady, who, under the prefect of Illyricum, was bound hand and foot to a post and burnt. <sup>F1382</sup> He mentions, also, a matter full of horror and grief. There assembled together in their temple many christian men to celebrate the memory of the nativity of Christ; of every age and sort some. Maximian, thinking to have a very fit occasion given him to execute his tyranny upon the poor Christians, sent thither such as should burn the temple. The doors being shut and closed round about, thither came they with fire; but first they commanded the crier with a loud voice to cry, that whosoever would have life, should come out of the temple, and do sacrifice upon the next altar of Jupiter they came to; and unless they would do this, they should all be burnt with the temple. Then one stepping up in the temple answered in the name of all the rest with great courage and boldness of mind, that they were all Christians, and believed that Christ was their only God and King, and that they would do sacrifice to him, with his Father, and the Holy Ghost; and that they were now all ready to offer unto him. With these words the fire was kindled, and compassed about the temple, and there were burnt of men, women, and children, certain thousands. <sup>f21383</sup> There were also in Arabia very many martyrs slain with axes. <sup>F1384</sup> **There was in Phrygia** <sup>a93</sup> a city, unto which the emperor sent his edicts, that they should do sacrifice to the gods, and worship idols; on which all the citizens, including the quaestor and the chief magistrate, <sup>f1385</sup> confessed that they were all Christians. The city upon this was besieged and set on fire, and all the people burnt. <sup>F1386</sup> At Sebaste, in lesser Armenia, Eustratius was martyred. This Eustratius, as Nicephorus declareth, was born in Arabrace, a region near adjoining to Armenia, <sup>f1387</sup> and very skillful in Greek learning, and executed the office of scribe to Lysias, who was governor of the east and a cruel minister of the persecution there against the Christians. This man, beholding the marvellous constancy of the martyrs, thirsted with the desire of martyrdom, for that he had privily learned the christian religion. Therefore he, not abiding for other accusers, detected himself, and worthily professed that he was a Christian, openly execrating the madness and vanity of the wicked gentiles. He therefore,

being carried away, was first tied up, and most bitterly beaten. After that, he was parched with fire being put into his bowels, and then basted with salt and vinegar; and lastly, so scotched and bemangled with the shards of sharp and cutting shells, that his whole body seemed to be all one continual wound: howbeit, by God's great goodness, afterward it was restored to the first integrity. After this he was carried away to Sebaste before Agricolaus, where, with his companion Orestes, he was burnt. Nicephorus saith, that at Nicopolis, in greater Armenia, the martyrs were in most miserable and pitiful wise handled, where Lysias had the execution thereof; at which time suffered Eugene, Auxentius, and Mardarius.<sup>F1388</sup> In Chalcedon suffered Euphemia, under Priscus the proconsul.<sup>F1389</sup> And in no less wise raged this persecution throughout all Egypt, where Eusebius maketh mention of Peleus and Nilus, martyrs and bishops in Egypt. But at Alexandria especially were declared most notable conflicts of christian and true constant martyrs that suffered; which Phileas the bishop of Thmuis<sup>f1390</sup> describeth, as after (God willing) shall be declared. In this persecution at Alexandria, the principal that then suffered was Peter, the bishop of Alexandria, with the elders of the same, most worthy martyrs: as Faustus, Didius, and Ammonius, also Phileas, Hesychius, Pachymius, and Theodorus; who all were bishops of the churches within Egypt, and besides them many other both famous and singular men.<sup>F1391</sup> The whole legion of christian soldiers, usually quartered at Thebes in Egypt<sup>f1392</sup> under the christian captain Maurice, when they would not obey the emperor's commandment touching the worshipping of images, were tithed to death once, and then again: and at last, through the exhortation of Maurice, died all together like constant martyrs,<sup>f1393</sup> Likewise at Antinoe in Egypt divers christian soldiers, notwithstanding they were seriously dissuaded, suffered death together, among whom were Ascla, Philemon, and Apollonius.<sup>F1394</sup> And also in the other parts of Africa, and Mauritania, was great persecution.<sup>F1395</sup> **Also [in Lesbos; a40 f1396 and in Samos, a94** of which place Chronicon<sup>f1397</sup> maketh mention; and Sicily, where were seventy-nine martyrs slain for the profession of Christ.<sup>F1398</sup>

Now let us come unto Europe. Henry of Herford saith, that at Rome, Johannes and Crispus, being priests, suffered execution as martyrs; and at Bologna,<sup>f1399</sup> Agricola and Vitalis;<sup>f1400</sup> and at Aquileia the emperor commanded to kill all the Christians.<sup>F1401</sup> And among those martyrs he

maketh mention of the two Felixes and Fortunatus <sup>f1402</sup> Regino also writeth, that in other places of Italy the persecution became great, as at Florence, Bergamo, Naples; at Benevento in Campania; at Venosa in Apulia; and in Tuscany: Henry of Herford saith, also, at Verona. In France, doubtless, Rectius Varus the prefect played the cruel hellhound, of whose great cruelty against the Christians many histories are full. <sup>F1403</sup> At Marseilles suffered Victor: <sup>f1404</sup> and at Marseilles, Maximian set forth his decree, that either they should all do sacrifice unto the gods of the Gentiles, or else be all slain with divers kinds of torments. Therefore many martyrs there died for the glory of Christ. <sup>F1405</sup> In Beauvais suffered Lucian. <sup>F1406</sup>

Vincentins and Regino <sup>f1407</sup> write of many places in Spain, where was great persecution, as at Merida, where suffered Eulalia, of whom more followeth hereafter; and Avila, where also suffered Vincentins, Sabina, and Christina. <sup>F1408</sup> At Toledo suffered Leocadia <sup>f1409</sup> the virgin; Saragossa were put to death eighteen; besides a great number of other martyrs who suffered under Dacian the governor, who afflicted with persecution all the coasts of Spain, as saith Vincentius. <sup>F1410</sup> The aforesaid Rectius made such persecution at Treves, near the river of Moselle, that the blood of the christian men that were slain ran like small brooks, and colored great and main rivers. Neither yet did this suffice him, but from thence he sent certain horsemen with his letters, commanding them to ride into every place, and charge all such as had taken and apprehended any Christians, that they should immediately put them to death. <sup>F1411</sup>

**Also Henry of Herford** <sup>a95</sup> and Regino make mention of great persecution to be at Cologne; and also at Augsburg in the province of Rhaetia, **where was martyred Afra** <sup>a96</sup> with her mother Hilaria. <sup>F1412</sup>

Bede also saith, that this persecution reached even unto the Britons, in his book “De ratione temporum.” And the Chronicle of Martinus <sup>f1413</sup> and “the Nosegay of Time” <sup>f1414</sup> do declare, that all the Christians in Britain were utterly destroyed: furthermore, that the kinds of death and punishment were so great and horrible, as no man’s tongue is able to express. In the beginning, when the emperor by his subtlety and wiliness rather dallied than showed his rigor, he threatened them with bands and imprisonment: but, within a while, when he began to work the matter in

good earnest, he devised innumerable sorts of torments and punishments, as whippings and scourgings, rackings, horrible scrapings, sword, fire, and ship-boats, wherein a great number being put, were sunk and drowned in the bottom of the sea. <sup>F1415</sup> Also hanging them upon crosses; binding them to the trunks of trees with their heads downwards; hanging them by the middles upon gallows till they died for hunger; throwing them alive to such kind of wild beasts as would devour them, as boars, bears, leopards and wild bulls; <sup>f1416</sup> pricking and thrusting them in with bodkins and iron claws, till they were almost dead; lifting them up on high with their heads downward, even as in Thebais they did unto the women, being naked and unclothed, one of their feet tied and lifted on high, and so hanging down with their bodies, which thing to see was very pitiful: with other devised sorts of punishments, most tragical or rather tyrannical, and pitiful to describe; as the binding of them to the boughs and arms of trees, forcibly bent together, then pulling and tearing asunder of their members and joints by letting go the said bent boughs and arms of trees; <sup>f1417</sup> the mangling of them with axes; the choking of them with smoke by small and slow fires; the mutilation of their hands and ears, and cutting off their other limbs; which things the holy martyrs of Alexandria suffered: the scorching and broiling of them with coals, not unto death, but every day renewed; with which kind of torment the martyrs at Antioch were afflicted. But in Pontus, other horrible punishments, and fearful to be heard, did the martyrs of Christ suffer; of whom some had their fingers' ends under the nails thrust in with sharp bodkins; some all-to besprinkled with boiling lead, having their most necessary members mutilated; others suffering most filthy and intolerable torments and pains in their bowels and privy members. <sup>F1418</sup>

To conclude, how great the outrage of the persecution which reigned in Alexandria was, and with how many and sundry kinds of new devised punishments the martyrs were afflicted, Phileas, the bishop of Thmuis, a man singularly well learned, hath described in his Epistle to the Thmuitans, the copy whereof Eusebius hath; out of the which we mean here briefly to recite somewhat:

Free leave being given to all persons, so disposed, to annoy the Christians, some beat them with cudgels, some with rods, others with whips; some again with leathern thongs, and others with

ropes. The spectacle of the beating was sometimes interchanged with other torments, exhibiting much wanton cruelty. For some of the martyrs, having their hands tied behind them, were suspended, on the wooden rack, and every limb was stretched out with certain machines: in this position the tormentors, by command of the judge, operated on them all over the body; and not only on the sides (as in the case of murderers), but also on the belly, the legs, and the cheeks they tortured them with scrapers. Others were hung up by one hand at a portico, the consequent straining of their limbs and joints causing them the most dreadful of all pain. Others were bound face to face against pillars, their feet not touching the ground, so that the cords, being strained by the weight of the body, were drawn tighter and tighter. And this they had to endure, not merely while the president was at leisure personally to attend them, but almost the whole day; for when he passed from them to others, he appointed officials to stay by those whom he left, and watch whether any of them, overcome by the tortures, seemed to flinch, charging them to brace with the cords unsparingly, and then when they were about to expire to let them down and haul them along the ground. "No care," said he, "ought to be taken of these Christians; let all treat them as unworthy the name of men."

Therefore our adversaries devised this second torture, to follow the beating. There were some, who, after they had been scourged, lay in the stocks, their feet being stretched four holes asunder; insomuch that they were obliged to lie in the stocks with their faces upward, unable to stand because of their fresh wounds, caused by the stripes which they had received all over their bodies. Others threw themselves on the ground, where they lay, by reason of the innumerable wounds made by their tortures exhibiting a spectacle more horrid to behold than the very operation of torture, and bearing on their bodies the varied torments devised against them. Some of the martyrs expired under their tortures, having shamed the adversary by their persevering constancy. Others, being half dead, were shut up in prison, where, in a few days, sinking under their sufferings, they were consummated. The residue having recovered by medical attention, became more stout and confident by time and their abode in prison. Therefore when, afterwards, a

new order was issued, and it was put to their choice, whether, by touching the detestable sacrifice, they would free themselves from all molestation, and obtain an acceptable liberty; or whether, refusing to sacrifice, they would abide the sentence of death; without hesitation, they cheerfully proceeded forth to death. For they well knew what was before prescribed to us by the sacred Scriptures: for “he (say they) that sacrificeth to other gods, shall be utterly destroyed:” and again, “Thou shalt have no other gods, but me.” (Exodus 22:20; 20:3. — ED.)

Thus much wrote Phileas to the congregation where he was bishop, before he received the sentence of death, being yet in bands; and in the same he exhorteth his brethren constantly to persist after his death in the truth of Christ professed. <sup>F1419</sup>

Sabellicus, in his seventh Ennead, and eighth book, saith that that christened man, who tore and pulled down the wicked edict of the emperor in Nicomedia, being flayed alive, <sup>f1420</sup> and afterwards washed in salt and vinegar, was then slain with this cruel kind of torment. Platina writeth, that Dorotheus and Gorgonius exhorted him to die so constantly. <sup>F1421</sup>

But, as all their torments were for their horribleness marvellous and notable, and therewithal so studiously devised, and no less grievous and sharp; so, notwithstanding, therewith were these martyrs neither dismayed nor overcome, but rather thereby confirmed and strengthened; so merrily and joyfully sustained they whatsoever was put unto them. Eusebius saith, that he himself beheld and saw the huge and great persecution that was done in Thebaid; insomuch that the very swords of the hangmen and persecutors being blunt with the great and often slaughter, they themselves for weariness sat down to rest them, and others were fain to take their places. And yet, all this notwithstanding, the murdered Christians showed their marvellous readiness, willingness, and divine fortitude, which they were indued with; with stout courage, joy, and smiling, receiving the sentence of death pronounced upon them, and sung even unto the last gasp hymns and psalms to God. So did also the martyrs of Alexandria, as witnesseth Phileas above-mentioned. “The holy martyrs,” saith he, “keeping Christ in their minds, being led with the love of better rewards, sustained whatsoever affliction and devised punishments they had to lay

upon them, and that not only at one time but also the second time, and bore not only all the menaces of the cruel soldiers, wherewith they threatened them in words, but also whatsoever in deed and work they could devise to their destruction; and that with most manly stomachs, excluding all fear by the perfection of their unspeakable love towards Christ; whose great strength and fortitude cannot by words be expressed.” And Sulpitius saith, in the second book of his Sacred History, that then the Christians, with more greedy desire, pressed and sought for martyrdom, than now they do desire bishoprics.

Although some there were also, as I have said, that with fear and threatenings, and by their own infirmities, were overcome and went back, <sup>f1422</sup> among whom Socrates nameth Meletius, <sup>f1423</sup> whom Athanasius, in his second Apology, calleth the bishop of Lycopolis, a city in Little Egypt; whom Peter the bishop of Alexandria excommunicated, for that in this persecution he sacrificed unto the Gentiles’ gods. Of the fall of Marcellinus, the bishop of Rome, I will speak afterwards; for he, being persuaded by others, and especially by the emperor Dioclesian himself, did sacrifice; whereupon he was excommunicated. But afterwards he, repenting the same, was again received into the congregation, and made martyr, as Platina and the compiler of the Book of the General Councils affirm. The number of the martyrs increased daily; sometimes ten, sometimes twenty were slain at once; some whiles thirty, and oftentimes threescore; and other whiles a hundred in one day, men, women, and children, by divers kinds of death. <sup>F1424</sup> Also Damasus, Bede, Orosius, **Honorius**, <sup>a97</sup> and others do witness, that there were slain in this persecution by the name of martyrs, within the space of thirty days, seventeen thousand persons, besides another great number and multitude that were condemned to the metal mines and quarries with like cruelty.

At Alexandria, with Peter the bishop, of whom I have made mention before, were slain with axes three hundred and above, as Sabel-liens declareth; Gereon <sup>f1425</sup> was beheaded at Cologne, with three hundred of his fellows, as saith Henry of Herford; Maurice, the captain of the christian legion, <sup>f1426</sup> with his fellows, six thousand six hundred and sixty-six. Victor, in the city of Troy, now called Xanthus, was slain, with his fellows, three hundred and threescore, as saith Otho of Frisingen. <sup>F1427</sup> Regino reciteth the names of many other martyrs, to the number of one hundred and twenty.

And forsomuch as mention here hath been made of Maurice and Victor, the particular description of the same history I thought here to insert, taken out of Ado, and other story-writers, as ensueth.

Maurice came out of Syria into France, <sup>f1428</sup> being captain of the band of the Theban soldiers, to the number of six thousand six hundred and threescore, being sent for of Maximian, to go against the rebellious Bagaudae; but rather, as it should seem, by the reason of the tyrant, who thought he might better in these quarters use his tyranny upon the Christians, than in the east part. These Thebans, with Maurice the captain, <sup>f1429</sup> after they had entered into Rome, were there, of Marcellinus the blessed bishop, confirmed in the faith, promising by oath, that they would rather be slain of their enemies, than forsake that faith which they had received; who followed the emperor's host through the Alps even into France. At that time the Caesareans were encamped not far from the town called Octodurum, <sup>f1430</sup> where Maximian offered sacrifice to his devils, and called all the soldiers, both of the east and west, to the same, strictly charging them by the altars of his gods, that they would fight against those rebels the Bagaudae, and persecute the christian enemies of the emperor's gods; which his commandment was showed to the Thebans' host, who were also encamped about the river Rhone, and in a place that was named Agaunum: <sup>f1431</sup> but to Octodurum they would in no wise come, for that every man did certainly appoint and persuade with themselves, rather in that place to die, than either to sacrifice to the gods, or bear armor against the Christians; which thing indeed very stoutly and valiantly they affirmed, upon their oath before taken to Maximian, when he sent for them. <sup>F1432</sup> Wherewith the tyrant, being wrathful and all moved, commanded every tenth man of that whole band to be put to the sword, whereto strivingly and with great rejoicing they committed their necks. To which notable thing and great force of faith, Maurice himself was a great encourager, who, by and by, with a most grave oration, exhorted and animated his soldiers both to fortitude and constancy; which, being again called of the emperor, answered in this wise, saying:

O emperor, we are your soldiers, but yet also, to speak freely, the servants of God. We owe to thee service of war, to him innocency: of thee we receive for our travail, wages; of him the beginning of life. In this we may in no wise obey thee, O emperor, to deny God

who is our author and Lord, and not ours only, but your author and Lord likewise, will ye, hill ye. If we be not enforced to do that whereby we shall offend him, doubtless, as we have hitherto, so we will yet obey you: but otherwise we will rather obey him than you. We offer here our hands against any real enemies: but to defile our hands with the blood of the innocent, that we may not do. These right hands of ours have skill to fight against the wicked and true enemies: but to spoil and murder the godly and our fellow-citizens, they have no skill at all. We have in remembrance that we took arms in hand for the defense of the citizens, and not against them. We have fought always for justice' sake, for piety, and for the welfare of the innocent. These have been always the rewards of our perils and travail. We have fought in the quarrel of faith, which in no wise we can keep to you, if we do not show the same to our God. We first sware allegiance to our God, then afterward to the king: and can you trust us in regard of the second, if we break the first? By us you would plague the Christians, to do which feat you must henceforth command others. We are here ready to confess God the Father, the author of all things, and we believe in his Son Jesus Christ our Lord. We see before our eyes our fellows, the partakers of our labors and travails, to be put to the sword, and we are sprinkled with their blood: of which our most holy comrades and brethren the end and death we have not bewailed nor mourned, but rather have given thanks, and have rejoiced, for that they have been counted worthy to suffer for the Lord their God. The extreme necessity of death hath not moved us in rebellion against your majesty, neither yet hath desperation, which is wont in danger to be so daring, armed us against you, O emperor. Behold here we have weapons, and yet resist not, for that we had rather to be killed, than kill; and guiltless die, than guilty live. Whatsoever more ye will command, appoint and enjoin us; we are here ready to suffer, yea, both fire and sword, and whatsoever other torments. We confess ourselves to be Christians, and Christians we cannot persecute. <sup>F1433</sup>

With which their answer, the king being altogether incensed and moved, commanded the second time the tenth man of them that were left, to be in

like case murdered. That cruelty also being accomplished, at length, when the christian soldiers would in no wise condescend unto his mind, he set upon them with his whole host, both footmen and also horsemen, and charged them to kill them all, who with all force set upon them: they, making no resistance, but throwing down their armor, yielded their lives to the persecutors, and offered to them their naked bodies.

Victor at the same time was not of that band, nor yet then any soldier; but being an old soldier, was dismissed for his age. At which time he, coming suddenly upon them as they were banqueting and making merry with the spoils of the holy martyrs, was bidden to sit down with them; who, first asking the cause of that their so great rejoicing, and understanding the truth thereof, detested the guests, and refused to eat with them. And then, being demanded of them whether haply he were a Christian or no, openly confessed and denied not but that he was a Christian, and ever would be. And thereupon they, rushing upon him, killed him, and made him partner of the like martyrdom and honor.

Bede, in his history, writeth that this persecution, being begun under Dioclesian, endured unto the seventh year of Constantine: and Eusebius saith, that it lasted until its tenth year. <sup>F1434</sup> It was not yet one year from the day in which Dioclesian and Maximian, joining themselves together, began their persecution, when that they saw the number of the Christians rather to increase than to diminish, notwithstanding all the cruelty that ever they could show, and now were out of all hope for the utter rooting out of them. Which thing was the cause of their first enterprise; and having now even their fill of blood, and loathing, as it were, the shedding thereof, they ceased at the last, of their own accord, to put any more Christians to death. But yet of a great multitude they thrust out their right eyes, and maimed their left legs at the ham with a searing iron, condemning them to the mines of metals, not so much for the use of their labor, as for the desire of afflicting them. And this was the clemency and release of the cruelty of those princes, who said that it was not meet that the cities should be defiled with the blood of their citizens, and to make the emperor's highness to be distained with the name of cruelty, but to show his princely beneficence and liberality to all men. <sup>F1435</sup>

When Dioclesian and Maximian had reigned together emperors one and twenty years (Nicephorus saith, two and twenty years), at length Dioclesian put himself from his imperial dignity at Nicomedia, and lived at Salona; Maximian at Milan; and led both of them a private life, in the three hundred and ninth year after Christ. <sup>f1436</sup> This strange and marvellous alteration gave occasion (and so it came to pass) that within short space after, there were in the Roman commonwealth many emperors at one time.

In the beginning of this persecution, you heard how Dioclesian, being made emperor, took to him Maximian. Also how these two, governing as emperors together, chose out two other Caesars under them, to wit, Galerius Maximian, and Constantius, the father of Constantine the Great. Thus then Dioclesian, reigning with Maximian, in the nineteenth year of his reign began his furious persecution against the Christians, whose reign after the same continued not long. For so it pleased God to put such a snaffle in the tyrant's mouth, that within two years after, he caused both him and Maximian (for what cause he knoweth) to give over their imperial function, and so remain not as emperors any more, but as private persons. So that they being now displaced and dispossessed, the imperial dominion remained with Constantius and Galerius Maximian, <sup>f1437</sup> which two divided the whole monarchy between them: so that Galerius should govern the east countries, and Constantius the west parts. But Constantius, as a modest prince, only contented with the imperial title, refused Italy and Africa, contenting himself only with France, Spain, and Britain. Wherefore **Galerius Maximian** <sup>a99</sup> chose to him Maximian and Severus, as Caesars. Likewise Constantius took Constantine his son, Caesar under him. In the mean time, while Galerius with: his two Caesars were in Asia, the Roman soldiers set up for their emperor Maxentius, the son of Maximian who had before deposed himself. Against whom Galerius the emperor of the East sent his son Severus, which Severus in the same voyage was slain of Maxentius, in whose place then Galerius took Licinius. And these were the emperors and Caesars, who, succeeding after Dioclesian and Maximian, prosecuted the rest of that persecution, which Dioclesian and Maximian before began, during near the space of seven or eight years, which was to the year of our Lord 313; save only that Constantius, with his son Constantine, was no great doer therein, but rather a maintainer and a supporter of the Christians. Which Constantius, surnamed Chlorus for his

paleness, was the son of Eutropius, a Roman of great nobility (he came of the line of AENEAS, as Laetus affirmeth), and Claudia, the daughter of Claudius Augustus. This man (as is before said) had not the desire of great and mighty dominions, and therefore parted he the empire with Galerius, and would rule but in France, Britain, and Spain, refusing the other kingdoms for the troublesome and difficult government of the same. Otherwise, he was a prince (as Eutropius maketh description of him) very excellent, civil, meek, gentle, liberal, and desirous to do good unto those that had any private authority under him. And as Cyrus once said, that he got treasure for himself when he made his friends rich, even so it is said that Constantius would oftentimes say, that it were better that his subjects had the public wealth, than he to have it hoarded in his own treasure-house. Also he was by nature sufficed with a little, insomuch that he used to eat and drink in earthen vessels (which thing was counted in Agathocles the Sicilian a great commendation); and if at any time cause required to garnish his table, he would send for plate and other furniture to his friends. In consequence of which virtues ensued great peace and tranquillity in all his provinces. To these virtues he added yet a more worthy ornament, <sup>f1438</sup> that is, devotion, love, and affection towards the word of God, as Eusebius affirmeth, <sup>f1439</sup> By which word being guided, he neither levied any wars contrary to piety and christian religion, neither aided he any others that did the same, neither destroyed he the churches, but commanded that the Christians should be preserved and defended, and kept them safe from all contumelious injuries. And when in the other jurisdictions of the empire the churches were molested with persecution, as Sozomen declareth, <sup>f1440</sup> he only gave license unto the Christians to live after their accustomed manner. This wonderful act of his following, besides others, doth show that he was a sincere follower <sup>f1441</sup> of the christian religion. Those which bare the chief offices amongst the Gentiles drave out of the emperors' courts all the godly Christians: whereupon this ensued, that the emperors themselves, at the last, were destitute of help, when those were driven away who, dwelling in their courts and living a godly life, poured out their prayers unto God for the prosperous estate and health both of the empire and the emperors. Constantius, therefore, minding at a certain time to try what sincere and good Christians he had yet in his court, called together all his officers and servants in the same, feigning himself to choose out such as would do sacrifice to devils, and that those only should dwell there and

keep their offices; and that those who would refuse to do the same, should be thrust out and banished the court. At this appointment, all the courtiers divided themselves into companies: the emperor marked who were the constantest and godliest from the rest. And when some said they would willingly do sacrifice, others openly and boldly refused to do the same; then the emperor sharply rebuked those who were so ready to do sacrifice, and judged them as false traitors unto God, accounting them unworthy to be in his court, who were such traitors to God; and forthwith commanded that they only should be banished the same. But greatly he commended those who refused to do sacrifice, and confessed God; affirming that they only were worthy to be about a prince; forthwith commanding that thenceforth they should be the trusty counsellors and defenders both of his person and kingdom; saying thus much more, that they only were worthy to be in office, whom he might make account of as his assured friends, and that he meant to have them in more estimation than the substance he had in his treasury. Eusebius maketh mention hereof in his first book of the life of Constantine, and also Sozomen in his first book and sixth chapter.

With this Constantius was joined (as hath been afore said) Galerius Maximian, a very civil man, as Eutropius affirmeth, and a passing good soldier; furthermore, a favorer of wise and learned men, of quiet disposition, not rigorous except in his drunkenness, whereof he would soon after repent him, as Victor writeth; but whether he meaneth Maximian the father, or **Maximin his son**, <sup>a100</sup> it is uncertain. But Eusebius far otherwise describeth the conditions of him, in his eighth book and fourteenth chapter. For he saith he was of a tyrannical disposition, the fearfullest man that might be, and curious in all magical superstition; insomuch that without the divinations and answers of devils, he durst do nothing at all, and therefore he gave great offices and dignities to enchanters. Furthermore, that he was an exactor and extortioner of the citizens, liberal to those that were flatterers, given to surfeiting and riot, a great drinker of wine, and in his furious drunkenness most like a madman, a ribald and adulterer, who came to no city but he ravished virgins and defiled men's wives. To conclude, he was so great an idolater, that he built up temples in every city, and repaired those that were fallen into decay, and appointed priests thereto, and chose out the most worthy of his

political magistrates to be the chief-priests, and devised that they should execute that their office with great authority and dignity, and also with warlike pomp. <sup>F1442</sup> But unto christian piety and religion, he was most hostile, and in the eastern churches exercised cruel persecution, and used as executioners of the same, Peucetius Quintian, Culcian, Theotecnus, and others. <sup>F1443</sup>

Notwithstanding, he was at length revoked from his cruelty by the just judgment and punishment of God. For he was suddenly vexed with a fatal disease most filthy and desperate, which disease to describe was very strange, taking the first beginning in his flesh outwardly, from thence it proceeded more and more to the inward parts of his body. For about the middle of the privy members of his body there happened unto him a sudden abscess to form, and afterwards in the fundament a spongy ulcer or fistula; both of which consumed and ate into his entrails, out of the which came forth an innumerable multitude of worms, with such a pestiferous stink, that no man could abide him; and so much more, for that all the grossness of his body, by abundance of meat before he fell sick, was turned also into fat; which fat now putrefied and stinking, was so uglisome and horrible, that none that came to him could abide the sight thereof. By reason whereof, the physicians who had him in cure, not able to abide the intolerable stink, some of them were commanded to be slain; others, because they could not heal him, being so swollen and past hope of cure, were also cruelly put to death. <sup>F1444</sup> At length, being put in remembrance that this disease was sent of God, he began to forethink the wickedness that he had done against the saints of God; and so coming again to himself, first confesseth to God all his offenses; then, calling them unto him who were about him, forthwith commanded all men to cease from the persecution of the Christians: requiring moreover that they should set up his imperial proclamations, for the restoring and re — EDifying of their temples, and that they should obtain of the Christians in their assemblies (which without all fear and doubt they might be bold to make), that they would devoutly pray to their God for the emperor. Then forthwith was the persecution stayed, and the imperial proclamations in every city were set up, containing the retraction or countermand of those things which against the Christians were before decreed, the copy whereof ensueth:

Amongst the other plans which we had conceived for the public profit and convenience, it was early our wish to reform all things according to the ancient laws and the national principles of the Romans; especially to devise means whereby the Christians, who have relinquished the opinions and usages of their parents, might be brought back to a right mind. For such a degree of arrogance and folly has (by some fancy) possessed them, that they will not follow the sanctions of their ancestors, which 'tis likely they also had before received from their parents; but they make laws for themselves, and observe them, just according to their own individual fancy and arbitrement, assembling large multitudes of people in divers places. Therefore, when we had published such an edict as should oblige them to return to the rites and ordinances of their ancestors; many of them were exposed to imminent dangers, and many, having been actually troubled, finally underwent death in various Forms. But when many persisted in this madness, and we perceived they did neither exhibit a due worship to the celestial gods, nor yet to the God of the Christians; having respect to our humanity and that continued usage by which we have been accustomed to exercise pardon towards all sorts of men—we have thought good most readily to extend our indulgence in this matter also; so that the Christians should again be tolerated, and that they should have license to rebuild the houses wherein they used to assemble themselves, and that they may not in future be forced to do any thing contrary to their principles. In another rescript we will signify to our judges what it shall behove them to observe. Wherefore, in gratitude for this our indulgence, they ought to supplicate their God both for our welfare and that of the commonwealth, as well as their own; that so, both public affairs may everywhere be kept in a wholesome state, and they themselves may live securely in their own dwellings. <sup>F1445</sup>

But one of the Caesars, whose name was Maximin, was not well pleased, when this countermand was published throughout all Asia, and the provinces where he had to do. Yet he, being qualified by this example, and feeling that it was not becoming for him to repugn the pleasure of those princes who had the chief authority, viz. Constantine and Galerius, set

forth of himself no edict touching the same; but commanded his officers by an unwritten order, that they should somewhat stay from the persecution of the Christians: of which commandment of the inferior Maximin, each of them gave intelligence unto their fellows by their letters. But Sabinus, who then amongst them all had the chiefest office and dignity, to the governor of every province wrote by his letter the emperor's pleasure, in this wise:

The majesty of our most sacred lords the emperors, with most earnest and devout care, long since determined to render the minds of all men conformable to a holy and correct way of living; so that they who seemed to have embraced usages different from those of the Romans should exhibit the due worship to the immortal gods. But the obstinate and most intractable perverseness of some persons was arrived at such a pass, that neither could the justice of the imperial edict prevail with them to recede from their own resolutions, nor the punishment annexed strike any terror into them. Since, therefore, it happened on this account, that many precipitated themselves into danger, the sacred majesty of our lords the most puissant emperors, considering (according to their innate generosity and piety) that it was far from the intention of their sacred majesties to involve people in so great a danger for such a cause as this, charged my excellency to write to your wisdom, that if evidence should be brought against any of the Christians of his following that way of worship observed by his sect, you should set him free from all danger and molestation, and that you should deem none worthy to be punished on this pretext; since it has evidently appeared in all this time, that they can by no means be persuaded to desist from their perverse stubbornness. Your prudence therefore is enjoined to write to the curators, <sup>f1446</sup> to the magistrates, and to the presidents of the villages belonging to every city, that they may understand, that for the future they are not to pay any attention to that edict. <sup>F1447</sup>

The governors therefore of the provinces, supposing this to be the determinate pleasure (and not feigned) of Maximin, did first advertise thereof the rustical and pagan multitude: after that, they released and set at liberty all such prisoners as were condemned to the metal-mines and to perpetual imprisonment for their faith, thinking thereby (wherein indeed

they were deceived) that the doing thereof would please Maximin. This, therefore, seemed to them as unlooked for as light to travelers in a dark night. They gather themselves together in every city, they call their synods and councils, and much marvel at the sudden change and alteration. The infidels themselves extol the only and true God of the Christians. The Christians receive again all their former liberties; and such as fell away before in the time of persecution, repent themselves, and after penance done, they returned again to the congregation. Now the Christians rejoiced in every city, praising God with hymns and psalms. <sup>F1448</sup> This was a marvellous-sudden alteration of the church, from a most unhappy state into a better. But scarce suffered Maximin the tyrant the same state of affairs six months unviolated to continue; for whatsoever seemed to make for the subversion of the same peace (yet scarcely hatched), that only did he meditate. And first of all he took from the Christians all liberty and leave for them to assemble and congregate in churchyards, on some pretext or other. After that he sent certain **miscreants unto the Antiochians**, <sup>a101</sup> to solicit them against the Christians, and to provoke them to ask of him, as a great favor, that he would not suffer any Christian to inhabit in their country: and amongst them was one Theotecnus, a most wicked miscreant, and an enchanter, and a most deadly enemy against the Christians. He first made the way whereby the Christians were put out of credit and accused to the emperor; to which base end, he also erected a certain idol of Jupiter to be worshipped or the enchanters and conjurers, and mingled the same worship with ceremonies, full of deceiveable witchcraft. Lastly, he caused the same idol to give this sound out of his mouth, that is: “Jupiter commandeth the Christians to be banished out of the city and suburbs of the same, as enemies unto him.” And the same sentence did the rest of the governors of the provinces publish against the Christians; and thus, at length, persecution began to kindle against them. Maximin also appointed priests in every city to offer sacrifice unto idols, and high-priests over these; and inveigled all those that were in great offices under him, that they should do all in their power against the Christians, and that they should with new-devised stratagems against them (as that would please him) put as many to death as by any means they might. (See Euseb. lib. 9 cap. 3, 4. — ED.) They also **did counterfeit** <sup>a102</sup> certain “Acts” of Pilate and our Savior Christ, full of blasphemy, and sent the same into all the dominion of Maximin; by their letters commanding, that the same should be published

and set up in every city and suburbs of the same, and that they should be delivered to the schoolmasters, to cause their scholars to learn the same by rote. <sup>F1449</sup>

After that, one named “praefectus castrorum” <sup>f1450</sup> (whom the Romans call “Dux”) at Damascus, in Phoenicia, allured certain light women, taken out of the market-place, by threats of torture, that they should openly say in writing, that they were once Christians, and that they knew what wicked and lascivious acts the Christians were wont to practice amongst themselves upon the Sundays; and what other things they thought good to make more of their own head, to the slander of the Christians. The captain showeth unto the emperor their words, as though it had been so indeed; and the emperor by and by commanded the same to be published throughout every city. Furthermore, they did hang in the midst of every city (which was never done before) the emperor’s edicts against the Christians, graven in tables of brass. **And the children** <sup>a103</sup> in the schools, with great noise and clapping of hands, did all the day resound “Jesus and Pilate,” and the contumelious blasphemies contained in those counterfeit “Acts,” after a most despiteful manner. <sup>F1451</sup> And this is the copy of the edict, which Maximin caused to be fastened to the pillars, fraught with all arrogant and insolent hate against God and Christ:

The human mind, weak and yet presumptuous as it is,—having shaken off and dispersed every cloud and mist of error which heretofore invested the senses of men (not so much wicked as wretched) involved in the fatal night of ignorance—has now at length discerned, that all things are undoubtedly ordered and settled by the gracious providence of the immortal gods. You cannot conceive how grateful, delightful, and acceptable a thing it was to us, when you gave such a proof of your pious disposition towards the gods; though before this, no person was ignorant what reverence and religious worship you showed towards the immortal gods; to whom you are well known, not by a faith of bare and empty words, but by a course of astonishing and glorious actions; upon which account your city may deservedly be styled—”The seat and mansion of the immortal gods.” <sup>F1452</sup> For it is evident by many instances that she flourisheth through the presence of the celestial deities in her. For lo! your city—as soon as it perceived

that the followers of that accursed vanity began to creep again, and [revive] like a smoldering fire, which, when the embers are stirred up, bursteth out afresh in a very great blaze—neglecting every thing that was for its own particular benefit, and overlooking former supplications made to us in its own behalf—immediately, without the least delay, had recourse to our piety as to the metropolis of all religion, petitioning for some remedy and assistance. 'Tis evident that the gods have instilled into your minds this wholesome resolution, on account of your faithful perseverance in your religion. Yea, the most high and mighty Jupiter (who presides over your most famous city, and preserveth your country gods, your wives and children, your families and houses, from all manner of evil) hath breathed into your minds this salutary resolution; plainly demonstrating thereby what an excellent, noble, and salutary thing it is, with due reverence to adore the immortal gods and to approach their sacred ceremonies. For what man can there be found so foolish and so void of all reason, as not to perceive, that it is through the gracious care of the gods that it cometh to pass—that the earth denies not the seeds committed to it, frustrating the hopes of the husbandmen with vain expectations; and that the aspect of impious war is not immovably fixed on the earth; and that men's bodies are not perpetually pining to death through a corrupt and disordered state of the air; and that the sea, tossed with the blowing of furious winds, doth not swell and overflow; and that sudden blasts, breaking fourth unexpectedly, do not raise a destructive hurricane: and lastly, that the earth (the nurse and mother of all things), shaken by a horrid trembling, doth not heave from its own inmost caverns; or that the mountains which lie upon it are not engulfed in the opening chasms. All these calamities—yea, far more horrible than these—have often occurred, as every one knoweth. And all these evils lay upon *us*, because of the pernicious error and empty folly of those wicked men, at the precise time when it abounded in their souls, and (as I may say) burdened the whole earth with shame and confusion. [And after the interposition of some words he continues] But now—let men cast their eyes over the corn fields, flourishing in the wide champaign and waving with ears; and upon

the meadows blooming with flowers and grass after seasonable showers; let them consider the state of the air how temperate and calm it is again become. In future let all men rejoice, for that by your piety, by your sacrifices, and religious worship, the fury of that most powerful and stern god Mars is appeased; and for this reason let them securely solace themselves in the quiet enjoyment of a most serene peace. <sup>F1453</sup> And, as many as have wholly abandoned that blind error, and from their wanderings have returned to a right and sound temper of mind—let them specially rejoice as they would do, had they been delivered from an unforeseen tempest or a dangerous disease; assured, that for the remainder of their lives they will reap sweet enjoyment. But if any shall wilfully persist in their execrable folly, let them be banished and driven far from your city and neighborhood, according to your request; that by this means your city, being (in consequence of your commendable anxiety in this affair) freed from all pollution and impiety, may (agreeably to its natural inclination) attend with due devotion upon the sacrifices of the immortal gods. And that you may know how acceptable your petition on this subject was to us, and how predisposed our soul is to gracious acts of its own voluntary motion, and without any memorializing or solicitation; we permit your devotion to ask whatever magnificent gift you may desire to have presented to you, in recompense of this your godly disposition. Now, therefore, make it your business to ask and receive some great boon; for you shall obtain it without any delay. And this, once being granted to your city, shall be a testimony throughout all ages of your most fervent piety towards the immortal gods; and shall also be an evidence to your children and descendants, that, for this excellent course of life you received due rewards from our gracious goodness. <sup>f1454</sup>

Thus came it to pass that at length the persecution was as great as ever it was, and the magistrates of every province were very disdainful against the Christians, condemning some to death, and some to exile. Among whom they condemned three Christians at Emisa in Phoenicia; among whom was Sylvanus the bishop of Emisa, a very old man, having been forty years in that function. Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, being brought to Nicomedia,

after he had exhibited to the emperor his apology concerning the doctrine of the Christians, was cast into prison, and afterward put to death. At Alexandria, Peter, the most worthy bishop of that church, was beheaded, with whom many other Egyptian bishops also died, <sup>f1455</sup> In Amasaea [a city of Cappadocia], Bringas, the lieutenant of Maximin, had at that time the executing of that persecution. <sup>f1456</sup> Quirinus, the bishop of Siscia in Croatia, having a millstone tied about his neck, was thrown headlong from the bridge into the flood, and there a long while floated above the water; and, having spoken to the lookers-on, that they should not be dismayed with that his punishment, prayed fervently that he might be, and was with much ado, drowned. <sup>f1457</sup> At Rome died Marcellinus the bishop, as saith Platina; also Timothy the presbyter, with many other bishops and priests were martyred. To conclude, many in sundry places everywhere were martyred, whose names <sup>f1458</sup> the book, intituled “Fasciculus temporum,” declareth; <sup>f1459</sup> as, Victorian, Symphorian, Castorins with his wife, Castulus; Caesarius; Mennas; Nobilis; Peter, Dorotheus, and Gorgonins; and other innumerable martyrs; Erasmus; Boniface; Juliana; Cosmas and Damian; Basilian, with seven others; Dorothea, Theophihs, Theodosia; Vitalis, and Agricola; Ascla <sup>f1460</sup> and Philemon; Irenaeus; Januarius, Festus, and Desiderius; Gregory, a presbyter of Spoleto; Agape, Chionia, and Irene; Theodora, and two hundred threescore and ten other. martyrs; Florian; Primus and Felician; Vitus, Modestus, and Crescentia; Alban; Rogatian and Donatian; Paneras; Catharina; <sup>f1461</sup> Margareta; Lucia the Virgin; Agnes; Christopher; <sup>f1462</sup> Simplicius, Faustin, and Beatrix; Pantaleon; George; Justus; Leocadia; Antonia, and other more (to an infinite number), suffered martyrdom in this persecution, whose names God hath written in the book of life; also Felix; Victor with his parents; Lucia the widow, and Geminian; with threescore and nineteen others; Sabinus; Anastasia and Chry-sogon; Felix and Adauctus; Adrian, Natalia, Eugenia. <sup>f1463</sup> Agnes also, when she was but thirteen years old, was martyred. Eusebius rehearseth these kinds of torments and punishments; that is to say, fire, wild beasts, the sword, crucifixion, drowning in the depths of the sea, the cutting and burning of the members, the thrusting out of the eyes, maiming of the whole body, hunger, the mines, imprisonment, and whatsoever other cruelty the magistrates could devise. All which notwithstanding, the godly ones, rather than that they would do sacrifice, as they were bid, manfully endured. Neither were the women any

thing at all behind; for they, being enticed to the filthy use of their bodies, rather suffered banishment, or willingly killed themselves. <sup>f1464</sup> Neither yet could the Christians live safely in the wilderness, but were fetched even from thence to death and torments; insomuch that this latter persecution under Maximin (a tyrant rather than a prince) was more grievous than was the former, cruel as that was. <sup>f1465</sup>

And forsomuch as ye have heard the cruel edict of Maximin proclaimed against the Christians, graven in brass, which he thought perpetually should endure to the abolishing of Christ and his religion; now mark again the great handywork of God, which immediately fell upon the same, checking the proud presumption of the tyrant, proving all to be false and contrary, that in the brazen proclamation was contained. For whereas the aforesaid edict boasted so much of the prosperity and plenty of all things in the same time of this persecution of the Christians, suddenly befel such unseasonable drought, with famine and pestilence among the people, besides also the wars with the Armenians, that all was found untrue that he had bragged so much of before. By reason of which famine and pestilence the people were greatly consumed, insomuch that one measure of wheat was sold for two thousand and five hundred pieces of money of Attic drachms; <sup>f1466</sup> by reason whereof innumerable died in the cities, but many more in the country and villages, so that most part of the husbandmen and countrymen died up with the famine and pestilence. Divers there were which bringing out their best treasure, were glad to give it for any kind of sustenance, were it never so little. Others, selling away their possessions, fell by reason thereof to extreme poverty and beggary. Certain, eating grass, and feeding on other unwholesome herbs, were fain to relieve themselves with such food as did hurt and poison their bodies. Also a number of women of good family in the cities, being brought to extreme misery and penury, were constrained to come forth, and fall to begging in the market-place. Some others, pined and withered like ghosts, without breath, reeling and staggering this way and that, from inability to stand fell down in the middle of the streets, and lying at full length with their faces downward, craved for some little morsel of bread to be given them; and being at the last gasp, ready to give up the ghost, and not able to utter any other words, still dolefully they cried out, that they were hungry. Of the richer sort, divers there were who, being weary with the number of beggars

and askers, after they had bestowed largely upon them, became hard-hearted, fearing lest they should fall into the same misery themselves, as those who begged. By reason whereof, the market-places, streets, lanes, and alleys, were full of dead and naked bodies, which lay cast out and unburied, to the pitiful and grievous beholding of them that saw them; whereof many were eaten of dogs: for which cause they that survived fell to the killing of dogs, lest they, running mad, should fall upon them and kill them.

In like manner the pestilence, scattering through all houses and ages of men, did no less consume them; especially those who through having plenty of victuals had escaped famine. Wherefore the rich governors of provinces, and presidents, and innumerable magistrates, being the more apt to receive the infection by reason of their plenty, were quickly dispatched and turned up their heels. Thus the miserable multitude being consumed with famine and with pestilence, all places were full of mourning; neither was there any thing else seen but wailing and weeping in every corner. So that death, what for famine and pestilence, in short time brake up and consumed whole households, two or three dead bodies being borne out together from the same house in one funeral. These were the rewards of the vain brags of Maximin and his edicts, which he did publish in all towns and cities against us.

At which time it was evident to all men, how diligent and charitable the Christians were to all men in this their miserable extremity. For they only, in all this time of distress, showed compassion upon them, travailing every day, some in tending the sick, and some in burying the dead, who otherwise of their own sort were forsaken. Others of the Christians, calling and gathering the multitude together, which were in jeopardy of famine, distributed bread unto them; <sup>f1467</sup> whereby they ministered occasion to all men to glorify the God of the Christians, and to confess them to be the true worshippers of God, as appeared by their works. By the means and reason hereof, the great God and defender of the Christians, who before had showed his anger and indignation against all men for their wrongful afflicting of us, opened again unto us the comfortable light of his providence; so that by means thereof peace fell unto us, as light unto them that sit in darkness, to the great admiration of all men, who easily perceived God himself to be a perpetual Director of our affairs; who many

times chasteneth his people with calamities for a time to exercise them, but after sufficient correction again showeth himself merciful and favorable to those who with trust call upon him. <sup>f1468</sup>

By the narration of these things heretofore premised, taken out of the History of Eusebius, like as it is manifest to see, so it is wonderful to mark; and note, how those counsels and rages of the Gentiles achieved against Christ and his Christians, when they seemed most sure against them, were most against themselves; and whereby they thought most to confound the church and religion of Christ, the same turned most to their own confusion, and to the profit and praise of the Christians; God, of his marvellous wisdom, so ordering and disposing the end of things. For whereas the brazen edict of the emperor promised temperate weather, God sent drought; whereas it promised plenty, God immediately sent upon them famine and penury; whereas it promised health, God struck them even upon the same with grievous pestilence, and with other more calamities, in such sort that the most relief they had was chiefly by the Christians; to the great praise of them, and to the honor of our God.

Thus most plainly and evidently was then verified the true promise of Christ to his church, affirming and assuring us, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his church builded upon his faith: (Matthew 16:18.) as sufficiently may appear by these ten persecutions above specified and described; wherein as no man can deny but that Satan and his malignant world have essayed the uttermost of their power and might to overthrow the church of Jesus, so must all men needs grant, who read these stories, that when Satan and the gates of hell have done their worst, yet have they not prevailed against this mount of Sion, nor ever shall. For else what was here to be thought,—where so many emperors and tyrants together, Dioclesian, Maximian, Galerius, Maximin, Severus, Maxentius, Licinius, with their captains and officers, were let loose, like so many lions, upon a scattered and unarmed flock of sheep, intending nothing else but the utter subversion of Christianity; and especially also when laws were set up in brass against the Christians, as a thing perpetually to stand;—what was here to be looked for, but a final desolation of the name and religion of Christians? But what followed, partly ye have heard, partly more is to be marked, as in the story followeth.

I showed before how Maxentius, the son of Maximian, was set up at Rome by the praetorian soldiers to be emperor. Whereunto the senate, although they were not consenting, yet for fear they were not resisting. Maximian his father, who had before deprived himself with Dioclesian, hearing of this, took heart again to him, to resume his dignity, and so labored to persuade Dioclesian also to do the same: but when he could not move him thereunto, he repaireth to Rome, thinking to wrest the empire out of his son's hands. But when the soldiers would not suffer that, of a crafty purpose he flieth to Constantine in France, under pretense to complain of Maxentius his son, but in very deed to kill Constantine. Notwithstanding, that conspiracy being detected by Fausta the daughter of Maximian, whom Constantine had married, so was Constantine through the grace of God preserved, and Maximian retired back: in the which his flight, by the way he was apprehended, and so put to death. And this is the end of Maximian.

Now let us return to Maxentius again, who all this while reigned at Rome with tyranny and wickedness intolerable, much like to another Pharaoh or Nero; for he slew the most part of his noblemen, and took from them their goods. And sometimes in his rage he would destroy great multitudes of the people of Rome by his soldiers, as Eusebius declareth. <sup>f1469</sup> Also he left no mischievous nor lascivious act unattempted, but was the utter enemy of all womanly chastity; who used to send the honest wives, whom he had adulterated, with shame and dishonesty unto their husbands (being worthy senators), after that he had ravished them. He abstained from no adulterous act, but was inflamed with the unquenchable lust of deflowering of women. Laetus declareth that he being that time far in love with a noble and chaste gentlewoman of Rome, sent unto her such courtiers of his as were meet for that purpose, whom also he had in greater estimation than any others, and with such was wont to consult about matters for the common weal. These first fell upon her husband and murdered him within his own house: <sup>f1470</sup> then when they could by no means, neither with fear of the tyrant, or with threatening of death, pull her away from him, at length she, being a Christian, desired leave of them to go into her chamber, and after her prayers she would accomplish that which they requested. And when she had gotten into her chamber under this pretense, she killed herself. But the courtiers, when they saw that the woman tarried so long, they, being

displeased therewith, brake open the doors, and found her there lying dead. Then returned they, and declared this matter to the emperor; who was so far past shame, that, instead of repentance, he was the more set on fire in attempting the like.

He was also much addicted to the art magical, which to execute he was more fit than for the imperial dignity. Also sometimes he would rip women with child; sometimes he would search the bowels of newborn infants. Often he would invoke devils in a secret manner, and by the answers of them he sought to repel the wars which he knew Constantine and Licinius prepared against him. And to the end he might the better perpetrate his mischievous and wicked attempts, which in his ungracious mind he had conceived, according to his purpose, in the beginning of his reign he feigned himself to be a favourer of the Christians; in which thing doing, thinking to make the people of Rome his friends, he commanded that they should cease from persecuting the Christians. And he himself in the mean season abstained from no contumelious vexation of them, till that he began at the last to show himself an open persecutor of them: at which time, as Zonaras writeth, he most cruelly raged against the Christians thereabouts, vexing them with all manner of injuries. Which things he in no less wise did, than Maximin, as Eusebius <sup>f1471</sup> seemeth to affirm. And Platina declareth, in the life of Marcellinus the bishop [of Rome], that he banished a certain noble woman of Rome, because she gave her goods to the church.

Thus, by the grievous tyranny and unspeakable wickedness of this Maxentius the citizens and senators of Rome being much grieved and oppressed, sent their complaints with letters unto Constantine, with much suit and most hearty petitions, desiring him to help and release their country and city of Rome; who, hearing and understanding their miserable and pitiful state, and grieved therewith not a little, first sendeth by letters to Maxentius, desiring and exhorting him to restrain his corrupt doings and great cruelty. But when no letters nor exhortations would prevail, at length pitying the woful case of the Romans, he gathered together his power and army in Britain and France, therewith to repress the violent rage of that tyrant: thus Constantine, sufficiently appointed with strength of men, but especially with strength of God, entered his journey coming towards Italy, which was about the last year of the persecution. Maxentius,

understanding of the coming of Constantine, and trusting more to his devilish art of magic than to the good-will of his subjects, which he little deserved, durst not show himself out of the city, nor encounter with him in the open field, but with privy garrisons laid wait for him by the way in sundry straits, as he should come; with whom Constantine had divers skirmishes, and by the power of the Lord did ever vanquish them and put them to flight. <sup>f1472</sup> Notwithstanding, Constantine yet was in no great comfort, but in great care and dread in his mind (approaching now near unto Rome) for the magical charms and sorceries of Maxentius, wherewith he had vanquished before Severus, sent by Galerius against him, as hath been declared, which made also Constantine the more afraid. Wherefore, being in great doubt and perplexity in himself, and revolving many things in his mind, what help he might have against the operations of his charming (who used to rip open women great with child, and to take his devilish charms by the entrails of the new-born infants, with such other like feats of devilishness which he practiced), these things (I say) Constantine doubting and revolving in his mind, in his journey drawing toward the city, and casting up his eyes many times to heaven, in the south part, about the going down of the sun, <sup>f1473</sup> he saw a great brightness in heaven, appearing in the similitude of a cross, with certain stars of equal bigness, giving this inscription like Latin letters, “In hoc vince,” that is, “In this overcome.” <sup>f1474</sup> This miraculous vision to be true, for the more credit. Eusebius Pamphilus in the first book of his “De Vita, Constantini” doth witness moreover, that he had heard the said Constantine himself oftentimes report, and also to swear this to be true and certain, which he did see with his own eyes in heaven, and also his soldiers about him. At the sight whereof when he was greatly astonied, and consulting with his men upon the meaning thereof, behold, in the night season in his sleep, Christ appeared to him with the sign of the same cross which he had seen before, bidding him to make the figuration thereof, and to carry it in his wars before him, and so should he have the victory. <sup>f1475</sup>

Wherein is to be noted, good reader, that this sign of the cross, and these letters added withal “In hoc vince,” was given to him of God, not to induce any superstitious worship or opinion of the cross, as though the cross itself had any such power or strength in it, to obtain victory; but only to bear the meaning of another thing, that is, to be an admonition to him to

seek and aspire to the knowledge and faith of Him who was crucified upon the cross, for the salvation of him and of all the world, and so to set forth the glory of his name, as afterward it came to pass. This by the way. Now to the matter.

The next day following after this night's vision, Constantine caused a cross after the same figuration to be made of gold and precious stone, and to be borne before him instead of his standard; and so with much hope of victory, and great confidence, as one armed from heaven, he seedeth himself toward his enemy. <sup>f1476</sup> Against whom Maxentius, being constrained perforce to issue out of the city, sendeth all his power to join with him in the field beyond the river Tiber; where Maxentius, craftily breaking down the bridge called "Pons Milvius," caused another deceitful bridge to be made of boats and wherries, being joined together and covered over with boards and planks, in manner of a bridge, thinking therewith to take Constantine as in a trap. But herein came to pass, that which in the seventh Psalm is written, "He made a pit and digged it, and is fallen into the ditch which he made; his mischief shall return upon his own head, and his violent dealing shall come down upon his own pate:" which here in this Maxentius was rightly verified; for after the two hosts did meet, he, being not able to sustain the force of Constantine fighting under the cross of Christ against him, was put to such a flight, and driven to such an exigence, that, in retiring back upon the same bridge which he did lay for Constantine (for haste, thinking to get the city), he was over-turned by the fall of his horse into the bottom of the flood; and there with the weight of his armor he, and a great part of his beaten men, was drowned: representing unto us the like example of Pharaoh and his host drowned in the Red Sea, who not unaptly seemeth to bear a prophetic figuration of this Maxentius. For as the children of Israel were in long thralldom and persecution in Egypt under tyrants there, till the drowning of this Pharaoh their last persecutor; so was this Maxentius the last persecutor in the Roman monarchy of the Christians; whom this Constantine, fighting under the cross of Christ, did vanquish, and set the Christians at liberty; who before had been persecuted now three hundred years in Rome, as hath been hitherto in this history declared. Wherefore as the Israelites with their Moses, at the drowning of their Pharaoh, sang gloriously unto the Lord, who miraculously had cast down the horse and horsemen into the sea,

(Exodus 15.) so no less rejoicing and exceeding gladness was here, to see the glorious hand of the Lord Christ fighting with his people, and vanquishing his enemies and persecutors. <sup>f1477</sup>

In histories we read of many victories and great conquests gotten, yet we never read, nor ever shall, of any victory so wholesome, so commodious, so opportune to mankind as this was; which made an end of so much bloodshed, and obtained so much liberty and life to the posterity of so many generations. For albeit that some persecution was yet stirring in the East countries by Maximin and Licinius, as shall be declared; yet in Rome, and in all the West parts, no martyr died after this heavenly victory gotten. And also in the East parts, the said Constantine, with the said cross borne before him, consequently upon the same, so vanquished the tyrants, and so established the peace of the church, that for the space of a just thousand years after that, we read of no set persecution against the Christians, unto the time of John Wickliff; when the bishops of Rome began with fire to persecute the true members of Christ, as in further process of this history (Christ granting) shall appear. So happy, so glorious (as I said), was this victory of Constantine, surnamed the Great. For the joy and gladness whereof, the citizens who had sent for him before, with exceeding triumph brought him into the city of Rome, where he with the cross was most honorably received, and celebrated the space of seven days together; having, moreover, in the market-place, his image set up, holding in his right hand the sign of the cross, with this inscription: “With this wholesome sign, the true token of fortitude, I have rescued and delivered our city from the yoke of the tyrant.” <sup>f1478</sup>

By this heavenly victory of Constantine, and by the death of Maxentius, no little tranquillity came unto the church of Christ: although, notwithstanding, in the East churches the storm of this tenth persecution was not yet altogether quieted, but that some tail thereof in those parts remained for the space of two or three years. But of this we mind to speak (Christ willing) hereafter. In the mean season, to return again to the West parts here in Europe, where Constantine then had most to do, great tranquillity followed, and long continued in the church without any open slaughter for a thousand years together <sup>f1479</sup> (to the time of John Wickliff and the Waldenses, as is before touched), by the means of the godly beginning of good Constantine; who, with his fellow Licinius, being now

established in their dominion, afterwards set forth their general proclamation or edict, not constraining therein any man to any religion, but giving liberty to all men, both for the Christians to persist in their profession without any danger, and for other men freely to adjoin with them, whosoever pleased. Which thing was very well taken, and highly allowed, of the Romans and all wise men. The copy of the edict or constitution here ensueth.

**THE COPY OF THE IMPERIAL CONSTITUTION<sup>F1480</sup> OF CONSTANTINE AND LICINIUS, FOR THE ESTABLISHING OF THE FREE WORSHIPPING OF GOD AFTER THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.<sup>F1481</sup>**

Having long since perceived, that liberty in religion ought not to be withheld, but that every one who hath a mind and will of his own on the subject should have the privilege of acting therein according to his own predilection, we had given orders, that all men, the Christians in particular, should be permitted to retain the creed of their respective religious persuasions. But soon after the decree, granting the said permission, was published,<sup>F1482</sup> with the names of many different sects clearly specified therein, it so happened (accidentally perhaps) that some of the parties alluded to drew back from their previous profession. When, therefore, by good fortune, we, Constantine and Licinius, emperors, had come to Milan, and had taken into consideration all matters which bore on the prosperity and comfort of the community; among other matters which promised to be in many ways important to all, or rather first and foremost of all, we resolved to settle those which involved the reverence and worship of the Deity; that is, that we would grant both to the Christians and all others a free choice to follow whatever religion they please; that so, the Deity, or Heavenly Being (whatever it is), may be propitious both to ourselves and all our subjects. This, then, on sound and conscientious deliberation, we decided to be our will and pleasure—that no individual whatever should be denied the privilege of choosing and following the religious profession of the Christians; and that every one should have a right of devoting his mind to that religion which he thinks most agreeable to himself; that so God may in all things

manifest his wonted care and kindness towards us. It was expedient that we should signify to you this our will and pleasure, in order that those names of sects which were inserted in our former rescript to your excellency concerning the Christians, might be taken clean out, and every thing cancelled which appeared ungracious and at variance with our accustomed mildness; and also that every one of those disposed to adhere to the religion of the Christians may now freely and constantly profess the same without any molestation. These things, I repeat, we resolved fully to intimate to your prudence, in order that you may be aware that we have thus granted to the Christians a free and absolute liberty of exercising their religion. And this liberty (as your excellency observes) is absolutely granted by us not only to *them*, but *all others* also who wish for it have the privilege allowed them of following their own religious profession. And it is evidently conducive to the quietness of this our time, that every one should have this privilege of choosing and exercising whatever religion he pleases; and we have ordered it so, that we might not seem in the least to disparage any mode of religious worship whatever. We also further decree in favor of the Christians, that those places of theirs wherein they used formerly to convene, and concerning which, in the former rescript sent to your excellency, a different plan was laid down, that in case it should appear that any persons have purchased any of them, either from our exchequer or from any, one else, they shall restore the same to the said Christians without fee or demand of the price paid for them, and without impediment or evasion: and that, if any persons have received any of them by way of donation, they should forthwith restore them to the Christians in like manner. And if either those who have bought such places, or those who have received them by donation, desire any compensation from our goodness, let them go to the chief justice of the province, and they shall be provided for by our bounty. And it shall be your duty to take care that all such places be restored to the society of Christians without delay. And whereas the said Christians are known to have possessed not only those places wherein they used to convene, but others also, not belonging to any individual among them, but the property of the society—all these

places (in conformity with the law just announced) you shall order to be restored without any demur whatever to the said Christians, that is, to each society and assembly of them respectively; the rule made in the other case being here also observed, viz, that those who shall restore the said places without demanding the price which they had paid for them (as aforesaid), may expect to be indemnified by our gracious liberality. Now, in relation to all these matters, you are to exert yourself vigorously, for the sake of the society of Christians aforesaid, that our mandate be executed as promptly as possible, by which means you will at the same time be providing for the general peace of the community. And thus (as we said before) the divine favor, which we have already in many cases experienced, will be secured to continue with us for ever. Finally, to the end that the definitive determination of these our gracious enactments may come to all men's knowledge, it is expedient that this rescript of ours be put up to public view, and made known to all persons; so that nobody may be ignorant of these our gracious enactments.

By these histories I doubt not, good reader, but thou dost right well consider and behold with thyself the marvellous working of God's mighty power; to see so many emperors at one time conspired and confederate together against the Lord and Christ his anointed, whose names before we have recited, as Dioclesian, Maximian, Galerius, Maxentius, Maximin, Severus, Licinius; who, having the subjection of the whole world under their dominion, did bend and extend their whole might and devices to extirpate the name of Christ, and of all Christians. Wherein, if the power of man could have prevailed, what could they not do? or what could they do more than they did? If policy or devices could have served, what policy was there lacking? If torments or pains of death could have helped, what cruelty of torment by man could be invented which was not attempted? If laws, edicts, proclamations, written not only in tables, but engraven in brass, could have stood, all this was practiced against the weak Christians. And yet, notwithstanding, to see how no counsel can stand against the Lord, (Psalm 2.) note here how all these be gone, and yet Christ and his church doth stand. First, of the taking away of Maximian you have heard; also of the death of Severus; of the drowning, moreover, of Maxentius,

enough hath been said. What a terrible plague was upon Galerius, consuming his privy members with worms, hath been also described. How Dioclesian the quondam emperor, being at Salona, <sup>f1483</sup> hearing of the proceedings of Constantine and of this edict, either for sorrow died, or, as some say, did poison himself. Only Maximin now in the East parts remained alive, who bare a deadly hatred against the Christians, and no less expressed the same with mortal persecution; to whom Constantine and Licinius caused this constitution of theirs to be delivered. At the sight whereof, although he was somewhat appalled and defeated of his purpose, yet forsomuch as he saw himself too weak to resist the authority of Constantine and Licinius the superior princes, he dissembled his counterfeit piety, as though he himself had tendered the quiet of the Christians, directing down a certain decree in the behalf of the Christians, wherein he pretendeth to write to Sabinus aforementioned, first repeating unto him the former decree of Dioclesian and Maximian in few words, with the commandment therein contained, touching the persecution against the Christians. After that, he reciteth the decree which he himself made against them, when he came first to the imperial dignity in the East part joined with Constantine. Then the countermand of another decree of his again, for the rescuing of the Christians, with such feigned and pretended causes, as are in the same to be seen. After that, he declareth how he, coming to Nicomedia, at the suit and supplication of the citizens of Antioch (which he also feigned, as may appear before), he applying to their suit, revoked that his former edict, and granted them that no Christian should dwell within their city or territories. Upon which Sabinus also had given forth his letters, rehearsing withal the general recountermand sent forth by him, for the persecution again of the Christians. Last of all now he sendeth down again another surrecountermand, with the causes therein contained, touching the safety of the Christians, and tranquillity of them, commanding Sabinus to publish the same; which edict of his is at large set forth of Eusebius. <sup>F1484</sup> But in this surrecountermand he then dissembled, as he had done in the other before. Howbeit shortly after, he, making wars, and fighting a battle with Licinius, wherein he lost the victory, coming home again, took great indignation against the priests and prophets of his gods, whom before that time he had great regard unto, and honored: upon whose answers he trusting, and depending upon their enchantments, began his war against Licinius. But after that he perceived himself to be deceived

by them, as by wicked enchanters and deceivers, and such as had betrayed his safety and person, he killed and put them to death. And he shortly after, oppressed with a certain disease, glorified the God of the Christians, and made a most absolute law for the safety and preservation of them, with franchise and liberty; the copy whereof ensueth: <sup>f1485</sup>

Imperator Caesar, Caius Valerius Maximinus, Germanicus, Sarmaticus, Pius, Felix, Invictus, Augustus: We take for granted that no man is ignorant, but that every one, adverting to what is continually passing, knows and is satisfied, that we constantly consult the welfare of our provincial subjects, and that we desire to pursue that line of policy towards them, which may best secure the interests of each, and contribute to their common good and profit—such as may at once suit the public interest, and be agreeable to the taste of every one in particular. Accordingly, when it came to our knowledge some time back, that upon occasion of the edict issued by their most sacred majesties, Diocletian and Maximian, our parents, prohibiting the assemblies of the Christians, many persons were troubled and spoiled by the officials, and that among our own subjects (for whose benefit it is our study to provide in the best way possible) the matter was proceeding to a serious length, their substance being in a fair way to be utterly wasted; we issued letters to the governors of each province last year, enacting—that if any person were desirous of following that sect, or adhering to the prescripts of that religion, he might without impediment persist in his resolution, and should not be hindered or prohibited by any man; and that they should be free to do just what pleased every one best, without any fear or mistrust. But it could not escape our knowledge, that, even now, some of the judges have misapprehended our orders, and have caused our subjects to stand in doubt respecting our decrees, and to be less ready in attaching themselves to that mode of worship which they prefer. To the intent, therefore, that all suspicion, ambiguity, and fear, may be for the future removed, we determined on publishing this present edict; whereby it must be plain to all men, that they who desire to follow that sect and religion, are allowed by this our gracious indulgence to apply themselves to that religion which they have usually

followed, in such a manner as seems agreeable and proper to each. We also permit them to rebuild their oratories. Moreover, that this our indulgence may appear the larger and more comprehensive, we have thought proper further to enact, that, if any houses or estates, formerly belonging to the Christians, in consequence of the edict of our parents aforesaid, devolved to the right of the exchequer, or were seized by any city, or were sold, or were presented to any one as a gratuity, we have ordered that they be all restored to their original owners the Christians; so that in this particular, also, our piety and providence may be felt and acknowledged by all men.

f1486

Maximin, then, being conquered of Licinius, and also plagued with an incurable disease in the guts, sent by the hand of God, was compelled by torments and adversity to confess the true God whom before he regarded not, and to write this edict in the favor of those Christians whom before he did persecute. Thus the Lord doth make many times his enemies, be they never so stern and stout, at length to stoop, and maugre their hearts to confess him, as this Maximin here did; who, not long after, by the vehemency of his disease ended his life; whereby no more tyrants now were left alive, to trouble the church, but only Licinius. Of which Licinius, and of his persecutions stirred up in the East parts against the saints of God, now remaineth in order of story to prosecute.

This Licinius, being a Dacian born, and first made Caesar by Galerius (as is above specified), was afterwards joined with Constantine in government of the empire, and in setting forth the edicts which before we have described: although it seemeth all this to be done of him with a dissembling mind. For so is he in all histories described, to be a man passing all others in desire of insatiable riches, given to lechery, hasty, stubborn, and furious. To learning he was such an enemy, that he named the same a poison, and a common pestilence, and especially the knowledge of the laws. He thought no vice worse became a prince than learning, because he himself was unlearned.

f1487

There was between him and Constantine in the beginning great familiarity, and such agreement, that Constantine gave unto him his sister Constantia in matrimony, as Aurelius Victor writeth. Neither would any man have

thought him to have been of any other religion than Constantine was of, he seemed in all things so well to agree with him. Whereupon he made a decree with Constantine, in the behalf of the Christians, as we have showed, <sup>f1488</sup> And such was Licinius in the beginning; but after arming himself with tyranny, [he] began to conspire against the person of Constantine, of whom he had received so great benefits; neither favorable to the law of nature, nor mindful of his oaths, his blood, nor promises. But, when he considered that in his conspiracies he nothing prevailed, for that he saw Constantine was preserved and safely defended of God, and partly being puffed up with the victory against Maximin, he began vehemently to hate him, and not only to reject the christian religion, but also deadly to hate the same. He said, he would become an enemy to the Christians, for that in their assemblies and meetings they prayed not for him, but for Constantine. Therefore first by little and little, and that secretly, he went about to wrong and hurt the Christians, and banished them his court, which never were by any means prejudicial to his kingdom. Then he commanded that all those should be deprived who were knights of the honorable order, <sup>f1489</sup> unless they would do sacrifice to devils. The same persecution afterward stretched he from his court, into all his provinces, and withal most wicked laws he devised and set forth: First, that for no cause the bishops should in any matter communicate together; neither that any one of them should go into the church of his neighbor; or to call any assemblies, and consult for the necessary matters and utility of the church: After, that the men and women should not come in company together to pray; nor that the women should come into those places where they used to preach and read the word of God; neither that they should be after that instructed any more of the bishops, but should choose out such women amongst them as should instruct them: The third (most cruel and wickedest of all) was, that none should help and succor those that were cast into prison, nor should bestow any alms or charity upon them, though they should die for hunger; and they who showed any compassion upon those that were condemned to death, should be as greatly punished as they to whom they showed the same should be. <sup>f1490</sup> These were the constitutions of Licinius, most horrible, and which went beyond and passed the bounds of nature.

After this he used violence against the bishops, but yet not openly, for fear of Constantine, but privily and by conspiracy; by which means he slew those that were the worthiest men amongst the doctors and prelates. And about Amasaea and other cities of Pontus, he rased the churches even with the ground: others he shut up, that no man should come after their accustomed manner to pray and worship God; and therefore, as we said before, his conscience accusing him, all this he did, for that he suspected they prayed for Constantine, and not at all for him. And from this place in the east; parts to the Lybians, which bordered upon the Egyptians, the Christians durst not assemble and come together, for the displeasure of Licinius, which he had conceived against them. <sup>f1491</sup>

Furthermore, the flattering officers that were under him, thinking by this means to please him, slew and made out of the way many bishops, and without any cause put them to death, as though they had been homicides and heinous offenders; and such rigorousness used they towards some of them, that they cut their bodies into gobbets and small pieces in manner of a butcher, and after that threw them into the sea to feed the fishes.

(Ibidem. — ED.) What shall we speak of the exiles and confiscations of good and virtuous men? for he took by violence every man's substance, and cared not by what means he came by the same; but threatened them with death, unless they would forego the same. He banished those who had committed no evil at all. He commanded that both gentlemen and men of honor should be made out of the way; neither yet herewith content, he gave their daughters that were unmarried, to varlets and wicked ones to be deflowered. And Licinius himself, although that by:reason of his years his body was spent, yet shamefully did he try to vitiate many women, men's wives and maids. <sup>f1492</sup> Which cruel outrages of his caused many godly men of their own accord to forsake their houses; and it was also seen, that the woods, fields, desert places, and mountains, were fain to be the habitations and resting-places of the poor and miserable Christians. <sup>f1493</sup> Of those worthy men and famous martyrs who in this persecution found the way to heaven, Nicephorus first speaketh of Theodore, a captain [dwelling at Heraclea in Pontus], who first being hanged upon the cross, had bodkins thrust into his secret parts, and, after that, his head stricken off; **also of another Theodore,** <sup>a104</sup> martyred at Amasaea, surnamed "Tyro," <sup>f1494</sup> being a young soldier; also of a third, who was crucified at Perga; Basileus

also, the bishop of Amasaea; Nicholas, the bishop of Myra; Gregory, of Armenia the greater; <sup>f1495</sup> after that, Paul of Neocaesarea, who, by the impious commandment of Licinius, had both his hands disabled with a searing iron. Besides these, in the city of Sebaste [in Armenia the less] forty worthy men, christian soldiers, in the vehement cold time of winter were sowed and drowned in a horse-pond, when Lysias and Agricolaus, lieutenants under Licinius <sup>f1496</sup> in the East parts (of whom we spoke before), were yet alive, and were in great estimation for inventing of new and strange torments against the Christians. The wives of those forty good men were carried to Heraclea, a city in Thrace, and there, with a certain deacon whose name was Amon, were (after innumerable torments by them most constantly endured) slain with the sword. These things writeth, Nicephorus. <sup>F1497</sup> Also Sozomen <sup>f1498</sup> alludeth to some of the same martyrs. And Basil, in a certain oration, seemeth to intreat of their history, saving that in the circumstances he somewhat varieth. And surely Licinius was determined, for that the first face of this persecution fell out according to his desire, to have overrun all the Christians; to which thing neither counsel, nor good will, nor yet opportunity perchance wanted, unless God had brought Constantine into those parts where he governed; where, in the wars which he himself began (knowing right well that Constantine had intelligence of his conspiracy and treason), joining battle with him, he was overcome.

Divers battles between them were fought, the first fought in Hungary, where Licinius was overthrown; then he fled into Macedonia, and, repairing his army, was again discomfited. Finally, being vanquished both by sea and land, he lastly, at Nicomedia yielded himself to Constantine, and was commanded to live a private life at Thessalonica, where at length he was slain by the soldiers.

Thus have ye heard the end and conclusion of all the seven tyrants which were the authors and workers of this tenth and last persecution against the true people of God; the chief captain and incencor or which persecution was first Dioclesian, <sup>f1499</sup> who died at Salona, as some say, by his own poison, in the year of our Lord 313. The next was Maximian, who (as is said) was hanged of Constantine at Marseilles, about the year of our Lord 310. <sup>F1500</sup> Then died Galerius, plagued with a horrible disease sent of God. Severus was slain by Maximian, father of Maxentius the wicked tyrant,

who was overcome and vanquished of Constantine, in the year of our Lord 312. Maximin the sixth tyrant not long after, being overcome by Licinius, died about the year of our Lord 313. Lastly, how this Licinius was overcome by Constantine and slain, in the year of our Lord 324, is before declared. Only Constantius, the father of Constantine, being a good and a godly emperor, died in the third year of the persecution, in the year of our Lord 306, and was buried at York. After whom succeeded (after his godly father) Constantine, as a second Moses sent and set up of God, to deliver his people out of this so miserable captivity into liberty most joyful.

### **A BRIEF STORY OF THE MOST NOTABLE MARTYRS THAT SUFFERED IN THIS TENTH PERSECUTION.**

Now remaineth after the end of these persecutors thus described, to gather up the names and stories of certain particular martyrs, which now are to be set forth, worthy of special memory for their singular constancy and fortitude, showed in their sufferings and cruel torments. The names of all those that suffered in this aforesaid tenth persecution, being in number infinite, in virtue most excellent, it is impossible here to comprehend: but the most notable, and in most approved authors expressed, we thought here to insert, for the more edification of other Christians, who may and ought to look upon their examples, first beginning with Alban, the first martyr that ever in England suffered death for the name of Christ.

At what time Dioclesian and Maximian the pagan emperors had, directed out their letters with all severity for the persecuting of the Christians; Alban, being then an infidel, received into his house a certain clerk, flying from the persecutors' hands, whom when Alban beheld continually, both day and night, to persevere in watching and prayer, suddenly by the great mercy of God, he began to imitate the example of his faith and virtuous life; whereupon, by little and little, he being instructed by his wholesome exhortation, and leaving the blindness of his idolatry, became at length a perfect Christian. And when the aforesaid clerk had lodged with him a certain time, it was informed the wicked prince, that this good man and confessor of Christ (not yet condemned to death) was harbored in Alban's house, or very near unto him. Whereupon immediately he gave in charge to the soldiers to make more diligent inquisition of the matter; who, as soon as they came to the house of Alban the martyr, he by and by putting on

the apparel wherewith his guest and master was apparelled (that is, a garment at that time used, named Caracalla), offered himself in the stead of the other to the soldiers; who, binding him, brought him forthwith to the judge. It fortuned that at that instant when blessed Alban was brought unto the judge, they found the same judge at the altars offering sacrifice unto devils, who, as soon as he saw Alban, was straightways in a great rage, for that he would presume of his own voluntary will to offer himself to peril, and give himself a prisoner to the soldiers, for safeguard of his guest whom he harboured; and commanded him to be brought before the images of the devils whom he worshipped, saying: "For that thou hadst rather hide and convey away a rebel, than deliver him to the officers, that (as a contemner of our gods) he might suffer punishment and merit of his blasphemy; look, what punishment he should have had, thou for him shalt suffer the same, if I perceive thee any whit to revolt from our manner of worshipping." But blessed Alban, who of his own accord had bewrayed to the persecutors that he was a Christian, feared not at all the menaces of the prince; but being armed with the spiritual armor, openly pronounced that he would not obey his commandment. Then said the judge, "Of what stock or kindred art thou come?" Alban answered, "What is that to you, of what stock I came? If you desire to hear the verity of my religion, I do ye to wit, that I am a Christian, and apply myself altogether to that calling." Then said the judge, "I would know thy name, and see thou tell me the same without delay." Then said he, "My parents named me Alban, and I worship the true and living God, who created all the world." Then said the judge, fraught with fury, "If thou wilt enjoy the felicity **of prolonged life**<sup>a105</sup>, do sacrifice (and that out of hand) to the mighty gods." Alban replieth, "These sacrifices which ye offer unto devils, can neither help them that offer the same, neither yet can they accomplish the desires and prayers of their suppliants; but rather shall they, whosoever they be, that offer sacrifice to these idols, receive for their meed everlasting pains of hell-fire." The judge, when he heard these words, was passing angry, and commanded the tormentors to whip this holy confessor of God, endeavoring to overcome the constancy of his heart with stripes, against which he had prevailed nothing with words. And when he was cruelly beaten, yet suffered he the same patiently, nay rather joyfully, for the Lord's sake. Then when the judge saw that he would not with torments be

overcome, nor be seduced from the worship of christian religion, he commanded him to be beheaded.

The rest that followeth of this story in the narration of Bede, as of drying up the river, as Alban went to the place of his execution; then, of making a well-spring in the top of the hill; and of the falling out of the eyes of him that did behead him; with such other prodigious miracles mentioned in his story, because they seem more legend-like than truth-like, also because I see no great profit nor necessity in the relation thereof, I leave them to the free judgment of the reader, to think of them as cause shall move him.

The like estimation I have of the long story, wherein is written at large a fabulous discourse of all the doings and miracles of St. Alban, taken out of the library of St. Alban's, compiled (as therein is said) by a certain pagan, who, as he saith, afterward went to Rome, there to be baptized. But, because in the beginning or prologue of the said book, containing the story of Alban and of his bitter punishments, the writer maketh mention of the ruinous walls of the town of Verolanium (which walls were then falling down for age, at the writing of the said book, as he saith), thereby it seemeth this story to be written a great while after the martyrdom of Alban, either by a Briton, or by an Englishman. If he were a Briton, how then did the Latin translator take it out of the English tongue, as in the prologue he himself doth testify? If he were an Englishman, how then did he go up to Rome for baptism, being a pagan, when he might have been baptized among the christian Britons more near at home?

But among all other evidences and declarations sufficient to disprove this legendary story of St. Alban, nothing maketh more against it, than the very story itself: as where he bringeth in the head of the holy martyr to speak unto the people after it was smitten off from the body; also where he bringeth in the angels going up and coming down in a pillar of fire, and singing all the night long; item, in the river which he saith St. Alban made dry, such as were drowned in the stone before in the bottom were found alive; with other suchlike monkish miracles and gross fables, wherewith these abbey-monks were wont in times past to deceive the church of God, and to beguile the whole world for their own advantage. Notwithstanding, this I write not to any derogation of the blessed and faithful martyr of God, who was the first that I did ever find, in this realm, to suffer

martyrdom for the testimony of Christ, and is worthy, no doubt, of condign commendation, especially of us here in this land; whose christian faith in the Lord, and charity towards his neighbor, I pray God all we may follow. As also I wish, moreover, that the stories both of him, and of all other christian martyrs, might have been delivered to us simple as they were, without the admixture of all these abbey-like additions of monkish-miracles, wherewith they were wont to paint out the glory of such saints to the most, by whose offerings they were accustomed to receive most advantage.

As touching the name of the clerk <sup>f1501</sup> mentioned in this story, whom Alban received into his house, I find it in the English stories to be Amphibalus, although the Latin authors name him not; who, the same time flying into Wales, was also fetched from thence again to the same town of Verolanium, otherwise called Verlancaſter, where he was martyred; having his belly opened, and made to run about a stake, while all his bowels were drawn out; then, thrust in with swords and daggers; and at last, was stoned to death, as the aforesaid legend declareth.

Moreover, the same time with Alban suffered also two citizens of the aforesaid city of Verlancaſter, whose names were Aaron and Julius; beside others, whereof a great number the same time, no doubt, did suffer, although our chronicles of their names do make no rehearsal.

The time of martyrdom of this blessed Alban and the other, seemeth to be about the second or third year of this tenth persecution, under the tyranny of Dioclesian, and Maximian Herculius, bearing then the rule in England, about the year of our Lord 301, before the coming of Constantius to his government. Where, by the way, is to be noted, that this realm of Britain being so christened before, yet never was touched with any other of the nine persecutions, before this tenth persecution of Diodesian and Maximian: in which persecution our stories and Polychronicon do record, that all Christianity almost in the whole island was destroyed, the churches subverted, all books of the Scripture burnt, many of the faithful, both men and women, were slain; among whom the first and chief ringleader (as hath been said) was Alban. And thus much touching the martyrs of Britain.

Now from England to return again unto other countries, where this persecution did more vehemently rage; we will add hereunto (the Lord willing) the stories of others, although not of all that suffered in this persecution (which were impossible), but of certain most principal, whose singular constancy in their strong torments are chiefly renowned in later histories; beginning first with Romanus, the notable and admirable soldier and true servant of Christ, whose history set forth in Prudentius, doth thus proceed; so lamentably by him described, that it will be hard for any man almost with dry cheeks to hear it.

Pitiless Galerius with his grand prefect Asclepiades violently invaded the city of Antioch, intending by force of arms to drive all Christians to renounce utterly their pure religion. The Christians, as God would, were at that time congregated together, to whom Romanus hastily ran, <sup>f1502</sup> declaring that the wolves were at hand which would devour the christian flock; "But fear not," said he, "neither let this imminent peril disturb you, my brethren." Brought was it to pass, by the great grace of God working in Romanus, that old men and matrons, fathers and mothers, young men and maidens, were all of one will and mind, most ready to shed their blood in defense of their christian profession. Word was brought unto the prefect, that the band of armed soldiers was not able to wrest the staff of faith out of the hand of the armed congregation, and all by reason that one Romanus so mightily did encourage them, that they stuck not to offer their naked throats, wishing gloriously to die for the name of their Christ. "Seek out that rebel," quoth the prefect, "and bring him to me, that he may answer for the whole sect," Apprehended he was, and, bound as a sheep appointed to the slaughter-house, was presented to the emperor, who, with wrathful countenance beholding him, said: "What! art thou the author of this sedition? Art thou the cause why so many shall lose their lives? By the gods I swear thou shalt smart for it, and first in thy fiesh shalt thou suffer the pains whereunto thou hast encouraged the hearts of thy fellows." Romanus answered, "Thy sentence, O prefect, I joyfully embrace; I refuse not to be sacrificed for my brethren, and that by as cruel means as thou mayest invent: and whereas thy soldiers were repelled from the

christian congregation, that so happened, because it lay not in idolaters and worshippers of devils, to enter into the holy house of God, and to pollute the place of true prayer.” Then Asclepiades, wholly inflamed with this stout answer, commanded him to be trussed up, and his bowels drawn out. The executioners themselves more pitiful in heart than the prefect, said, “Not so, sir, this man is of noble parentage; unlawful it is to put a nobleman to so un noble a death.” “Scourge him then with whips, quoth the prefect, with knaps of lead at the ends.” Instead of tears, sighs and groans, Romanus sung psalms all the time of his whipping, requiring them not to favor him for nobility’s sake. “Not the blood of my progenitors,” said he, “but christian profession maketh me noble.” Then, with great power of spirit, he inveighed against the prefect, laughing to scorn the false gods of the heathen, with the idolatrous worshipping of them, affirming the God of the Christians to be the true God that created heaven and earth, before whose judicial seat all nations shall appear. But the wholesome words of the martyr were as oil to the fire of the prefect’s fury. The more the martyr spake, the madder was he, insomuch that he commanded the martyr’s sides to be lanced with knives, until the bones appeared white again. “Sorry am I, O prefect,” quoth the martyr, “not for that my flesh shall be thus cut and mangled, but for thy cause am I sorrowful, who being corrupted with damnable errors, seducest others.” <sup>F1503</sup>

The second time he preached at large the living God, and the Lord Jesus Christ his well-beloved Son, eternal life through faith in his blood, expressing therewith the abomination of idolatry, with a vehement exhortation to worship and adore the living God. At these words Asclepiades commanded the tormentors to strike Romanus on the mouth, that his teeth being stricken out, his pronounciation at leastwise might be impaired. The commandment was obeyed, his face buffeted, his eyelids torn with their nails, his cheeks scorched with knives; the skin of his heard was plucked by little and little from the flesh; finally, his seemly face was wholly defaced. The meek martyr said, “I thank thee, O prefect, that thou hast opened unto me many mouths, whereby I may preach my

Lord and Savior Christ. Look; how many wounds I have, so many mouths I have lauding and praising God.” <sup>F1504</sup> The prefect astonished with this singular constancy, commanded them to cease from the tortures. He threateneth cruel fire, he revileth the noble martyr, he blasphemeth God, saying, “Thy crucified Christ is but a yesterday’s God; the gods of the Gentiles are of most antiquity.”

Here again Romanus, taking good occasion, made a long oration of the eternity of Christ, of his human nature, of the death and satisfaction of Christ for all mankind. Which done, he said, “Give me a child, O prefect, but seven years of age, which age is free from malice and other vices wherewith riper age is commonly infected, and thou shalt hear what he will say.” His request was granted. A little boy <sup>f1505</sup> was called out of the multitude, and set beforehim. “Tell me, my babe,” quoth the martyr, “whether thou think it reason that we should worship one Christ, and in Christ one Father, or else that we worship many gods?” Unto whom the babe answered, “That certainly (whatsoever it be) which men affirm to be God, must needs be one; and that which pertains to that one, is unique: and inasmuch as Christ is unique, of necessity Christ must be the true God; for that there be many gods, we children cannot believe.” The prefect hereat clean amazed, said, “Thou young villain and traitor, where, and of whom learnedst thou this lesson?” “Of my mother,” quoth the child, “with whose milk I sucked in this lesson, that I must believe in Christ.” The mother was called, and she gladly appeared. The prefect commanded the child to be hoisted up and scourged. The pitiful beholders of this pitiless act, could not temper themselves from tears: the joyful and glad mother alone stood by with dry cheeks. Yea she rebuked her sweet babe for craving a draught of cold water: she charged him to thirst after the cup that the infants of Bethlehem once drank of, forgetting their mothers’ milk and paps; she willed him to remember little Isaac, who, beholding the sword wherewith, and the altar whereon, he should be sacrificed, willingly proffered his tender neck to the dint of his father’s sword. Whilst this counsel was in giving, the hutch-erly tormentor plucked the skin from the crown of his head, hair and all. The mother cried, “Suffer, my child! anon thou shalt pass

to Him that will adorn thy naked head with a crown of eternal glory.” The mother counselleth, the child is counselled; the mother encourageth, the babe is encouraged, and. received the stripes with smiling countenance. The prefect perceiving the child invincible, and himself vanquished, committeth the silly soul, the blessed babe, the child uncherished, to the stinking prison, commanding the torments of Romanus to be renewed and increased, as chief author of this evil.

Thus was Romanus brought forth again to new stripes, the punishments to be renewed and received again upon his old sores; when the lofty conqueror thus addressed the tormentors, taunting them as sluggards:

*Where is (quothe the martyr), where is your might?  
 What! are ye not able one body to spill?  
 Scant may it, so weak is it, stand upright:  
 And yet in spite of you shall it live still?  
 The vulture with talon, the dog with his tooth,  
 Could sooner, ye dastards, this corpse rend and tear;  
 Like them though ye hunger, and raven in sooth,  
 Yet idly my life to dispatch ye forbear.* <sup>F1506</sup>

Then, no longer could the tyrant forbear, but needs he must draw nearer to the sentence of death. Is it painful to thee, saith he, to tarry so long alive? A flaming fire, doubt thou not, shall be prepared for thee by and by, wherein thou and that boy, thy fellow in rebellion, shall be consumed into ashes.” Romanus and the babe were led to the place of execution. As they laid hands on Romanus, he looked back, saving, I appeal from this thy tyranny, O judge unjust! unto the righteous throne of Christ, that upright! Judge, not because I fear thy cruel torments and merciless handlings, but that thy judgments may be known to be cruel and bloody.” Now, when they were come to the place, the tormentors required the child of the mother, for she had taken it up in her arms; and she, only kissing it, delivered the babe. “Farewell,” she said, “my sweet child; and when thou hast entered the kingdom of Christ, there in thy blest estate remember thy mother, and from being her son become her patron.” <sup>F1507</sup> And as the hangman applied his sword to the babe’s neck, she sang on this manner:

*All laud and praise with heart and voice,  
O Lord, we yield to thee:  
To whom the death of this thy saint,  
We know most dear to be.* <sup>F1508</sup>

The innocent's head being cut off, the mother wrapped it up in her garment, and laid it on her breast. On the other side a mighty fire was made, whereinto Romanus was cast, who said, that he should not burn: wherewith a great storm arose (if it be true) and quenched the fire. The prefect gave in commandment that his tongue should be cut out. Out was it plucked by the hard roots, and cut off: nevertheless he spake, saying, "He that speaketh of Christ, never wanted a tongue: think not that the voice that uttereth Christ, hath need of the tongue to be the minister." The prefect at this, half out of his wits, bare in hand that the hangman deceived the sight of the people by some subtle sleight and crafty conveyance. "Not so, quoth the hangman; "if you suspect my deed, open his mouth, and diligently search the roots of his tongue." The prefect at length being confounded with the fortitude and courage of the martyr, straitly commanded him to be brought back into the prison, and there to be strangled; where his sorrowful life and pains being ended, he now enjoyeth quiet rest in the Lord, with perpetual hope of his miserable body to be restored again, with his soul, into a better life, where no tyrant shall have any power. <sup>F1509</sup>

### **THE STORY OF GORDIUS, A CENTURION.**

Gordius was a citizen of Caesarea, a worthy soldier, and captain of a hundred men. He, in the time of extreme persecution, refusing any longer to execute his charge, did choose of his own accord willing exile, and lived in the desert some time a religious and a solitary life. But upon a certain day, when a solemn feast of Mars was celebrated in the city of Caesarea, and much people were assembled in the theater to behold the games, he left the desert, and got him up into the chief place of the theater, and with a loud voice uttered this saying of the apostle: "Behold I am found of them which sought me not, and to those which asked not for me, have I openly appeared." By which words he let it to be understood, that of his own accord he came unto those games to surrender himself. At this

noise, the multitude, little regarding the sights, looked about to see who it was that made such exclamation. As soon as it was known to be Gordius, and the crier had commanded silence, he was brought unto the sheriff, who sat thereabout, and ordered the games. When he was asked the question who he was, from whence, and for what occasion he came thither, he telleth the truth of every thing as it was: "I am come," saith he, "to publish, that I set nothing by your decrees against the christian religion, but that I profess Jesus Christ to be my hope and salvation; and when I understood how ye surpassed other men in cruelty, I took this as a fit time to accomplish my desire." The sheriff with these words was greatly moved, and revengeth all his displeasure upon poor Gordius, commanding the executioners to be brought out with scourges, wheel, gibbet, and whatsoever torments else might be devised. Whereunto Gordius answered, saying, "that it should be to him a hindrance and damage, if he could not suffer and endure divers torments and punishments for Christ's cause." The sheriff, being more offended with his boldness, commanded him to feel as many kind of torments as there were. With all which, Gordius, notwithstanding, could not be mastered or overcome; but lifting up his eyes unto heaven, singeth this saying out of the Psalms: "The Lord is my helper, I will not fear the thing that man can do to me."

After this, he against himself provoketh the extremity of the tormentors, and blameth them if they favor him any thing at all. When the sheriff saw that hereby he could win but little, he goeth about by gentleness and enticing words, to turn the stout and valiant mind of Gordius. He promiseth to him great and large offers if he will deny Christ; as to make him a captain of as many men as any other is, to give him riches, treasure, and what other thing soever he should desire. But in vain (as the proverb is) pipeth the minstrel to him that hath no ears to hear, for he, deriding the foolish madness of the magistrate in supposing that it lay in him to confer any earthly good, which was worthy to compare with having a place in heaven. The magistrate, with these words thoroughly angered and vexed, prepared himself to his condemnation; whom after that he had condemned, he caused to be had out of the city to

be burnt. There run out of the city great multitudes by heaps to see him put to execution; some take him in their arms, and lovingly kiss him, persuading him to take a better way, and save himself, and that with weeping tears. To whom Gordius answered, "Weep not, I pray you for me, but rather for the enemies of God, who always make war against the Christians; weep, I say, for them who prepare for us a fire, purchasing hell-fire for themselves in the day of vengeance; and cease off further, I pray you, to molest and disquiet my stttled mind. Truly," saith he, "I am ready for the name of Christ to suffer and endure a thousand deaths, if need were." Some others came unto him, who persuaded him to deny Christ with his mouth, and to keep his conscience to himself. "My tongue," saith he, which by the goodness of God I have, cannot be brought to deny the author and giver of the same; for with the heart we believe unto righteousness, and with the tongue we confess unto salvation." Many more such-like words he spake; but especially uttering to them such matter, whereby he might persuade the beholders to death, and to the desire of martyrdom, After all which, with a merry and glad countenance, never changing so much as his color, he willingly gave himself to be burnt. <sup>F1510</sup>

Not much unlike to the story of Gordius, is the story also of Mennas, an Egyptian, who, being likewise a soldier by his profession, in this persecution of Dioclesian forsook all, and went into the desert, where a long time he gave himself to abstinence, watching, and meditation of the Scriptures.

At length returning again to the city of Cotyaeum, there, in the open theater, as the people were occupied upon their spectacles or pastimes, he with a loud voice openly proclaimed himself to be a Christian, and upon the same was brought to Pyrrhus the president; of whom he, being demanded of his faith, made this answer: "Convenient it is that I should," saith he, "confess God, in whom is light and no darkness, forsomueh as Paul doth teach that with heart we believe to righteousness, with mouth confession is given to salvation." After this the innocent martyr was most painfully pinched and cruciate with sundry punishments. In all which notwithstanding he declared a constant heart, and faith

invincible, having these words in his mouth, being in the midst of his torments: “There is nothing in my mind that can be compared to the kingdom of heaven; neither is all the world, if it were weighed in balance, able to be conferred with the price of one soul:” and said, “Who is able to separate us from the love of Jesus Christ our Lord? shall affliction or anguish? And moreover,” saith he, “I have thus learned of my Lord and my King, not to fear them which kill the body, and have no power to kill the soul; but to fear him rather, who hath power to destroy both body and soul in hell-fire.” To make the story short, after manifold torments borne of him, and suffered, when the last sentence of death was upon him pronounced (which was to be beheaded), Mennas being then had to the place of execution, said, Lord God, who hast so accepted me to be found a partaker of thy precious death, and hast not given me to be devoured of my fierce enemies, but hast made me to remain constant in thy pure faith unto this my latter end.” And so this blessed soldier, fighting valiantly under the banner of Christ, lost his head, and won his soul. <sup>F1511</sup>

In the which author there followeth a long narration of the miracles of this holy man, which here for prolixity I do omit.

Basil, in a certain sermon about the forty martyrs, rehearseth this story, not unworthy to be noted:

There came [saith he], into a certain place [of which place he maketh no mention], the emperor’s marshal or officer, with the edict which the emperor had set out against the Christians, that whosoever confessed Christ, should after many torments suffer death. And first they did privily suborn certain who should detect and accuse the Christians whom they had found out, or had laid Wait for. Upon this the sword, the gibbet, the wheel, and the whips were brought forth; at the terrible sight whereof the hearts of all the beholders did shake and tremble. Some for fear did fly; some did stand in doubt what to do. Certain were so terrified at the beholding of these engines and tormenting instruments, that they denied their faith. Some others began the game, and for a time did abide the conflict and agony of martyrdom; but, vanquished at

length by the intolerable pain of their torments, made shipwreck of their consciences, and lost the glory of their confession. Among others, forty there were at that time, invincible and noble soldiers of Christ, who, after the marshal had showed the emperor's edict, and required of all men obedience to the same, freely and boldly of their own accord confessed themselves to be Christians, and declared to him their names. The marshal, somewhat amazed at this their boldness of speech, standeth in doubt what was best to do. Yet forthwith he goeth about to win them with fair words, advertising them to consider their youth, neither that they should change, a sweet and pleasant life, for a cruel and untimely death: after that he promiseth them money and honor-able offices in the emperor's name. But they, little esteeming all these things, brake forth into a long and bold oration, affirming that they did neither desire life, dignity, nor money, but only the celestial kingdom of Christ; saying further, that they were ready for the faith and love they had in God, to endure the affliction of the wheel, the cross, and the fire. The rude marshal being herewith offended, devised a new kind of punishment. He spied out before the walls of the city a certain great pond, which lay full upon the cold northern wind, for it was in the winter-time, wherein he caused them to be put all that night; but they, being merry, and comforting one another, received this their appointed punishment, and said, as they were putting off their clothes, "We put off," said they, "now not our clothes, but we put off the old man, corrupt with the deceit of concupiscence; we give thee thanks, O Lord, that with this our apparel we may also put off, by thy grace, the sinful man; for by means of the serpent, we once put him on, and by the means of Jesus Christ, we now put him off. When they had thus said, they were brought naked into the place, where they felt most vehement cold; insomuch that all the parts of their bodies were stark and stiff therewith. As soon as it was day, they, yet having breath, were brought unto the fire, wherein they were consumed, and their ashes thrown into the flood. By chance there was one of the company more lively, and not so near dead as the rest, of whom the executioners taking pity, said unto his mother standing by, that they would save his life. But she, with her own hands taking up her

son, brought him to the pile of wood, where the residue of his fellows (crooked for cold), did lie ready to be burnt, and admonished him to accomplish the blessed journey he had taken in hand with his companions. <sup>F1512</sup>

A like story of forty martyrs, who were married men, we read of in Nicephorus and Sozomen, <sup>f1513</sup> who were killed likewise in a lake or pond at Sebaste, a town of Armenia, under Licinius, if the story be not the same with this.

In this fellowship and company of martyrs cannot be left out and forgot the story of Cyrus.

This Cyrus was a physician born in Alexandria, who, flying into Egypt, in the persecution of Dioclesian and Maximian, led a solitary life in Arabia, being much spoken of for his learning and miracles; unto whose company after a certain time did one John, born in the city of Edessa, beyond the river Euphrates, join himself, leaving the soldier's life which before that time he had exercised. But, whilst as yet the same persecution raged in a city in Egypt, called Canope, there were cast into prison for the confession of their faith, a certain godly christian woman, called Athanasia, and her three daughters, Theoctista, Theodota, and Endoxid, with whom Cyrus was well acquainted; at whose infirmities he much fearing, accompanied with his brother John, he came and visited them for their better confirmation; at which time Syrianus was chief captain and lieutenant of Egypt, <sup>f1514</sup> of whose wickedness and cruelty, especially against women and maidens, Athanasius maketh mention in his Apologies, and in his epistle to those that lead a solitary life. This Cyrus, therefore, and John, being accused and apprehended of the heathen men, as the persons by whose persuasions the maidens and daughters of Athanasia contumeliously despised the gods and the emperor's religion, and could by no means be brought to do sacrifice, were, after the publication of their constant confession, put to death by the sword: Athanasia also, and her three daughters, being condemned to death. <sup>f1515</sup>

Sebastian, being born in the part of France called Gallia Narbonensis, was a Christian, and was lieutenant-general of the van-ward <sup>f1516</sup> of Dioclesian the emperor, who also encouraged many martyrs of Christ by his exhortations unto constancy, and kept them in the faith. He, being therefore accused to the emperor, was commanded to be apprehended, and that he should be brought into the open field, where of his own soldiers he was thrust through the body with innumerable arrows, and after that his body was thrown into a jakes or sink. Ambrose maketh mention of this Sebastian the martyr, in his Commentary upon Psalm 118; and Simeon Metaphrastes, amongst other martyrs that suffered with Sebastian, numbereth also these following: Nicostratus, with Zoe his wife; Tranquillinus, with Martia his wife; Traglinus, Claudius, Castor, Tibertius, Castulus, Marcus, and Marcellianus, with others.

Basil, in another sermon, also maketh mention of one Barlaam, being a noble and famous martyr, who abode all the torments of the executioners even to the point of death; which thing when the tormentors saw, they brought him, and laid him upon the altar, where they did use to offer sacrifices to their idols, and put fire and frankincense into his right hand, wherein he had yet some strength; thinking that the same his right hand, by the heat and force of the fire, would have scattered the burning incense upon the altar, and so have sacrificed. But of that their hope the pestiferous tormentors were disappointed; for the flame eat round about his hand, and the same endured as though it had been red-hot embers, when Barlaam recited out of the Psalms this saying: “Blessed is the Lord my God, which teacheth my hands to fight.”

To this narration of Basil, touching the martyrdom of Barlaam, we will annex consequently another story of Ambrose. <sup>F1517</sup>

He, making a certain exhortation to certain virgins, in the same oration commendeth the martyrdoms of Agricola and Vitalis, who suffered also in the same persecution under Dioclesian and Maximian (as they affirm) at Bologna. This Vitalis was servant to Agricola, who both together, between themselves, had made a compact to give their lives with other martyrs for the name of Christ. Whereupon Vitalis, being sent before his master to offer himself to martyrdom, fell first into the hands of persecutors, who

labored about him by all means, to cause him to deny Christ: which when he would in no case do, but stoutly persisted in the confession of his faith, they began to exercise him with all kind of torments, so unmercifully, that there was no whole skin left on all his body. So Vitalis, in the midst of the agony and painful torments, after he had in a short prayer commended himself to God, gave up his life. After him, the tormentors set upon Agricola his master, whose virtuous manners and gentle conditions, because they were singularly well liked, and known to the enemies, his suffering therefore was the longer deferred. But Agricola, not abiding the long delay and driving off, and provoking, moreover, the adversaries to quicker speed, at length was fastened unto the cross, and so finished his martyrdom which he so long desired.

No less worthy of commemoration is the lamentable martyrdom of Vincentius, whose history here followeth. This Vincentius was a Spaniard, of Saragossa, and a Levite <sup>f1518</sup> most godly and virtuous, who at this time suffered martyrdom at Valentia, <sup>f1519</sup> under Dacian the president, as we may gather by Prudentius in his fourth and fifth hymns. <sup>F1520</sup> Bergomensis, in his “Supplement,” reciteth these words concerning his martyrdom, out of a certain sermon of St. Augustine.

Our heart conceived not a vain and fruitless sight (as it were in beholding o. lamentable tragedies), but certainly a great sight and marvellous, and there with singular pleasure received it, when the painful passion of victorious Vincentius was read unto us. Is there any so heavy hearted, that will not be moved in the contemplation of this immovable martyr, so manly, or rather so godly, fighting against the craft and subtlety of that serpent, against the tyranny of Dacian, against the horrors of death, and by the mighty Spirit of his God conquering all? But let us in few words rehearse the degrees of his torments, though the pains thereof in many words cannot be expressed. First, Dacian caused the martyr to be laid upon the torture, and all the joints of his body to be distended and racked out, until they cracked again. This being done in most extreme and cruel manner, all the members of his painful and pitiful body were grievously indented with deadly wounds. Thirdly (that his dolours and griefs might be augmented), they miserably vexed

his flesh with iron combs, sharply filed. And to the end the tormentors might vomit out all their vengeance on the meek and mild martyr's flesh, the tormentors themselves, also, were vilely scourged at the president's commandment. And lest his passion, through want of pains, might seem imperfect, or else too easy, they laid his body, being all out of joint, on a grate of iron; and when they had opened it with iron hooks, they seared it with fiery plates, with hot burning salt sprinkling the same, Last of all, into a vile dungeon was this mighty martyr drawn, the floor whereof, first, was thick spread with the sharpest shells that might be gotten; his feet then being fast locked in the stocks, there was he left alone without all worldly comfort. But the Lord his God was with him; the Holy Spirit of God (whose office is to comfort the godly afflicted) fulfilled his heart with joy and gladness. "Hast thou prepared a terrible rack, O cruel tyrant, O devouring lion! for the martyr's bed? the Lord shall make that bed soft and sweet unto him. Rackest thou his bones and joints all asunder? His bones, his joints, his hairs, are all numbered. Tormentest thou his flesh with mortal wounds? The Lord shall pour abundantly into all his sores of his oil of gladness. Thy scraping combs, thy sharp fleshhooks, thine hot searing-irons, thy parched salt, thy stinking prison, thy cutting shells, thy pinching stocks, shall turn to this patient martyr to the best. All together shall work contrary to thine expectation; great plenty of joy shall he reap into the barn of his soul, out of this mighty harvest of pains that thou hast brought him into. Yea, thou shalt prove him Vincentius indeed; that is, a vanquisher, a triumpher, a conqueror, subduing thy madness by his meekness, thy tyranny by his patience, thy manifold means of tortures by the manifold graces of God, wherewith he is plentifully enriched." <sup>F1521</sup>

In this catalogue or company of such holy martyrs as suffered in this aforesaid tenth persecution, many more, and almost innumerable, there be expressed in authors beside them whom we have hitherto comprehended; as Philoromus, a man of noble birth and great possessions in Alexandria, who, being persuaded by his friends to favor himself, to respect his wife, to consider his children and family, did not only reject the counsels of them, but also neglected the threats and torments of the judge, to keep the

confession of Christ inviolate unto the death and losing of his head: <sup>f1522</sup> of whom Eusebius beareth witness, that he was there present himself.

Of like estate and dignity was also Procopius in Palestine, who, after his conversion, brake his images of silver and gold, and distributed the same to the poor; and after all kind of torments, of racking, of cording, of tearing his flesh, of goring and stabbing in, of firing, at length had his head also smitten off, as witnesseth Nicephorus. <sup>F1523</sup>

To this may be joined also George, a young man of Cappadocia, who, stoutly inveighing against the impious idolatry of the emperors, was apprehended and cast into prison; then torn with hooked irons, burnt with hot lime, stretched with cords; after that, his hands and feet with other members of his body being cut off, at last with a sword he had his head cut off. <sup>F1524</sup>

With these aforementioned, add also Sergius and Bacchus; Pantaleon, a physician in Nicomedia; <sup>f1525</sup> Theodorus, of the city of Amasaea, in Pontus; <sup>f1526</sup> Faustus, a martyr of Egypt; <sup>f1527</sup> Gereon, with three hundred and eighteen fellow-martyrs, who suffered about Cologne; <sup>f1528</sup> Hermogenes, the president of Athens, who, being converted by the constancy of one Mennas and Eugraphus in their torments, suffered also for the like faith. *Item*, Samonas, Gurias, and Abibus, mentioned in Simeon Metaphrastes; Jerome also, with certain of his confessors, under Maximin, mentioned in Metaphrastes; Indes and Domnas, <sup>f1529</sup> who suffered with many other martyrs above mentioned at Nicomedia, as recordeth Metaphrastes. Evelasius and Maximin, the emperor's officers, whom Fausta the virgin in her torments converted. Also Thyrsus, Leucius, Callinicus; <sup>f1530</sup> Apollonius, Philemon, Asclas; Leonidas; with Arrian, president of Thebais. Cyprian likewise, a citizen of Antioch, who, after he had continued a long time a filthy magician or sorcerer, at length was converted and made a deacon, then a priest, and at last the bishop of Antioch, of whom partly we touched somewhat before. This Cyprian, with Justina a virgin, suffered among the martyrs. <sup>F1531</sup> *Item*, Glycerius at Nicomedia; Felix a presbyter, Fortunatus and Achilleus deacons, in the city of Valence; Artemius at Rome; Cyriacus deacon to Marcellus bishop of Rome; Carpophorus priest at Spoleto, with Abundius a deacon. *Item*, Claudius, Cyrinus, and Antoninus, <sup>f1532</sup> who suffered with Marcellinus

bishop of Rome; <sup>f1533</sup> Cucuphas, in the city of Barcelona; Felix, a bishop, <sup>f1534</sup> with Adauctus <sup>f1535</sup> and Januarius his priests, Fortunatus and Septimus his readers, who suffered in the city of Venosa in Apulia, <sup>f1536</sup> under Dioclesian. <sup>F1537</sup>

It were too long a travail or trouble to recite all and singular names of them particularly, whom this persecution of Dioclesian did consume; the number of whom being almost infinite, is not to be collected or expressed. One story yet remaineth not to be forgotten of Cassianus, whose pitiful story being described of Prudentius we have here inserted, rendering metre for metre as followeth. <sup>F1538</sup>

*Verses on Cassianus.  
Through Forum as (in Italy)  
I passed once to Rome,  
Into a church by chance came I,  
And stood fast by a tomb;  
Which church sometime a place had been,  
Where causes great in law [giv'n,  
Were scanned and tried and judgment  
To keep brute men in awe.  
This place Sylla Cornelius  
First built; he rais'd the frame,  
And call'd the same Forum, and thus  
That city took the name. <sup>F1539</sup>  
In musings deep as here I stood,  
Casting mine eye aside,  
A figure in full piteous mood  
Pourtrayed by chance I spied;  
Marked with a thousand wounds full  
All mangled rent and torn; [bad,  
The skin appeared as though it had  
Been jagged and prickt with thorn.  
A school of pictured boys did band  
About that loathsome sight,  
That with their sharpened gads in hand  
His members thus had dight.  
These gads were but their pens, where-  
Their tablets written were, [with  
And such as scholars often, sith,*

*Unto the schools do bear.  
 “Whom thou seest here thus pictured sit,  
 And firmly dost behold,  
 No fable is, I do thee wit,”*

*(The verger question’d told, <sup>f1540</sup>  
 That walk’d thereby) “but doth declare  
 The history of one,  
 Which, written, would good record bear*

*What faith was long ago.  
 A skillful schoolmaster this was,  
 That here sometime did teach,  
 The bishop once of Brixen was, <sup>f1541</sup>*

*And Christ full plain did preach.  
 He knew well how to comprehend  
 Long talk in a few lines,  
 And it at length how to amend*

*By order and by times.  
 His sharp precepts and his stern looks  
 His beardless boys did fear;  
 When hate in heart, yet, for their books*

*Full deadly they did bear.  
 The child that learns, I do ye weet,  
 Terms aye his tutor cruel;  
 No discipline in youth seems sweet;*

*Count this a common rule.  
 Behold the raging time now here,  
 Oppressing so the faith,  
 Doth persecute God’s children dear,*

*And all that Christ bewraith.  
 This trusty teacher of the swarm  
 Profest the living God;  
 The chief good thing they count their harm,*

*Perhaps he shakes his rod. <sup>F1542</sup>  
 ‘What rebel,’ asked the president,  
 ‘Is he I hear so loud?’  
 ‘Unto our youth an instrument,’*

*They say, and low they bowed.  
 “Go, bring the caitiff forth,” he bids,  
 “And make no long delay;  
 Let him be set the boys amidst.”*

*They do as he doth say.  
 “Let him be given unto them all,  
 And let them have their will,  
 To do to him what spite they shall,*

*So that they will him kill.  
 Even as they list let them him fray,  
 And him deride so long,  
 Till weariness provokes their play,*

*No longer to prolong.  
 Let them,! say then, uncontrolled  
 Both prick and scotch his skin;  
 To bathe their hands let them be bold*

*In the hot blood of him.”  
 The scholars hereat make great game,  
 It pleaseth them full well; [flame,  
 That they may kill and quench the*

*They thought to them a hell.  
 They bind his hands behind his back,  
 And naked they him strip;  
 In bodkin-wise at him they hack,*

*They laugh to see him skip.  
 The private hate that each one hath  
 In heart, it now appears;  
 They pour it forth in gawdy wrath,*

*They wreak them of their tears.  
 Some cast great stones, some others break  
 Their tablets on his face;  
 “Lo! here thy Latin and thy Greek!”*

*(Oh barren boys of grace!)  
 The blood runs down his cheeks, an ddoth  
 Imbrue the boxen leams,  
 Where notes by them were made (though loth),*

*And well proponed themes.  
 Some whet and sharp their pencils’ points,  
 Which served to write withal;  
 Some others gage his flesh and joints,*

*‘As with a pointed nail.  
 Sometime they prick, sometime they rent, <sup>f1543</sup>  
 This worthy martyr’s flesh;  
 And thus by turns they do torment*

*This confessor afresh.  
Now all with one consent on him  
Their bloody hands they lay;  
To see the blood from limb to limb*

*Drop down, they make a play.  
More painful was the pricking pang  
Of children oft and thick,  
Than of the bigger boys that stung,*

*And near the heart did stick.  
For by the feeble strokes of th' one,  
Death was denied his will,  
Of smart that made him woe-begone,*

*He had the better skill.  
The deeper strokes the great ones gave,  
And nearer touched the quick,  
The welcomer he thought the same,*

*Whom longing death made sick.  
"God make you strong," [he saith, "I pray,  
God give you might at will;  
And what you want in years, I say,*

*Let cruelty fulfill.  
But whilst the hangman breatheth still  
And me with you doth match,  
That weakly work (yet want no will)*

*My life for to dispatch,  
My griefs wax great."—"What groan'st thou now?"  
Said some of them again,  
"In school, advised well art thou,*

*Whom there thou put'st to pain.  
Behold (we pray) and now make good  
As many thousand stripes,  
As when with weeping eyes we stood*

*In danger of thy gripes.  
Art thou now angry at thy band,  
Who always criedst, 'write, write;'  
And never wouldst that our right hand*

*Should rest in quiet plight?  
We had forgot our playing times,  
Which thou wert stingy of:  
We now but prick and point our lines."*

*And thus they grin and scoff:  
 "Correct, good sir! our viewed verse,  
 If aught amiss there be:  
 Now use thy power, and them rehearse*

*That have not minded thee."  
 Christ, pitying this groaning man,  
 With torments torn and tired,  
 Commands his heart to break even then;*

*Who—yielded and expired.  
 [This tale the picture tells (saith he)  
 Which doth thine eyes allure—  
 The agonies and victory*

*Of Cassian, martyr pure.  
 Say, stranger, doth some strong desire  
 Thy panting soul possess,  
 Or some fond hope thy bosom fire,*

*Or some deep grief distress?  
 Here make thy suit: the martyr saint,  
 In humble faith address, [plaint,  
 Each suppliant hears, whate'er his*

*And grants each pure request.  
 I could not but consent: I weep:  
 His tomb I do embrace:  
 His altar in devotion deep*

*I kiss with glowing face.  
 The secret thoughts I then rehearse  
 Which fill'd my lab'ring breast,  
 Whisper my fears of sad reverse,*

*My longings to be blest.  
 Of home and all its dear delights,  
 Mid dangers left behind,  
 Of all that now my steps invites*

*To Rome, I tell my mind.  
 The martyr hears, and smiles success:  
 At home in safety found,  
 I there the name of Cassian bless,  
 And Cassian's fame resound. <sup>F1544</sup> ]*

No less admirable than wonderful was the constancy also of women and maidens, who, in the same persecution, gave their bodies to the

tormentors, and their lives for the testimony of Christ, with no less boldness of spirit than did the men themselves above specified, to whom how much inferior they were of bodily strength, so much more worthy of praise they be, for their constant standing. Of whom some examples here we mind (Christ willing) to infer, such as in our stories and chronicles seem most notable, first beginning with Eulalia, whose story we have taken out of the aforesaid Prudentins, as followeth: <sup>f1545</sup>

In the west part of Spain is a city great and populous, named Merida, wherein dwelt, and was brought up, a virgin, born of noble parentage, whose name was Eulalia; which Merida, although for the situation thereof, it was both rich and famous, yet more adorned and famous was the renown thereof by the martyrdom, blood, and sepulcher of this blessed virgin, Eulalia. Twelve years of age was she, and not much above, when she, <sup>f1546</sup> not delighting in precious balms, or costly ornaments and jewels, but forsaking and despising all these and such-like pompous allurements, showed herself most busy in preparing her journey to her hoped inheritance and heavenly patronage; which Eulalia, as she was modest and discreet in behavior, sage and sober in conditions, so was she also witty and sharp in answering her enemies. But when the furious rage of persecution broke out against God's children in the household of faith, and when the Christians were commanded to offer incense and sacrifice to devils or dead gods, then began the blessed spirit of Eulalia to kindle; and, being of a prompt and ready wit, thought forthwith (as a courageous captain) to give a charge upon this so great and disordered a battle. And so she, silly woman, her innocent heart panting with the divine inspiration, challengeth the force, and rage of her enemies against her. But the godly care of her parents, fearing lest the willing mind of this damsel, so ready to die for Christ's cause, might make her guilty of her own death, hid her, and kept her close at their house in the country, being a great way out of the city. She yet misliking that quiet life, and also detesting to make such delay, softly stealeth out of the doors (no man knowing thereof) in the night; and in great haste leaving the common way, openeth the hedge-gaps, and with weary feet (God knoweth) passed through the thorny and briery places, accompanied yet with

spiritual guard. And although dark and dreadful was the silent night, yet had she with her the Lord of light. And as the children of Israel, coming out of Egypt, had by the mighty power of God, a cloudy pillar for their guide in the day, and a flame of fire in the night, so had this godly virgin, travelling in this dark night, when she, flying and forsaking the place where all filthy idolatry abounded, and hastening her heavenly journey, was not oppressed with the dreadful darkness of the night. But yet she traveled many miles in this her speedy journey, before the day appeared.

In the morning betime, with a bold courage she goeth unto the tribunal or judgment-seat; and in the midst of them all, with ‘a loud voice’ crying out, said, “I pray you, what a shame is it for you thus rashly and without advisement, to destroy and kill men’s souls, and to throw their bodies alive against the rocks, and cause mere to deny God, the universal Father. Would you know, O you unfortunate! what I am? Behold, I am one of the Christians, an enemy to your devilish sacrifices. I spurn your idols under my feet; I confess God omnipotent, with my heart and mouth. His, Apollo, and Venus, what are they? Maximian himself, what is he? The one a thing of nought, for that they be the works of men’s hands; the other but a castaway, because he worshippeth the same work. Therefore, frivolous are they both, and both not worthy to be set by. Maximian is a lord of substance, and yet he himself falleth down before a stone, and voweth the honor of his dignity unto those that are much inferior to his vassals. Why then doth he oppress so tyrannically more worthy stomachs and courages than himself? He must needs be a good guide and an upright judge, who feedeth upon innocent blood, and breathing on the bodies of godly men, doth rend and tear their bowels; and, what is more, hath his delight in destroying and subverting the faith. Go to, therefore, thou hangman! burn, cut, and mangle thou, these earthly members. It is an easy matter to break a brittle substance, but the inward mind shalt thou not hurt for any thing thou canst do.”

The praetor then, or judge, with these words of hers set in a great rage, saith, “Hangman! take her and pull her out by the hair of her head, and torment her to the uttermost. Let her feel the power of

our country's gods, and let her know what the imperial government of a prince is. But yet, O thou sturdy girl! fain would I have thee (if it were possible), before thou die, to revoke this thy wickedness. Behold, what pleasures thou mayest enjoy by the honorable house thou camest of; thy fallen house and progeny follow thee to death with lamentable tears, and the nobility of thy kindred in much concern make doleful lamentation for thee. What meanest thou? Wilt thou kill thyself, so young a flower, and so near the honorable marriage and great dowry which thou mayest enjoy? Doth not the glistening and golden pomp of the bride-bed move thee? Doth not the reverend piety of thine ancestors prick thee? Who is it that this thy rashness and wickedness grieve not? Behold here the furniture ready prepared for thy terrible death: either shalt thou be beheaded with this sword, or else with these wild beasts shalt thou be pulled in pieces; or else thou, being cast into the fiery flames, shalt be (although lamentably bewailed of thy friends and kinsfolks) consumed to ashes. What great matter is it for thee, I pray thee, to escape all this? If thou wilt but take and put with thy fingers a little salt and incense into the censers, thou shalt be delivered from all these punishments."

To this Eulalia made no answer, but being in a great fury, she spitteth in the tyrant's face; she throweth down the idols, and spurneth abroad with her feet the heap of incense prepared to the censers. Then, without further delay, the hangmen with both their strengths took her, and rent her slender breast, and with hooks or claws scotched her sides to the hard bones; she all this while counting the gashes, and saying, "O Lord! behold thou art inscribed upon me! how pleasant it is to note those piercings, which mark thy triumphs, O Christ! even the purple blood itself proclaims thy sacred name." This sang stile with a bold stomach, neither lamentingly nor yet weepingly, but being glad and merry, abandoning from her mind all heaviness and grief, when, as out of a warm fountain, her mangled members with fresh blood bathed her white and fair skin.

Then proceed they to the last and final torment, which was not only the goring and wounding of her mangled body with the iron

grate and hurdle, and terrible harrowing of her flesh, but burned on every side with flaming torches, her tormented breasts and sides: her hair hanging about her shoulders in two parts divided (wherewith her shamefaced chastity and virginity were covered) reaching down to the ground. But when the cracking flame flieth about her face, kindled by her hair, and reacheth the crown of her head, then she, desiring swift death, opened her mouth and swallowed the flame. And so rested she in peace.

The said Prudentius and Ado, also Equilinnus, add moreover, writing of a white dove issuing out of her mouth at her departing, and of the fire quenched about her body; also of her body covered miraculously with snow, with other things more, whereof let every reader use his own judgment. <sup>F1547</sup>

As ye have heard now the christian life and constant death of Eulalia, much worthy of praise and commendation, so no less commendation is worthy to be given to blessed Agnes, that constant damsel and martyr of God, who, as she was in Rome of honorable parents begotten, so lieth she there as honourably entombed and buried. Which Agnes for her unspotted and undefiled virginity deserved no less praise and commendation, than for her willing death and martyrdom. Some writers make of her a long discourse (more, in my judgment, than necessary), reciting divers and sundry strange miracles by her done in the process of her history; which, partly for tediousness, partly for the doubtfulness of the author (some father them upon Ambrose), and partly for the strangeness and incredibility thereof, I omit, being satisfied with that which Prudentius briefly writeth of her, as followeth:

She was [saith he] young, and not marriageable, when first she, being dedicated to Christ, boldly resisted the wicked edicts of the emperor, and refused to embrace the worship of idols and to deny and forsake the holy faith. Although first proved by divers and sundry policies to induce her to the same (as now with the flattering and enticing words of the judge, now with the threatenings of the storming executioner), she stood notwithstanding stedfast in all courageous strength, and willingly offered her body to hard and painful torments, not refusing (as she

said) to suffer whatsoever it should be, yea, though it were death itself. Then said the cruel tyrant, "If to suffer pain and torment be so easy a matter, and lightly regarded of thee, and that thou accountest thy life nothing worthy, yet the shame of thy dedicated or vowed virginity is a thing more regarded, I know, and esteemed of thee. Wherefore, this is determined, that forasmuch as thou, Agnes the virgin, inveighest against both Minerva and her virginity, thou shalt make obeisance to the altar of Minerva, and ask forgiveness of her for thy arrogancy; else thou shalt be sent and abandoned to the common stews or brothel-houses, whither the youth in shoals will flock and run together, and crave that they may have thee for their ludibrious prey." Then saith Agnes, "Christ is not forgetful of those that be his, that he will suffer violently to be taken from them their golden and pure chastity, neither will he leave them so destitute of help. He is always at hand, and ready to fight for such as are shamefaced and chaste virgins; neither suffereth he his gifts of holy blood, if thou wilt. but thou shalt not defile my body with filthy lust, for any thing thou canst do. She had no sooner spoken these words, but he commanded that she should be set naked at the corner of some street (which place, at that time, such as were strumpets, commonly used); the greater part of the multitude both sorrowing and shaming to see so shameless a sight, went their ways, some turning their heads, some hiding their faces. But one amongst the rest, with uncircumcised eyes beholding the damsel, and that in such opprobrious wise, behold! a flame of fire, like unto a flash of lightning, falleth upon him, and striketh his eyes; whereupon he, falling unto the ground for dead, sprawleth in the kennel-dirt; whose companions taking him up, and carrying him away, bewailed him as a dead man: but the virgin, for this her miraculous delivery from the danger and shame of that place, singeth praises to God and Christ.

There be [saith Prudentius] that report, how that she, being desired to pray unto Christ for the party that a little before was stricken with fire from heaven for his incontineny, was restored by her prayer both unto his perfect health and sight. But blessed Agnes,

after that she had climbed this her first greese <sup>f1548</sup> and step unto the heavenly palace, forthwith began to climb another: for fury engendering now the mortal wrath of her bloody enemy, wringing his hands, he crieth out, saying, "I am undone! O thou executioner, draw out thy sword, and do thine office that the emperor hath appointed thee!" And when Agnes saw a sturdy and cruel fellow to behold, stand near to her with a naked sword in his hand, "I am now gladder," saith she, "and rejoyce that such a one as thou, being a stout, fierce, strong, and sturdy soldier, art come, than that one more feeble, weak, and faint, should come; or else any other young man, sweetly embalmed, and wearing gay apparel, that might destroy me with the loss of my chastity. This, even this, is he, I now confess, that I do love. I will make haste to meet him, and will no longer protract my longing desire. I will willingly receive into my paps the length of his sword, and into my breast will draw the force thereof even unto the hilts, that thus, I being married unto Christ my spouse, may surmount and escape all the darkness of this world, being raised even unto the skies. O eternal Governor! vouchsafe to open the 'gates of heaven, once shut up against all the inhabitants of the earth, and receive, O Christ, my soul that seeketh thee." Thus speaking, and kneeling upon her knees, she prayeth, looking up unto Christ above in heaven, that so her neck might be the readier, for the sword, now hanging over the same. The executioner then with his bloody hand accomphsheth her hope, and at one, stroke cutteth off her head; and by such short and swift death doth he prevent her of the pain thereof. <sup>F1549</sup>

I have oftentimes before complained, that the stories of saints have been powdered and sauced with divers untrue additions, and fabulous inventions of men, who, either of a superstitious devotion, or of a subtle practice, have so mangled their stories and lives, that almost nothing remaineth in them simple and uncorrupt, as in the usual portasses wont to be read for daily service, is manifest and evident to be seen; wherein few legends there be able to abide the touch of history, if they were truly tried. This I write upon the occasion specially of good Katharine, whom now I have in hand; in whom although I nothing doubt but in her life was great holiness, in her knowledge excellency, in her death constancy, yet, that all

things be true that be storied of her, neither do I affirm, neither am I bound so to think; so many strange fictions of her be feigned diversely of divers writers, whereof some seem incredible, some also impudent. As where Petrus de Natalibus, <sup>f1550</sup> writing of her conversion, declareth, how that Katharine sleeping before a certain picture or table of the crucifix, Christ with his mother Mary appeared unto her; and when Mary had offered her unto Christ to be his wife, he first refused her for her blackness. The next time, she being baptized, Mary appearing again, offered her to marry with Christ; who then, being liked, was espoused to him and married, having a golden ring the same time put on her finger in her sleep, etc. <sup>f1551</sup> Bergomensis writeth thus, that because she in the sight of the people openly resisted the emperor Maxentius to his face, and rebuked him for his cruelty, therefore she was commanded and committed upon the same to prison: which seemeth hitherto not much to digress from truth. It followeth, moreover, that the same night an angel came to her, comforting and exhorting her to be strong and constant unto the martyrdom, for that she was a maid accepted in the sight of God, and that the Lord would be with her for whose honor she did fight, and that he would give her a mouth and wisdom which her enemies should not withstand: with many other things more, which I here omit. As this also I omit concerning the fifty philosophers, whom she in disputation convicted, and converted unto our religion, and who died martyrs for the same. *Item*, of the converting of Porphyry, kinsman to Maxentius, and Faustins, the emperor's wife. At length (saith the story), after she had proved the rack and the four sharp-cutting wheels, having at last her head cut off with the sword, so she finished her martyrdom, about the year of our Lord 310, as Antoninus affirmeth. <sup>F1552</sup> Simeon Metaphrastes, writing of her, discourseth the same more at large, to whom they may resort, who covet more therein to be satisfied.

Among the works of Basil a certain oration is extant concerning Julitta the martyr, of Caesarea in Cappadocia, who came to her martyrdom (as he witnesseth) by this occasion:

A certain avaricious and greedy person of great authority (and, as it may appear, the emperor's deputy, or other like officer), who abused the decrees and laws of the emperor against the Christians, to his own lucre and gain, violently took from this Julitta all her

goods, lands, chattels, and servants, contrary to all equity and right. She made her pitiful complaint to the judges: a day was appointed when the cause should be heard. The spoiled woman, and the spoiling extortioner, stood forth together: the woman lamentably declareth her cause; the man frowningly beholdeth her face. When she had proved that of good right the goods were her own, and that wrongfully he had dealt with her, the wicked and bloodthirsty wretch, preferring vile worldly substance before the precious substance of a christian body, affirmed her action to be of no force, for that she was an outlaw, in not having observed the emperor's gods since her christian faith had been abjured. His allegation was allowed as good and reasonable. Whereupon incense and fire were prepared for her to worship the gods, which unless she would do, neither the emperor's protection, nor laws, nor judgment, nor life, should she enjoy in that commonweal. When this handmaid of the Lord heard these words, she said, "Farewell life, welcome death; farewell riches, welcome poverty. All that I have. if it were a thousand times more, would I rather lose, than to speak one wicked and blasphemous word against God my Creator. I yield thee thanks most hearty, O my God! for this gift of grace, that I can contemn and despise this frail and transitory world, esteeming christian profession above all treasures." Henceforth, when any question was demanded, her answer was: "I am the servant of Jesus Christ." Her kindred and acquaintance, flocking to her, advertised her to change her mind: but that vehemently she refused, with detestation of their idolatry. Forthwith the judge, with the sharp sword of sentence, not only cutteth off all her goods and possessions, but judgeth her also to the fire most cruelly. The joyful martyr embraceth the sentence as a thing most sweet and delectable. She addresseth herself to the flames, in countenance, gesture and words, declaring the joy of her heart, coupled with singular constancy. To the women beholding her sententiously she spake: "Stick not, O sisters, to labor and travail after true piety and godliness. Cease to accuse the fragility of feminine nature. What! are not we created of the same matter that men are? Yea, after God's image and similitude are we made as lively as they. Not flesh only did God use in the creation of the woman, in sign and token of her infirmity

and weakness, but bone of bones is she, in token that she must be strong in the true and living God, all false gods forsaken; constant in faith, all infidelity renounced; patient in adversity, all worldly ease refused. Wax weary, my dear sisters, of your lives led in darkness, and be in love with my Christ, my God, my Redeemer, my Comforter, who is the true light of the world. Persuade yourselves, or rather the Spirit of the living God persuade you, that there is a world to come, wherein the worshippers, of idols and devils shall be tormented perpetually; the servants of the high God shall be crowned eternally. With these words she embraced the fire, and sweetly slept in the Lord. <sup>F1553</sup>

There have been, moreover, beside these above recited, divers godly women and faithful martyrs, as Barbara a noble woman in Tuscany, who, after miserable prisonment, sharp cords, and burning flames put to her sides, was at last beheaded. Also Fausta the virgin, who suffered under Maximian; by whom Euiladius a ruler of the emperor's palace, and Maximin the president, were both converted, and also suffered martyrdom, as witnesseth Metaphrastes. *Item*, Juliana, a virgin of singular beauty in Nicomedia, who, after divers agonies, suffered likewise under Maximin. *Item*, **Anysia a maid** <sup>a107</sup> of Thessalonica, who under the said Maximin suffered. <sup>F1554</sup> Justina, who suffered with Cyprian bishop of Antioch; <sup>f1555</sup> not to omit also Tecla, <sup>f1556</sup> although most writers do record that she suffered under Nero. Platina <sup>f1557</sup> maketh also mention of Lucia and Agatha. All which holy maids and virgins glorified the Lord Christ with their constant martyrdom, in this tenth and last persecution of Dioclesian.

During the time of which persecution, these bishops of Rome succeeded one after another; Caius, who succeeded awhile after Sixtus <sup>f1558</sup> before-mentioned; Marcellinus; Marcellus (of whom Eusebius in his story maketh no mention); Eusebius; and then Miltiades: all which died martyrs in the tempest of this persecution. First, Marcellinus, after the martyrdom of Caius, was ordained bishop. He, being brought by Dioclesian to the idols, first yielded to their idolatry, and was seen to sacrifice. Wherefore, being excommunicated by the Christians, he fell into such repentance, that he returned again to Dioclesian, where he, standing to his former confession, and publicly condemning the idolatry of the heathen, recovered the crown of martyrdom, suffering with Claudius, Quirinus, and Antoninus. <sup>F1559</sup>

Marcellus likewise was urged of Maxentius to renounce his bishopric and religion, and to sacrifice with them to idols; which when he constantly refused, he was beaten with cudgels, and so expelled the city. Then he, entering into the house of Lucina a widow, assembled there the congregation; which when it came to the ears of Maxentius the tyrant, he turned the house of Lucina into a stable, <sup>f1560</sup> and made Marcellus the keeper of the beasts; who with the stink thereof and miserable handling was put to death. Eusebius sat bishop of Rome, as Eusebius saith, <sup>f1561</sup> seven months; Marianus Scotus saith eight months, Damasus affirmeth six years. Sabellicus allegeth certain authors that say, that he was slain by Maximian; but correcteth that himself, affirming that Maximian died before him.

Miltiades or Melchiades, by the testimony of Platina and others that follow him, sat three years and seven months, and suffered under Maximian. But that seemeth not to be true, <sup>f1562</sup> as Sabellicus doth rightly note, (Euseb. Ecc. Hist. 10. 5.) affirming that the same cannot stand by the supputation of time; forsomuch as the said Galerius' Maximian reigned but two years, and died before Miltiades. Also Eusebius manifestly expresseth the example of a letter of Constantine <sup>f1563</sup> written to this Miltiades bishop of Rome, plainly convicting that to be false, which Platina affirmeth.

In the book collected of General Councils, among the decretal epistles, there is a long tractation about the judgment and condemnation of Marcellinus; whereof the masters and patrons of popery in these our days take great hold to prove the supremacy of the pope to be above all general councils, and that he ought not to be subject to the condemnation of any person or persons, for that there is written, "Nemo unquam iudicavit pontificem, nec praesul sacerdotem suum, quoniam prima sedes non iudicabitur a quoquam <sup>f1564</sup> etc.": although this sentence of Miltiades seemeth apparently to be patched in rather by some Hildebrand than by Miltiades, both for that it hangeth with little order of sense upon that which goeth before; and again, because that "prima series," here mentioned, was not yet ordained nor attributed to the see of Rome before the council of Nice, where the order and placing of bishops was first established. But to let this sentence pass, yet notwithstanding, the circumstance and proceeding of this judgment, if it be rightly weighed, maketh very little to the purpose of these men. Neither is it true that the bishops of this council

of Sinuessa <sup>f1565</sup> did not condemn Marcellinus, for the words of the council be plain: “They subscribed therefore to his condemnation, and condemned him to be expelled out of the city.” <sup>F1566</sup> Moreover by the said council were brought in the seventy-two witnesses against Marcellinus, <sup>f1567</sup> In the said council, the verdict of the same witnesses was demanded, and also received. Furthermore Quirinus, one of the bishops there, openly protested, that he would not depart the council, before the naughtiness of the bishop was revealed. What doth all this declare, but that the bishop of Rome was called there, and did appear before the judgment-seat of the council, and there stood subject to their sentence and authority, by the which he was expelled out of the city? As for the words of the council, whereupon our papists stand so much, “Non enim nostro, seal tuo ipsius iudicio condemnaberis,” etc. *Item*, “Tuo ore iudica causam tuam,” etc.: these words import not here the authority of the Roman bishop to be above the council, neither do they declare what the council could not do, but what they would and wished rather to be clone; that is, that he should rather acknowledge his crime before God and them with a voluntary yielding of his heart, than that the confession of such a heinous fact should be extorted from him through their condemnation; for that they saw to be expedient for his soups health, otherwise their condemnation should serve him to small purpose. And so it came to pass; for he, being urged of them to condemn himself, so did, prostrating himself and weeping before them; whereupon immediately they proceeded to the sentence against him, <sup>f1568</sup> condemning and pronouncing him to be expelled the city. Now, whether by this may be gathered that the bishops of Rome ought not to be cited, accused, and condemned by any person or persons, let the indifferent reader judge simply.

As touching the decretal epistles, which be intituled under the names of these aforesaid bishops, whoso well adviseth them, and with judgment will examine the style, the time, the argument, the hanging together of the matter, and the constitutions in them contained (little serving to any purpose, and nothing serving for those troublesome days then present), may easily discern them, either in no part to be theirs, or much of the same to be clouted and patched by the doings of others, which lived in other times; especially seeing all the constitutions in them, for the most part, tend to the setting up and to exalt the see of Rome above all other bishops

and churches, and to reduce all causes and appeals to the said see of Rome. So the epistle of Caius, beginning with the commendation of the authority of his see, endeth after the same tenor, willing and commanding all difficult questions in all provinces whatsoever emerging, to be referred to the see apostolical. Moreover the greatest part of the said epistle from this place, <sup>f1569</sup> “Quicunque illi sunt, ita obcaecati,” etc. to the end of this period, “Quoniam sicut ait Beatus Apostolus, magnum est pietatis,” etc., is contained in the epistle of Leo, unto Leo the emperor: and so rightly agreeth in all points with the style of Leo, that evident it is the same to be borrowed out of Leo, and to be patched into the epistle of Caius out of Leo.

Likewise the epistle of Marcellinus, to get more authority with the reader, is admixed with a great part of Paul’s epistle to the Ephesians, word for word. And how is it likely that Marcellinus, which died in the twentieth year of Dioclesian, could write of consubstantiality of the Divine Persons, when that controversy and term of consubstantiality was not heard of in the church before the Nicene council, which was twenty-three years after him? But especially the two epistles of Marcellus bewray themselves, so that for the confuting thereof needeth no other probation more than only the reading of the same. Such a glorious style of ambition therein doth appear, as it is easy to be understood not to proceed either from such an humble martyr, or to sayour any thing of the misery of such a time. His words of his first epistle written unto the brethren of Antioch, and alleged in the pope’s decrees by Gratian, are these: <sup>f1570</sup>

“We desire you, brethren, that you do not teach nor think any other thing but what ye have received of the blessed apostle St. Peter, and of the other apostles and fathers. For of him ye were first of all instructed; wherefore you must not forsake your own Father, and follow others. For he is the Head of the whole church, to whom the Lord said, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church;” whose seat was first with you in Antioch, which afterward, by the commandment of the Lord, was translated from thence to Rome; of the which church of Rome I am this day placed (by the grace of God) to be the governor. <sup>f1571</sup> From the ordering of which church of Rome neither ought you to deviate, seeing to the same church all manner of causes ecclesiastical, being of any

importance, (God's grace so disposing) are commanded to be referred; by the same authority to be ordered regularly, from whence they took their first beginning," etc. And followeth consequently upon the same, "And if your church of Antioch, which was once the first, yielded precedence unto the see of Rome, there is no other church else that is not subject to our dominion. To whom all bishops who please or find it necessary (according to the decrees of the apostles and of their successors), ought to fly, as to their head, and must appeal to the same, so as there to have their redress and protection, from whence they took their first instruction and consecration," etc. <sup>f1572</sup>

Whether this be likely matter to proceed from the spirit of Marcellus, that blessed martyr, in those so dreadful days, I say no more, but only desire thee, gentle reader, to judge.

In his second epistle, moreover, the said Marcellus writing to Maxentius, the bloody tyrant, first reprehendeth him for his cruelty, sharply admonishing him how and what to do: to learn and seek the true religion of God, to maintain his church, to honor and reverence the priests of God; and especially exhorteth him to charity, and that he would cease from persecution, etc. All this is possible, and likely to be true. But now mark, good reader, what blanch stuff here followeth withal: as where he, alleging the statutes and sanctions of his predecessors, declareth and discusseth that no bishop nor minister ought to be persecuted or deprived of his goods. And if they be, then ought they to have their possessions and places again restored by the law, before they were bound by the law to answer to the accusations laid in against them; and so after that, in convenient time, to be called to a council; the which council notwithstanding, without the authority of the holy see, cannot proceed regularly, albeit it remain in his power to assemble certain bishops together. Neither can he regularly condemn any bishop, appealing to this his apostolical see., before the sentence definitive do proceed from the aforesaid see, etc. And it followeth after: "And therefore," saith he, "let no bishop, of what crime soever he be attached, come to his accusation, or be heard, but in his own ordinary synod at his convenient time: the regular and apostolical authority being joined withal." Moreover in the said epistle, writing unto Maxentius, he decreeth that no laymen, nor any

suspected bishop, ought to accuse prelates of the church: “So that if they be either laymen, or men of evil conversation, or proved manifest enemies, or incensed with any hatred, their accusations against any bishops ought not to stand:” with other such matters more, concerning the disposition of judicial courts; which matter, if pope Gregory VII. had written unto Henry IV. emperor, or if pope Alexander III. had written to the emperor Frederic I., it might have stood with some reason and opportunity of time. But now for Marcellus to write these decrees <sup>f1573</sup> in such persecution of the church, to Maxentius the heathen and most cruel emperor, how unlikely it is to be true, and how it served then to purpose, the reader may soon discern. And yet these be the epistles and constitutions decretal, whereby (under the pretended title of the fathers) all churches of late time, and all ecclesiastical causes, have been and yet are, in this realm of England to this day governed, directed, and disposed.

The like discussion and examination I might also make of the other epistles that follow of Eusebius and Miltiades, which all tend to the same scope, that no prelate or bishop ought to come to his answer (or “Ad litem contestatam,” as the words of their writing do term it.) before they be orderly and fully restored, again to their possessions. Who moreover in the said their epistles still harp upon this key of the Scripture, “Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecolasiam meam.” Declaring, moreover, that this privilege of judging all men, and to be judged of no man, but only to be left to the judgment of the Lord, was given to this aforesaid holy see of Rome from time of the apostles, and chiefly left with Peter the holy key-keeper: so that although the election of the apostles was equal, yet this was chiefly granted to St. Peter, to have pre-eminence above the rest. Concluding in the end hereby, “That always all greater causes, as be the matters of bishops, and such other cares of weighty importance, should be brought to the see of St. Peter, the blessed prince of the apostles,” <sup>f1574</sup> etc. These be the words of Miltiades and Eusebius, whereby it may partly be smelled of him that hath any nose, what was the meaning of them which forged these writings and letters upon these ancient holy martyrs. <sup>F1575</sup>

This I cannot but marvel at in the third epistle of Eusebius, the bishop of Rome, that whereas Marcellinus, his late predecessor before, in his own time and remembrance did fall so horribly, and was condemned for the same justly to be expulsed the city by the council of three hundred

bishops, yet notwithstanding the aforesaid Eusebius, in his third epistle, <sup>f1576</sup> alleging that place of “Tu es Petrus,” bringeth in for a proof of the same, and saith, “Quia in sede apostolica extra maculam semper est catholica servata religio,” etc.; that is, “For in the apostolical see always the catholic religion hath been preserved without any spot or blemish.” But howsoever the forgers of these decretal epistles have forgotten themselves, most certain it is, that these holy bishops, unto whom they were and are ascribed, lived perfect good men, and died blessed martyrs. Of whom this Miltiades was the last among all the bishops of Rome here in the west church of Europe, that ever was in danger of persecution to be martyred, yet to this present day.

And thus have ye heard the stories and names of such blessed saints, as suffered in the time of persecution, from the nineteenth year of Dioclesian to the seventh <sup>f1577</sup> and last year of Maxentius, described; with the deaths also and plagues upon those tormentors and cruel tyrants, which were the captains of the same persecution. And here cometh in (blessed be Christ!) the end of these persecutions here in these west churches of Europe, so far as the dominion of blessed Constantine did chiefly extend. Yet, notwithstanding, in Asia all persecution as yet ceased not for the space of four years, as above is mentioned, by the means of wicked Licinius, under whom divers there were holy and constant martyrs, that suffered grievous torments; as Hermylus a deacon, and Stratonicus, a keeper of the prison, both which after their punishments sustained, were strangled in the Danube. <sup>F1578</sup> Also Theodorus the captain, <sup>f1579</sup> who being sent for of Licinius, because he would not come, and because he brake his gods in pieces, and gave them to the poor, therefore was fastened to the cross, and after being pierced with sharp pricks or bodkins in the secret parts of his body, was at last beheaded. Add to these also Milles, <sup>f1580</sup> who being first a soldier, was afterward made bishop of a certain city in Persia; where he, seeing himself could do no good to convert them, after many tribulations and great afflictions among them, cursed the city and departed; which city, shortly after, by Sapor, <sup>f1581</sup> king of Persia, was destroyed.

In the same country of Persia, about this time [A.D. 343] suffered under Sapor the king (as recordeth Simeon Metasphrastes) divers valiant and constant martyrs, as Acindynus, Pegasius, An empodistus, Epidephorus, <sup>f1582</sup> also Simeon, archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, royal cities of

Persia, with other ministers and religious men of that region, to the number of one hundred and twenty-eight. Of this Simeon thus writeth Sozomen:

f1583

The idolatrous magicians and the Jews in Persia, taking counsel together against the Christians, accused Simeon, archbishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, to Sapor the king, of being friendly to the Roman emperor, and of bewraying to him such things as were done in the land of Persia. Whereupon Sapor being moved, took great displeasure against the Christians, oppressing them with taxes and tributes unto their utter impoverishing, killing all their priests with the sword: after that he called for Simeon the archbishop, who there, before the king, declared himself a worthy and valiant captain of Christ's church. For when Sapor had commanded him to be led to suffer torments, he neither shrank for any fear, nor showed any great humble suit of submission for any pardon: whereat the king, partly marvelling, partly offended, asked "Why he did not kneel down as he was wont before to do?" Simeon to this answered, "For that," saith he, "before this time I was not brought unto you in bonds to betray the true God, as I am now; and so long I refused not to accomplish that which the order and custom of the realm of me required: but now it is not lawful for me so to do, for now I come to stand in defense of our religion and true doctrine." When Simeon thus had answered, the king, persisting in his purpose, offereth to him the choice either to worship the sun with him after his manner (promising to him many great gifts, if he would so do), or, if he would not, threateneth to him and to all the other Christians within his land destruction. But Simeon, neither allured with his promises nor terrified with his threatenings, continued constant in his doctrine professed, so as neither he could be induced to idolatrous worship, nor yet to betray the truth of his religion. For the which cause he was committed into bonds, and there commanded to be kept, till the king's pleasure was further known.

It befel in the way as he was going to the prison, there was sitting at the king's gate a certain eunuch, an old tutor or schoolmaster of the king's, named Usthazanes, who had been once a Christian, and

afterward, falling from his profession, fell with the heathenish multitude to their idolatry. This Usthazanes, sitting at the door of the king's palace, and seeing Simeon passing by, led to the prison, rose up, and revered the bishop. Simeon, again, with sharp words (as the time would suffer) rebuked him, and in great anger cried out against him, who being once a Christian, would so cowardly revolt from his profession, and return again to the heathenish idolatry. At the hearing of these words the eunuch forthwith bursting out into tears, laying away his courtly apparel, which was sumptuous and costly, and putting upon him a black and mourning weed, sitteth before the court gates, weeping and bewailing, thus saying with himself: "Woe is me! with what hope, with what face shall I look hereafter for my God, who have denied my God, when this Simeon, my familiar acquaintance, thus passing by me, so much disdaineth me, that he refuseth with one gentle word to salute me?"

These words being brought to the ears of the king (as such tale-carriers never lack in princes' courts), procured against him no little indignation. Whereupon Sapor the king sending for him, first with gentle words and courtly promises began to speak him fair, asking him, "What cause he had so to mourn, and whether there was any thing in his house which was denied him, or which he had not at his own will and asking?" Whereunto Usthazanes answering again, said, "That there was nothing in that earthly house, which was to him lacking, or whereunto his desire stood. Yea would God," said he, "O king, any other grief or calamity in the world, whatsoever it were, had happened to me rather than this, for the which I do most justly mourn and sorrow! For this sorroweth me, that I am this day alive, who should rather have died long since, and that I see this sun, which against my heart and mind, for your pleasure dissemblingly I appeared to worship; for which cause double-wise I am worthy of death: first, for that I have denied Christ; secondly, because I did dissemble with you." And incontinent upon these words, swearing by him that made both heaven and earth, he affirmed most certainly, that although he had played the fool before, he would never be so mad again, as instead of the Creator

and Maker of all things, to worship the creatures which he had made and created. Sapor the king, being astonished at the so sudden alteration of this man, and more enraged than ever at the Christians, whom he supposed to have wrought this change in him by means of enchantments, doubting whether to intreat him with gentleness or with rigor, at length, in this mood, commanded the said Usthazanes, his old ancient servant, and first tutor and bringer up of his youth, to be had away, and to be beheaded. As he was going to the place of execution, he desired of the executioners a little to stay, while he might send a message unto the king, which was this (sent in by one of the king's most trusty eunuchs), desiring him, that for all the old and faithful service he had done to his father, and to him, he would now requite him with this one office again, to cause to be cried openly by a public crier in these words following: "That Usthazanes was beheaded, not for any treachery or crime committed against the king or the realm, but only for that he was a Christian, and would not, at the king's pleasure, deny his God." And so, according unto his request, it was performed and granted. For this cause did Usthazanes so much desire the cause of his death to be published, because that as his shrinking back from Christ was a great occasion to many Christians to do the like, so now the same, hearing that Usthazanes died for no other cause but only for the religion of Christ, should learn likewise by his example to be fervent and constant in that which they profess. And thus this blessed eunuch did consummate his martyrdom. Of the which his said martyrdom Simeon (being in prison) hearing, was very joyful, and gave God thanks; who, on the next day following, being brought forth before the king, and constantly refusing to condescend unto the king's request, to worship him or the sun, was likewise by the commandment of the king beheaded, with a great number more which the same day also did suffer, to the number (as is said) of a hundred and more; all which were put to death before Simeon, he standing by, and exhorting them with comfortable words, admonishing them to stand firm and stedfast in the Lord; preaching, and teaching them concerning death, resurrection, and true piety; and proving by the Scriptures that so to die, was true life indeed; and that it was death indeed, to deny or betray God for

fear of punishment. And added further, “There is no man alive, but needs once must die; forsomuch as to all men is appointed necessarily here to have an end. But those things which after this life follow hereafter, are eternal; which neither shall come to all men after one sort; for the time shall come when all men in a moment shall render an account of their lives, and receive according to their doings in this present life immortal recompence: such as have here done well, life and glory; such as have done contrary, perpetual punishment. As touching our well doing, there is no doubt but of all other our holy actions and virtuous deeds, there is no higher or greater deed, than if a man here lose his life for his Lord God.” With these words of comfortable exhortation the holy martyrs being prepared, willingly yielded up their lives to death. After whom at last followed Simeon, with two other priests or ministers of his church, Abedechalaas and Ananias, who also with him were partakers of the same martyrdom. <sup>F1584</sup>

At the suffering of those above mentioned, it happened that Pusices, one of the king’s officers and overseer of his artificers, was there present; who, seeing Ananias, being an aged old father, somewhat to shake and tremble as he was preparing to suffer, “O father,” said he, “a little moment shut thine eyes, and be strong, and shortly thou shalt see the light of Christ.” Upon these words thus spoken, Pusices immediately was apprehended and brought unto the king; who there confessing himself constantly to be a Christian, and for that he was very bold and hardy before the king in this cause of Christs faith, was extremely and most cruelly handled in the execution of his martyrdom; for in the upper part of his neck they made a hole to thrust in their hand, and plucked out his tongue out of his mouth; and so he was put to death. At the which time also the daughter of Pusices, a godly virgin, by the malicious accusation of the wicked, was apprehended and put to death.

The next year following, upon the same day when the Christians did celebrate the remembrance of the Lord’s passion (which we call Good Friday before Easter), as witnesseth the said Sozomen, Sapor the king directed out a cruel and sharp edict throughout all his land, condemning to death all them whosoever confessed themselves to be Christians. By reason whereof an innumerable multitude of Christians, through the wicked

procuring of the malignant magicians, suffered the same time by the sword, both in city and in town; some being sought for, some offering themselves willingly, lest they should seem, by their silence, to deny Christ. Thus all the Christians that could be found without pity were slain, and divers also of the king's own court and household; amongst whom was also Azades, a eunuch, one whom the king did entirely love and favor; which Azades after that the king understood to be put to death, being greatly moved with the sorrow thereof, he commanded after that no Christians should be slain, but them only who were the doctors and teachers of christian religion. <sup>F1585</sup>

In the same time it happened that the queen fell into a certain disease; upon the occasion whereof the cruel Jews, with the wicked magicians, falsely and maliciously accused Tarbula, the sister of Simeon the martyr, a godly virgin, with a sister also and a maid of hers, that they had wrought privy charms, to hurt the queen, for the revenging of the death of Simeon. This accusation being received and believed, innocent Tarbula, and the two others, were condemned, and with a saw cut in sunder by the middle; whose quarters were then hanged upon stakes, the queen going between them, thinking thereby to be delivered of her sickness. This Tarbula was a maid of a right comely beauty and very amiable, to whom one of the magicians cast great love, much desiring and laboring, by gifts and rewards sent into the prison, to win her to his pleasure; promising that if she would apply to his request, she should be delivered and set at liberty. But she, utterly refusing to consent unto him, or rather rebuking him for his incontinent attempt, did choose rather to die, than to betray either the religion of her mind or the virginity of her body.

Now, forsomuch as the king had commanded that no Christians should be put to death, but only such as were the teachers and leaders of the flock, the ms, clans and arch-magicians left no diligence untried to set forward the matter; whereby great affliction and persecution was among the bishops and teachers of the church, who in all places went to slaughter, especially in the country of the Adiabeni; <sup>f1586</sup> for that part of Persia, above all other, was most christian: <sup>f1587</sup> where Acepsimas the bishop, with a great number of his flock and clergy, were apprehended and taken; upon the apprehension of whom, the magicians, to satisfy the king's commandment, dismissed all the rest, only depriving them of their living and goods. Only Acepsimas the bishop they retained, with whom one Jacob, a priest of his

church, was also joined; not of any compulsion, but only as himself so desired and obtained of those magicians that he might follow him, and be coupled in the same bonds, to serve the aged bishop, and to relieve (so much as he might) his calamities, and heal his wounds. For he had been sore scourged before of the magicians, after they had apprehended him, **and urged him** <sup>a108</sup> to worship the sun: which thing, because he would not do, they cast him into prison again, where this Jacob was waiting upon him. At the same time likewise Aithalas and Jacob, <sup>f1588</sup> priests, also Azadanes and Abdiesus, deacons, were imprisoned and miserably scourged, for the testimony of the Lord Jesus. After this the arch-magician, <sup>f1589</sup> espying his time, complaineth unto the king of them, having authority and commission given him (unless they would worship the sun) to punish them as he pleased. This commandment received of the king the arch-magician doth declare to them in prison. But they answered again plainly, that they would never be either betrayers of Christ, or worshippers of the sun; whereupon without mercy they were put to bitter torments: where Acepsimas, strongly persisting in the confession of Christ, died; the other, being no less rent and wounded with scourges, yet continued marvellously alive, and, because they would in no case turn from their constant sentence, were turned again into prison. Of whom Aithalas, in the time of his whipping, was so drawn and racked with pulling, that both his arms being loosed out of the joints hanged down from his body, which he so carried about, without use of any hand to feed himself, but as he was fed of others. <sup>F1590</sup>

Miserable, and almost innumerable, were the slaughters under the reign of this Sapor, of priests, deacons, monks, holy virgins, and other ecclesiastical persons, such as did then cleave to the doctrine of Christ, and suffered for the same: the names of the bishops taken in the persecution, besides the other multitude, are recited in Sozomen, <sup>f1591</sup> and in Nicephorus, <sup>f1592</sup> in this order following; Barbasymes, Paulus, Gaddiabes, Sabinus, Marcus, Mocius, Johannes, Hormisdas, Papas, Jacobus, Romas, Madres, Agas, Bochres, Abdas, Abdiesus, Johannes, Abramius, Agdelas, Sapor, Isaac, and Dausas, <sup>f1593</sup> a prisoner of war from Zabda; with Mareabdas, a chorepiscopus, and the rest of his clergy under him, to the number of two hundred and fifty persons, who had also been taken prisoners of the Persians. Briefly, to comprehend the whole multitude of

them that suffered in that persecution, the manner of their apprehension, the cruelty of their torments, how and where they suffered, and in what places, it is not possible for any history to discharge. Neither are the Persians themselves (as Sozomen recordeth <sup>f1594</sup>) able to recite them. In sum, the multitude and number of them whom they are able to recite by name, cometh to the sum of sixteen thousand men and women.

The rumor and noise of this so miserable affliction of the Christians in the kingdom of Persia, coming to the ears of Constantine the emperor, put him in great heaviness, studying and revolving with himself, how to help the matter, which indeed was very hard for him to do. It so befel the same time, that certain ambassadors were then at Rome from Sapor king of Persia; to whom Constantine did easily grant and consent, satisfying all their requests and demands: thinking thereby to obtain the more friendship at the king's hands, that at his request he would be good to the Christians; to whom he writeth his epistle in their behalf, and sendeth the same by his messengers, beginning thus: "Divinam fidem servans, veritatis lucem sortior. Veritatis luce doctus, divinam fidem cognosco. Per ea igitur, quibus illa res agendas confirmat, sanctissimam religionem cognitam reddo, et hunc me cultum doctorem cognitionis Sancti Dei habere confiteor," etc. The contents whereof, briefly do tend to this effect:

He declareth unto him how he should stand much beholden to him, if at his request he would show some quiet and rest to the Christians in whose religion there was nothing which he could justly blame: forsomuch as in their sacrifices they use to kill nothing, nor to shed blood, but only to offer up unbloody sacrifices; to make their prayers unto God, who delighteth not in blood-shedding, but only in the soul that loveth virtue, and followeth such doctrine and knowledge, which is agreeing unto true piety; and therefore such men as do lead and learn him so to believe and to worship God, are more to be commended. Moreover, he assureth him to find God more merciful unto him, if he would embrace the godly piety and truth of the Christians. And for example thereof, alludeth to the stories of Gallien and Valerian, who, so long as they were favourers of the Christians, did prosper and flourish: but, as soon as they moved any persecution against them, it happened to them as it did to all other emperors before

them, that all went backward with them; as specially might appear by Valerian, who, after he had raged so cruelly against the Christians, was eftsoons overcome of the Persians, the revenging hand of God falling upon him; where he led ever a miserable life, in wretched captivity. Further also, for the more evidence of the same, he referreth to the examples of those emperors and tyrants in his time, whom he vanquished and subdued only by his faith in Christ, for the which faith God was his helper, and gave him the victory in many battles, and triumph over great tyrants; whereby he hath so enlarged the dominion of the Roman monarchy, from the West ocean unto the uttermost parts well-near of all the East. To the doing whereof, he neither called to him the help of any charmer, or divination of soothsayer, nor used the killing of any sacrifice, but only the following of the cross; and prayer made to Almighty God, without any bloody sacrifice, was the armor wherewith he overcame, etc.

And in the end of the epistle he addeth these words:

“What joy,” saith he, “is it to my heart, to hear the kingdom also of the Persians to flourish and abound in this sort of men; the Christians, I mean. And I wish that both you with them, and they with you, in long prosperity may enjoy much felicity together, as your hearts would desire. For so shall you have God, who is the Author and Creator of all this universal world, to be merciful and gracious to you. These men, therefore, I commend to your kingly honor; and, for the piety for which you are renowned, I commit the same unto you; embrace them according to your humanity and benignity; and in so doing you will confer an immense benefit through your faith, both on yourself and on me.” <sup>F1595</sup>

This epistle wrote Constantine <sup>f1596</sup> to king Sapor; such care had this godly prince for them that believed in Christ, not only in his own monarchy, but also in all places of the world. Neither is it to be doubted, but this intercession of the emperor did something mitigate the heat of the Persian’s persecution, although thereof we read no certain thing in our histories.

Of other troubles and persecutions we read, which happened afterward in the said country of Persia, under Isdegerdes the king, and his son and successor Vororanes; but these followed long after, about the time of the emperor Theodosius the younger; <sup>f1597</sup> at which time suffered Abdas a bishop, <sup>f1598</sup> and Hormisdas a great nobleman's son, and of great reputation among the Persians; whom when the king understood to be a Christian, and to deny to turn from his religion, he condemned him to keep his **army-camels, naked.** <sup>a109</sup> In process of time, the king looking out of his chamber window, and seeing him all swarted and tanned in the sun, commanded him to have a shirt put on, and to be brought before him; whom then the king asked, if he would deny Christ. Hormisdas hearing this, tore off his shirt from his body and cast it from him, saying, "If ye think that I will deny my faith to Christ for a shirt, have here your gift again," etc. And so was upon that expelled the country. <sup>f1599</sup>

Another there was that same time, named Suenes, which had under him a **thousand servants.** <sup>a110</sup> The king, taking displeasure with him for that he would not alter from his religion and godly truth, asked who was the worst of all his servants, and him the king made ruler of all the rest, and coupling him in marriage with his master's wife, brought also Suenes under his subjection, thinking thereby to subdue also the faith of Suenes: but "his house was builded upon the rock." <sup>f1600</sup>

Of Benjamin the deacon thus writeth the said Theodoret, in his fifth book, that after two years of his imprisonment, at the request of the Roman ambassador he was delivered; who a year afterward, having meanwhile contrary to the king's commandment preached and taught the gospel of Christ, was most miserably excarnificate, having twenty sharp pricks of reeds thrust under his nails: but when he did laugh at that, then in his privy member he had a sharp reed thrust in with horrible pain. After that, a certain long stalk ragged and thorny, being thrust into his body by the nether part, was forced into him; with the horribleness of the pain whereof, the valiant and invincible soldier of the Lord gave over his life. <sup>f1601</sup> And thus much concerning the martyrs and persecutions among the Persians, although these persecutions belong not to this time, but came (as it is said) long after the days of Constantine, about the year of our Lord 425.

Likewise under Julian the wicked apostate, <sup>f1602</sup> certain there were which constantly suffered martyrdom by the heathen idolaters: as AEmilian who was burned in Thrace, and Domitius who was slain in his cave. Theodore also, for singing of a psalm at the removing of the body of Babylas (whereof mention is made before) being apprehended, was so examined with exquisite torments, and so cruelly excruciated from morning almost to noon, that hardly he escaped with life; who, being asked afterward of his friends, how he could abide so sharp torments, said, “That at the first beginning he felt some pain, but afterward there stood by him a young man, who, as he was sweating, wiped away his sweat, and refreshed him with cold water oftentimes: wherewith he was so delighted, that when he was let down from the engine, it grieved him more than before. <sup>f1603</sup> Artemius also, the captain of the Egyptian soldiers, the same time lost his head for his religion indeed; although other causes were pretended against him. <sup>f1604</sup> Add unto these, moreover, Eusebius, Nestabus, and Zeno, brothers, with Nestor their cousin, who for their Christianity were dragged through the streets, and murdered of the idolatrous people of Gaza. <sup>f1605</sup> Among them of Caesarea in Cappadocia, some were slain, some were banished, by Julian, for pulling down the temple of Fortune: Euppsychius, a nobleman of that country, died also with them a martyr. <sup>f1606</sup> But especially the cruelty of the inhabitants of Heliopolis, on mount Lebanon, and of Arethusa, a city of Syria, exceeded against the christian virgins, whom they set out naked before the multitude to be scorned; after that they shaved them; lastly they ripped them up, and, covering them with swill and draffe wont to be given to their hogs, so caused their bowels and flesh to be devoured of the hungry swine. This rage and fury of the wicked Arethusians Sozomen supposeth to come of this, because that Constantine before had broken them from their country-manner of setting forth and exposing their virgins filthily to whosoever lusted, and destroyed the temple of Venus at Heliopolis, restraining the people there from their filthiness and vile whoredom. <sup>f1607</sup>

Of the lamentable story or rather tragedy of Marcus, bishop of Arethusa, <sup>f1608</sup> writeth the said Sozomen; and also Theodoret, <sup>f1609</sup> in his third book and seventh chapter, in these words as followeth:

The tragedy (saith he) of Marcus, bishop of Arethusa, doth require the eloquence of AEschylus and Sophocles, to set forth and

beautify his great afflictions as the matter deserveth. This man, in the time of Constantine, pulled down a certain temple dedicated to idols, and instead thereof built up a church where the Christians might congregate. The Arethusians afterward, on learning the little good-will that Julian bare to the Christians, soon began openly to discover their spite against Marcus. At the first, according as the Scripture teacheth, he prepared himself to fly: but when he learnt that there were certain of his kinsmen or friends apprehended in his stead, returning again of his own accord, he offered himself to those that thirsted for his blood. Whom when they had gotten, as men neither pitying his old age and worn years, nor abashed at his virtuous conversation, being a man so adorned both with doctrine and manners, first stripped him naked, and pitifully beat him: then within a while after, they cast him into a foul filthy sink, and from thence being brought, they caused boys to thrust him in with sharpened sticks made for the nonce, to provoke his pain the more. Lastly, they put him in a basket, and being anointed with honey and broth, they hung him abroad in the heat of the sun, as meat for wasps and bees to feed upon. And all this extremity they showed unto him, for that they would enforce him to do one of these things; that is, either to build up again the temple which he had destroyed, or else to give so much money as should pay for the building of the same. But even as he purposed with himself to suffer and abide their grievous torments, so refused he to do that they demanded of him. At length they, taking him to be but a poor man, and not: able to pay such a sum of money, promised to forgive him the one half, so that he would be contented to pay the other half. But he, hanging in the basket, wounded pitifully with the sharpened sticks of boys and children, and all-to bebiten with wasps and bees, did not only conceal his pain and grief, but also derided those wicked ones, and called them base, low, and terrene people, and he himself to be exalted and set on high. At length, they demanding of him but a small sum of money, he answered thus: "It would be as great wickedness to confer one half penny in a case of impiety, as if I should bestow my all." Thus they, being not able to prevail against him, let him down, and were so

completely altered from their former purpose, that they received instruction in true religion at his mouth.

Although the tractation of these aforesaid stories and persecutions of Persia, above premised, do stray somewhat out of the order and course of time and place, as which came neither in the time of Constantine, nor be pertinent to the monarchy of Rome; yet because in this present history we are in hand with the holy martyrs and saints of Christ, forsomuch as these also gave such a faithful testimony of the Lord Jesus with their blood, I thought therefore not to pass them over without some testimony in this our catalogue of holy martyrs. And here an end of these persecutions of the primitive church.

It may, peradventure, be marvelled of some, reading the history of these so terrible persecutions above specified, why God Almighty, director of all things, would suffer his own people and faithful servants, believing in his own and only-begotten Son Jesus, so cruelly to be handled, so wrongfully to be vexed, so extremely to be tormented and put to death, and that the space of so many years together, as in these foresaid persecutions may appear. To the which admiration I have nothing to answer, but to say with the words of Jerome, “Non debemus super hac rerum iniquitate perturbari, videntes,” etc. We ought not to be moved with this iniquity of things, to see the wicked to prevail against the body: forsomuch as in the beginning of the world, we see Abel the just to be killed of wicked Cain; and afterward Jacob being thrust out, Esau to reign in his father’s house. In like case the Egyptians with brick and tile afflicted the sons of Israel; yea, and the Lord himself, was he not crucified of the Jews, Barabbas the thief being let go? <sup>f1610</sup>

Time would not suffice me to recite and reckon up how the godly in this world go to wrack, the wicked flourishing and prevailing. <sup>f1610</sup> Briefly, howsoever the cause hereof proceedeth, whether for our sins here in this life, or how else soever; yet this is to us, and may be to all men a sufficient stay, that we are sure these afflictions and persecutions of God’s people in this world did not come by any chance or blind fortune, but by the provident appointment and forewarning of God. For so in the old law, by the affliction of the children of Israel, he hath prefigured these persecutions of the Christians. So by the words of Christ’s own mouth in the gospel he

did forewarn his church of these troubles to come. Again, neither did he suffer these so great afflictions to fall upon his servants, before that he had premonished them sufficiently by special revelation in the Apocalypse of John his servant; in the which Apocalypse he declared unto his church before, not only what troubles were coming at hand towards them, and where and by whom they should come; but also in plain number, if the words of the prophecy be well understood, assigneth the true time, how long the said persecutions should continue, and when they should cease. For, as there is no doubt but by the beast with seven heads bearing the whore of Babylon, drunken with the blood of saints, is signified the city of Rome; so, in my judgment, the power of making <sup>f1611</sup> forty-two months (in the thirteenth of the Apocalypse) is to be expounded [by] taking every month for a sabbath of years, that is, reckoning a month for seven years, so that forty and two such sabbaths of years being gathered together, make up the years just, between the time of Christ's death to the last year of the persecution of Maxentius; <sup>f1612</sup> when Constantine, fighting under the banner of Christ, overcame him, and made an end of all persecution within the monarchy of Rome. The number of which years by plain computation come to two hundred ninety and four: to the which two hundred ninety and four years if ye add the other six years, <sup>f1613</sup> under the persecution of Licinius in Asia, then it filleth up full the three hundred years. And so long continued the persecution of Christ's people, under the heathen tyrants and emperors of the monarchy of Rome, according to the number of the forty and two months which the beast had power to make, <sup>f1614</sup> specified in the thirteenth of the Apocalypse. For the better explication whereof, because the matter (being of no small importance) greatly appertaineth to the public utility of the church; and lest any should misdoubt me herein, to follow any private interpretation of mine own; I thought good to communicate to the reader that which hath been imparted unto me, in the opening of these mystical numbers in the aforesaid Book of Revelation contained, by occasion as followeth.

As I was in hand with these histories, and therein considered the exceeding rage of these persecutions, the intolerable torments of the blessed saints, so cruelly racked, rent, torn, and plucked in pieces with all kind of tortures, pains and punishments that could be devised, more bitter than any death itself, I could not without great sorrow and passion of mind,

behold their sorrowful afflictions, or write of their bloody passions. Wherein much like it happened to me as it did to Titus Livius; who, writing of the wars of Carthage, was so moved in the writing thereof, “*Ac si in parte aliqua laboris ac periculi ipse pariter fuisset.*” The further I proceeded in the story, and the hotter the persecutions grew, the more my grief with them and for them increased; not only pitying their woful case, but almost reasoning with God, thinking thus like a fool with myself:— Why should God of his goodness suffer his children and servants so vehemently to be cruciated and afflicted? If mortal things were governed by heavenly providence (as must needs be granted), why did the wicked so rage and flourish, and the godly go so to wrack? If their sins deserved punishment, yet neither were they sinners alone, and why was their death above all other so sharp and bitter? At least why should the Lord suffer the vehemency of these so horrible persecutions to endure so long time against his poor church, showing unto them no certain determined end of their tribulations, whereby they, knowing the appointed determination of Almighty God, with more consolation might endure out the same? The Israelites in the captivity of Babylon had seventy years limited unto them; and under Pharaoh they were promised a deliverance out; also under the Syrian tyrants threescore and two weeks were abridged unto them. Only in these persecutions I could find no end determined, nor limitation set for their deliverance. Whereupon, much marvelling with myself, I searched the Book of Revelation, to see whether any thing there might be found; wherein, although I well perceived the beast there described to signify the empire of Rome, which had power to overcome the saints, yet concerning the time and continuance of these persecutions under the beast, I found nothing to satisfy my doubt. For, albeit I read there of forty-two months, of a time, times, and half a time, of one thousand two hundred and threescore days; yet all this by computation coming but to three years and a half, came nothing near the long continuance of these persecutions, which lasted three hundred years. Thus, being vexed and turmoiled in spirit about the reckoning of these numbers and years; it so happened upon a Sunday in the morning, I lying in my bed, and musing about these numbers, suddenly it was answered to my mind, as with a majesty, thus inwardly saying within me; “Thou fool, count these months by sabbaths, as the weeks of Daniel are counted by sabbaths.” The Lord I take to witness, thus it was. Whereupon thus being admonished, I began to reckon the

forty-two months by sabbaths: first, of months; that would not serve: then by sabbaths of years; wherein I began to feel some probable understanding. Yet not satisfied herewith, to have the matter more sure, eftsoons I repaired to certain merchants of mine acquaintance; of whom one is departed a true faithful servant of the Lord, the other two be yet alive, and witnesses hereof. To whom the number of these aforesaid forty-two months being propounded and examined by sabbaths of years, the whole sum was found to surmount unto two hundred ninety and four years, containing the full and just time of these aforesaid persecutions, neither more nor less.

Now this one clasp being opened, the other numbers that follow are plain and manifest to the intelligent reader to be understood. For, whereas mention is made of three days and a half; of one time, two times, and half a time; also of one thousand two hundred and threescore days; all these come to one reckoning, and signify forty and two months; by which months, as is said, is signified the whole time of these primitive persecutions, as here in order may appear.

### **THE MYSTICAL NUMBERS IN THE APOCALYPSE OPENED.**

**First**, whereas mention is made (Apocalypse, 11) that the two prophets shall prophesy one thousand two hundred and sixty days; and also that the woman flying into the desert, shall there be fed one thousand two hundred and sixty days; who knoweth not that one thousand two hundred and sixty days make three years and a half? that is, months forty-two.

**Secondly**, whereas we read (chap. 11) the bodies of the two aforesaid prophets shall lie in the streets of the great city unburied the space of three days and a half, and after the said three days and a half they shall revive again, etc., let the hours of these three days and a half (which be forty-two) be reckoned every day for a sabbath of years, or else every day for a month; and they come to months forty-two. <sup>f1615</sup>

**Thirdly**, whereas in the same book is expressed, that the woman had two wings given her to fly unto the desert for a time, times, and half a time; give for one time, one year or one day; for two times, two years or two days; for half a time, half a year or half a day; and so it is

manifest, that these three [times or] years and a half amount to months (Revelation 12:14.) forty-two.

**Fourthly**, account these forty-two months aforesaid, which the beast had power to make (Apoc. 13:5), by sabbaths of years; that is, seven years for a month, or every month for seven years; and it amounteth to the sum of years two hundred and ninety-four.

And so have ye the just years, days, times, and months of these aforesaid persecutions under the beast, neither shorter nor longer, reckoning from the death of John Baptist under Herod the Roman king, to the end of Maxentius, and of Licinius, the two last great persecutors, the one in the West, the other in the East, who were both vanquished by godly Constantine. And so peace was given to the church; albeit not in such ample wise, but that divers tumults and troubles afterward ensued, yet they lasted not long: and the chief brunt, to speak of these Roman persecutions which the Holy Ghost especially considered above all others in this his Revelation, thus; ended in the time of Constantine. Then was the great dragon the devil (to wit, the fierce rage and power of his malicious persecuting) tied short for a thousand years after this, so that he could not prevail in any such sort, but that the power and glory of the gospel by little and little increasing, and spreading with great joy and liberty, so prevailed that at length it got the upper hand, and replenished the whole earth, rightly verifying therein the water of Ezekiel, (Ezekiel 47:2.) which issuing out of the right side of the altar, the further it ran, the deeper it grew, till at length it replenished the whole ocean sea, and healed all the fishes therein. No otherwise the course of the gospel, proceeding of small and hard beginnings, kept still its stream: the more it was stopped, the swifter it ran. By blood it seeded, by death it quickened, by cutting it multiplied, through violence it sprung; till, at last, out of thralldom and oppression it so burst forth into perfect liberty, and flourished in all prosperity: had it so been that the Christians wisely and moderately could have used this liberty, and not abused the same (forgetting their former estate) to their own pride, pomp, and worldly ease! as it came afterward to pass: whereof more is to be seen and said (the Lord willing) in place and time convenient.

And thus much touching the propheticall numbers in the Apocalypse. Wherein is to be noted and magnified the eternal wisdom and high providence of Almighty God, so disposing and governing his church, that no adversitie or perturbation happeneth at any time to it, which his provident wisdom did not foresee before, and preordain; neither did he pre-ordain or determine any thing, which he doth not most truly perform, both foreseeing the beginning of such persecutions, and limiting the end thereof, how long to continue, and when to cease. In much like sort we read in the books of Genesis, how the stock of Israel was four hundred years in the land of Egypt. During the space of which four hundred years, after the death of Joseph (who beareth a plain figure of Christ) they were hardly entreated, and cruelly afflicted of the Egyptians, about the space of three hundred years, reckoning from after the death of Joseph, to their deliverance out of the bondage of Egypt: semblably as these Christians, after Christs time, suffered the like bondage under the Roman tyrants. Thus much by the way I thought to insinuate, lest any should muse or take any offense in himself, to see or read of the church and people of God so long and so many years to be under so miserable and extreme afflictions: wherein neither chance, nor fortune, nor disposition of man, hath had any place, but only the fore-counsel and determination of the Lord so governed and disposed the same; who not only did suffer them to fall, and foresaw those persecutions before they fell, but also appointed the times and years how long they should last, and when they should have an end, as by the aforesaid forty-two months in the eleventh and thirteenth chapters of St. John's Apocalypse hath been declared; which months, containing two hundred ninety and four years, if they be rightly gathered, make the full time between the first year of the persecution of Christ under the Jews and Herod, till the last year of persecution under Licinius; which was in the year from the nativity of Christ 324: which was from the first persecution of Christ, in the year of our Lord 30, two hundred ninety and four years, as is aforesaid. After the which year, according to the pre-ordinate counsel of God, when his severity had been sufficiently declared upon his own house, it pleased him to show mercy again, and to bind up Satan, the old serpent, according to the twentieth chapter of the Revelation, for the space of a thousand years; that is, from this time of Licinius, to the time of John Wickliff and John Huss. During all which time, albeit certain conflicts and tumults were among christian bishops themselves in the church; yet no

universal murdering persecution was stirring before the preaching of John Wickliff, Huss, and such others; as in the further process of this history (Christ willing and aiding us) shall more appear hereafter. <sup>F1616</sup>

Thus having at large discoursed these horrible persecutions past, and heavy afflictions of christian martyrs; now by the grace of God, coming out of this red sea of bloody persecution, leaving Pharaoh and his host behind, let us sing gloriously to the worthy name of our God; who through the blood of the Lamb, after long and tedious afflictions, at length hath visited his people with comfort, hath tied up Satan short, hath sent his meek Moses (gentle Constantine, I mean), by whom it hath so pleased the Lord to work deliverance to his captive people, to set his servants at liberty, to turn their mourning into joy, to magnify the church of his Son, to destroy the idols of all the world, to grant life and liberty (and would God also not so much riches!) unto them which before were the objects of all the world, and all by the means of godly Constantine, the meek and most christian emperor; of whose divine victories against so many tyrants and emperors, persecutors of Christ's people, and lastly against Licinius in the year of our Lord 324, of whose other noble acts and prowesses, of whose blessed virtues and his happy birth and progeny, part we have comprehended before, part now remaineth (Christ willing) to be declared.

This Constantine was the son of Constantius the emperor, a good and virtuous child of a good and virtuous father; born in Britain (as saith Eutropius <sup>f1617</sup>), whose mother was named Helena, daughter indeed of king Coilus: although Ambrose in his funeral oration on the death of Theodosius saith, she was an inn-holder's daughter. He was a most bountiful and gracious prince, having a desire to nourish learning and good arts, and did oftentimes use to read, write, and study himself. He had marvellous good success and prosperous achieving of all things he took in hand, which then was (and truly) supposed to proceed of this, for that he was so great a favorer of the christian faith. Which faith when he had once embraced, he did ever after most devoutly and religiously reverence; and commanded by special commission and proclamation, that every man should profess the same religion throughout all the Roman monarchy. the worshipping of idols (whereunto he was for some time addict by the allurements of Fausta his wife, insomuch that he did sacrifice to them), after the discomfiture of Maxentius in battle, he utterly abjured: but his baptism

he deferred even unto his old age, because he had determined a journey into Persia, and thought in Jordan to have been baptized. <sup>F1618</sup>

As touching his natural disposition and wit, he was very eloquent, a good philosopher, and in disputation sharp and ingenious. He was accustomed to say, that an emperor ought to refuse no labor for the utility of the common-weal; and that a part of the body must be cut off, if it cannot be cured; otherwise the same should be cherished. <sup>F1619</sup> This do Aurelius Victor, Pomponius Laetus, and Egnatius write of him. And Aelius Lampridius saith, writing upon the life of Heliogabalus; that Constantine was wont to say, “That an empire was given by the determinate purpose of God; <sup>f1620</sup> and that he to whom it was given, should so employ his diligence, as that he might be thought worthy of the same at the hands of the Giver:” which same saying also Augustine noteth in his third book against Cresconius. <sup>f1621</sup>

He first entered into the empire by the mercifulness of God, minding after long waves of doleful persecution to restore unto his church peace and tranquillity, in the year of our Lord 310, <sup>f1622</sup> as Eusebius accounteth in his chronicle. His reign continued, as Eutropius affirmeth, thirty years; Laetus saith thirty and two years, lacking two months. Great quiet and tranquillity enjoyed the church under the reign of this good emperor, who took great pain and travail for the preservation thereof. First (yea, and that before he had subdued Licinius), he set forth many edicts for the restitution of the goods of the church, for the revoking of the Christians out of exile, for talcing away the dissension of the doctors out of the church, for the setting of them free from public charges, and such like; even as the copies of his Constitutions declare, which Eusebius hath recorded in his tenth book and fifth chapter; in his Life of Constantine he repeateth other edicts of his, breathing kindness toward the christian church, in this wise: <sup>f1623</sup>

### **THE COPY OF AN EPISTLE OF CONSTANTINE, SENT TO HIS SUBJECTS INHABITING IN THE EAST.**

Victor Constantine, Maximus Augustus, to our loving subjects inhabiting the eastern provinces, sendeth greeting. Every thing connected with the established laws of nature furnishes sufficient

indication to all men of providence and design, such as imply a divine agency; neither can there be any doubt that where the mind is led to the subject in the direct path of knowledge, the accurate apprehension of sound reason and of sight itself tends, equally with true virtue, to lead up to the knowledge of God. Therefore no wise man would ever be disturbed, though he sees mankind swayed by divers and opposite predilections; for the excellency of virtue would have remained in unprofitable obscurity, had not vice on the contrary part exhibited the life of perverse folly. Assuredly, therefore, there is a crown of reward for virtue; but the most high God reserves to himself the final adjudication. But I will endeavor, as perspicuously as I can, to explain to you all concerning the hope that is in me.

For my own part, I always looked on the emperors, our immediate predecessors, as having forfeited their share in the empire on account of the ferocity of their manners. My father was the only one among them, who adopted a merciful line of conduct; and with an admirable piety he invoked God the Father in all his actions. But all the rest, like persons in a phrensy, made cruelty rather than kindness their study, and indulged it without restraint, seeking all the time they were in power to supplant the true doctrine: nay, the fury of their wickedness was kindled to such a degree, that when all sacred and civil affairs were in a state of profound repose, they stirred up civil wars.

It was said at the time, that Apollo had given an oracle from a certain den and dark cavern, and not by a man's voice, that the righteous people on the earth were an impediment to his predicting the truth, and that for this reason the responses given from his tripods proved false. This caused his locks to hang down relaxed, and he bewailed the misfortune to mankind of the prophetic influence being driven away. But let us see to what manner of conclusion these things were brought.

I now appeal to thee, the most high God, for the truth of what follows. When quite a youth, I heard him who then held the primacy among the Roman emperors (a wretched, truly wretched

man, being deceived in his mind by error) with much curiosity inquire of his guards, who were meant by “the righteous people on the earth:” when one of the priests who were about him answered, “the Christians to be sure.” The emperor, having gulped this answer as he would a mess of honey, unsheathed the swords which were prepared to punish crimes, against unblameable sanctity. Immediately, therefore, he wrote edicts of blood (as I may say) with homicidal sword-points, and desired the judges to rack their wits to the utmost, in devising more terrible tortures. Then, then might you have seen with what strength those venerable worshippers of God, during a long continuance of cruelty, daily endured no common injuries; while the sobriety, which none of their enemies had ever aspersed, became the mere sport of their enraged fellow-citizens. What fire, what pains, what kind of tortures, was not applied indiscriminately to persons of all sorts and ages? Then, without doubt, the earth wept, and the round world with all things contained therein, being polluted with their blood, made lamentation, and the very day itself was clouded for sorrow at the awful prodigy.

But what of all this? Why from these things the very barbarians now take occasion to glory, who received under their protection those of our countrymen who then fled, and kept them in a most humane captivity; for they not only afforded them preservation, but also liberty to retain their religious worship with security; and to this very day the Roman nation beareth the brand of infamy fixed upon it by those who were then banished from the Roman world, and found an asylum with the barbarians.

But what is the use of dwelling any longer on those lamentable events, which were the general sorrow of the whole world? Even the authors themselves of that horrid wickedness are at length gone, and have been committed for everlasting punishment to the depths of Acheron with an ignominious end: for having become involved in civil wars, they have left neither name nor kindred of theirs behind; which would not have happened to them, had not the impious prophecy of the oracles of Apollo possessed a spurious force. And now I beseech thee, the supreme God, be mild and propitious to

thy creatures in the eastern regions, yea to all thy provincials, worn out by long continued calamity: by me thy servant administer a remedy. And this I ask not without reason, O Lord of all, holy God! for it is under thy guidance and assistance that I have hitherto undertaken and perfected salutary measures; carrying thy sign before me everywhere, I have led a victorious army; and as often as any public necessity requires I go forth against the enemy following the same ensigns of thy excellency. For these reasons I have entrusted my soul to thee, duly tempered with thy love and fear; for! sincerely love thy name, but I stand in awe of thy power, which thou hast manifested by many tokens, thereby rendering my own faith in thee the firmer. I hasten therefore (putting my own shoulders to the work) to repair and beautify thy most holy house, which those detestable and most ungodly wretches in their destructive phrensy laid waste. I desire that thy people may enjoy peace and live in tranquillity, and that—for the common advantage of the world and all its inhabitants. And may those who are yet in error partake (and welcome) of the enjoyment of peace and quiet equally with the believers, for the restoration of the social feeling will of itself have a great efficacy to lead those in error into the right way. Let no one, therefore, annoy his neighbor; but let every one be left to follow that which he really prefers. Yet right-minded persons will of necessity hold, that they only can live holily and purely, whom thou thyself callest to acquiesce in thy holy laws. As for those who withdraw themselves, let them have (if they must) their synagogues of false doctrine; we retain that splendid house of thy own truth which thou gavest us when born again. <sup>f1624</sup> This, however, we heartily wish for the others also, namely, that they also may reap pleasure from the general pacification.

And yet our religion is nothing new or recent, but from the time when we believe the fabric of the universe to have been framed, thou didst enjoin it to be: observed with becoming reverence. But mankind stumbled, being misled with all sorts of errors. Nevertheless, thou, in order that sin might not increase more and more, raising up a pure light, hast by thine own Son called all men to remember thee.

Thy works confirm these things: it is thy power that makes us innocent and faithful; the sun and moon have their stated course; neither do the stars run their circuit round the world at random; the changes of the seasons recur by a certain law; it is by thy word that the earth is kept firm on its base; the wind makes its motion according to a set time; the ebb-tide of the waters alternates with the flood by a certain measure; the sea is confined within fixed bounds; and throughout the wide range of earth and ocean every thing is framed for certain admirable and advantageous uses. But unless all this were ordered according to thy sovereign will, without doubt so great a diversity of things, and a manifold distribution of independent power, would have brought ruin on all living beings and things in general. For those who fought against one another, would doubtless have fought with greater vehemence against mankind; which also they do, though invisible to the eye.

We give thee abundant thanks, Lord of all, supreme God! for, as human nature is distinguished by special tokens of thy regard, so the instructions of thy divine word come specially recommended to such as are right-minded and zealous for true virtue. But if any one hinders himself from being cured, let him not impute that to another; for the means of cure are openly, proffered to all men. Only let every man beware of doing wrong to that, which experience proves to be immaculate. Let us all then take our share in that common good which is now offered, namely, the blessing of peace, discarding from our minds every thing that is contrary to it. But, whatever a man has been persuaded himself to adopt, let him not take occasion thereby to injure another; and if one sees and understands a thing, let him serve his neighbor therewith, if he can; but if that cannot be, let him leave the matter alone; for it is one thing to take up the struggle for immortality voluntarily, and another, to be forced to it by punishment. Let this suffice: in fact, I have gone into the subject at greater length than my mansuetude intended, because I would not conceal what I consider the true belief; especially because some (as I hear) assert, that the temple-rites and the power of darkness have been abolished: which indeed I would ere this have advised all men to do, had not the violent

insurrection of wicked error so strongly entrenched itself in some men's minds, to the hinderance of the common resurrection.

Such was the goodness of this emperor Constantine, or rather such was the providence of Almighty God toward his church in stirring him up, that all his care and study of mind was set upon nothing else, but only how to benefit and enlarge the commodities of the same. Neither was it to him enough to deliver the church and people of God from outward vexation of foreign tyrants and persecutors. No less beneficial was his godly care also in quieting the inward dissensions and disturbance within the church, among the christian bishops themselves; according as we read of Moses the deliverer of the Israelites, in agreeing the brethren together, when he saw them at variance: (Exodus 2.) no less, also, did his vigilant study extend in erecting, restoring, and enriching the churches of God in all cities, and in providing for the ministers of the same. And therefore, writing to Anulinus his chief captain, he declareth his will and mind to him in letters concerning the goods which did appertain to the churches of the Christians; that he should procure vigilantly for the same, that all goods, houses, and gardens, belonging before to the tight of churches, should again be restored in all speedy wise, and that he therein might be certified with speed, etc. <sup>f11625</sup>

Moreover he, writing to the said Anulinus in another letter, signifieth unto him in this effect: that forsomuch as the contempt of God's reverend religion is and hath been ever the greatest decay to the name and people of Rome, as, contrarily, the maintaining and reverencing the same hath ever brought prosperity to all commonweals, therefore he, in consideration thereof, hath taken that order, and giveth to him in charge, that through that province where he had to do, which was in Africa where Caecilian was bishop, he should there see and provide that all such ministers and clerks, whose vocation was to serve in the church, should be freed and exempted from all public duties and burdens; whereby they being so privileged, and all impediments removed which should hinder their divine ministration, thereby the common utility of the people might the better flourish, etc.

<sup>f1626</sup>

Furthermore the said Constantine, in another letter writing to Miltiades, bishop of Rome, and to Marcus, declareth in his letters to them how

Caecilian bishop of Carthage had been accused unto him by divers of his colleagues and fellow-bishops. Wherefore his will is, that the said Caecilian, with ten bishops his accusers, and with ten other his defendants, should repair up to him at Rome; where, in the presence of the aforesaid Miltiades, with the assistance of Reticus, Maternus, Marinus, and of others his colleagues, the cause of Caecilian might be heard and tightly examined, so that all schism and division might be cut off from among them; wherein the fervent desire of Constantine to peace and unity may well appear. <sup>f1627</sup> Upon the like cause and argument also he writeth to Chrestus, bishop of Syracuse; being so desirous to nourish peace and concord in the church, that he offereth to him, with two of his ministers of the second order and three servants, a public carriage to come up to him unto the council of other bishops, to be held at the city of Aries on the calends of August, for the agreeing of certain matters belonging to the church. <sup>f1628</sup> He writeth also another letter to the aforementioned Caecilian bishop of Carthage. <sup>f1629</sup> To the provincials likewise of Palestine and those parts about, he directeth his edict in the behalf of the Christians, for the releasing of such as were in captivity, and for the restoring again of them which had sustained any loss in the former persecution before, and for the refreshing of such as heretofore had been oppressed with any ignominy or molestation for their confession sake; declaring in the said edict how that his whole body, life and soul, and whatsoever is in him, he oweth to God and to the service of him, etc. <sup>f1630</sup> Moreover another letter he writeth to Eusebius, for the edifying of new christian churches, and restoring of them which had been wasted before by foreign enemies. <sup>F1631</sup>

He also collected the synod of Nice <sup>f1632</sup> for the study of peace and unity of the church, after he had first written upon the same to Alexander and Arius. In which his letter he most lamentably uttered the great grief of his heart, to see and hear of their contention and division, whereby the peace and common harmony of the church was broken, the synods provoked and resisted, the holy people of the Lord divided into parts and tumults, contrary to the office of good and circumspect men, whose duty were rather to nourish concord, and to seek tranquillity. And though in some small points and light trifles they did disagree from others; yet the example of philosophers might teach them, who although in some part of a sentence or piece of a question, some might dissent from others, yet in the unity of

their profession they did all join as fellows together. In like case were it their duty in such fruitless questions (or rather pieces of questions) to keep them in the conceptions of their minds in silence unto themselves, and not to bring them forth into public synods, or to break there-for from the communion of the reverend council: declaring moreover in the said epistle, the first origin and occasion of this their contentious dissension to rise upon vain and trifling terms, vile causes and light questions, and pieces rather of questions; about such matters as neither are to be moved, nor to be answered unto, being moved; more curious to be searched, and perilous to be expressed, than necessary to be inquired: “Magisque puerilibus ineptiis, quam sacerdotum ac cordatorum virorum prudentiae convenientia;” <sup>f1633</sup> as he there doth term them. Wherefore by all manner of means he doth labor them, doth desire and entreat them, and doth persuade them, not only with reasons, but also with tears and sighing sobs, that they would restore peace again unto the church, and quietness to the rest of his life (which otherwise would not be sweet unto him), and that they would return again to the communion of the reverend council; who, in so doing, should open his way and purposed journey into the East parts: who otherwise, hearing of their discord and dissension, would be sorry to see with his eyes that which grieveth him now to hear with his ears—with much more in the same epistle contained; but this is the effect of the whole. <sup>F1634</sup> Thus much I thought summarily to comprehend, whereby the divine disposition and singular gentle nature of this meek and religious Constantine might more notoriously appear to all princes, for them to learn by his example what zeal and care they ought to bear toward the church of Christ, and how gently to govern, and how to be beneficial to the same.

Many other edicts and epistles, written to other places and parties, be expressed at large in the second book of Eusebius’s “De Vita Constantini;” wherein the zealous care and princely beneficence of this noble emperor toward the church of Christ may appear; whereof, in a brief recapitulation, such specialties we have collected as here follow, and are to be seen in Sozomen. <sup>F1635</sup>

First, he commanded all them to be set free, whosoever for the confession of Christ had been condemned to banishment, or to the mines of metal, or to any public or private labor to them inflicted. Such as were put to any

infamy or open shame among the multitude, he willed them to be discharged from all such blemish of ignominy. Soldiers, who before were either deprived of their place, or put out of their wages, were put to their liberty either to serve again in their place, or quietly to live at home. Whatsoever honor, place, or dignity had been taken away from any man, should be restored to them again. The goods and possessions of them that had suffered death for Christ, howsoever they were alienated, should return to their heirs or next of kin, or for lack of them should be given to the church. He commanded, moreover, that only Christians should bear office; the others he charged and restrained, that they should neither sacrifice nor exercise any more divinations and ceremonies of the Gentiles, nor set up any images, nor keep any feasts of the heathen idolaters. He corrected, moreover, and abolished all such unlawful manners and dishonest usages in the cities as might be hurtful any ways to the church; as the custom that the Egyptians had in the flowing of Nile, at what time the people used to run together like brute beasts, both men and women, and with all kind of filthiness and sodomitry to pollute their cities in celebrating the increase of that river. This abomination Constantine extinguished, causing that wicked order called Androgyni to be killed: by reason whereof the river afterward (through the benefit of God) yielded more increase in its flowing, to the greater fertility of the ground, than it did before. <sup>F1636</sup>

Among the Romans was an old law, that such as were barren, having no fruit of children, should be amerced of half the goods left them by will. Also, that such as being above the years of twenty and five unmarried, should not be numbered in the same privileges with them that were married, neither should be entitled to any thing by will, unless they were next in kin. <sup>F1637</sup> These laws, because they seemed unreasonable (to punish the defect of nature, or gift of virginity by man's law), he abrogated and took away. Another order was among the Romans, that they who made their wills being sick, had certain prescribed and conceived words appointed to them to use, which unless they followed, their wills stood in no effect. This law also Constantine repealed, permitting to every man, in making his testament, to use what words or what witnesses he would. Likewise among the Romans he restrained and took away the cruel and bloody spectacles and sights, where men were wont with swords one to

kill another. Of the barbarous and filthy fashion of the Arethusians in Phoenicia, <sup>f1638</sup> I have mentioned before, where they used to expose and set forth their virgins to open fornication before they should be married: which custom also Constantine removed away. Where no churches were, there he commanded new to be made; where any were decayed, he commanded them to be repaired; where any were too little, he caused them to be enlarged, giving to the same great gifts and revenues, not only of such tributes and taxes as came to him from certain sundry cities, which he transferred unto the churches, but also out of his own treasures. When any bishops required any council to be had, he satisfied their petitions; and what in their councils and synods they established, being godly and honest, he was ready to confirm the same.

The armor of his soldiers, who were newly come from Gentilism, he garnished with the arms of the Cross, whereby they might learn the sooner to forget their old superstitious idolatry. Moreover, this worthy emperor, acting the part of a catechist, prescribed a certain form of prayer, for every man to have, and to learn how to pray and to invoke God. The which form of prayer is recited in the fourth book of Eusebius's, "De Vita Constantini," in words as followeth:

"We acknowledge thee only to be our God; we confess thee to be our King; we invoke and call upon thee our only helper; by thee we obtain our victories; by thee we vanquish and subdue our enemies; to thee we attribute whatsoever present commodities we enjoy, and by thee we hope for good things to come: unto thee we all direct our suits and petitions, most humbly beseeching thee to conserve Constantine our emperor (with his pious children) in long life to continue, and to give him victory over all his enemies." <sup>F1639</sup>

In his own palace he set up a house, peculiar for prayer and doctrine, using also to pray and sing with his people. Also in his wars he went not without his tabernacle appointed for the same. The Sunday he commanded to be kept holy of all men, and free from all judiciary causes, from markets, marts, fairs, and all other manual labors, only husbandry excepted: especially charging that no images or monuments of idolatry should be set up.

Men of the clergy and of the ministry in all places he endued with special privileges and immunities; so that if any were brought before the civil magistrate, and listed to appeal to the sentence of his bishop, it should be lawful for him so to do, and that the sentence of the bishop should stand in as great force as if the magistrate or the emperor himself had pronounced it. But here is to be observed and noted by the way, that the clerks and ministers then newly creeping out of persecution, were in those days neither in number so great as, nor in order of life of the like disposition to, these in our days now living.

No less care and provision the said Constantine also had for the maintenance of schools pertaining to the church; and others for the nourishing of good arts and liberal sciences, especially of jurisprudence; not only with stipends and subsidies furnishing them, but also with large privileges and exemptions defending the same, as by the words of his own law is to be seen and read as followeth:

“Physicians, grammarians, and other professors of liberal arts, and doctors of the law, with their wives and children, and all other their possessions which they have in cities, we command to be freed from all civil charges and functions, neither to receive foreign strangers in provinces, nor to be burdened with any public administration, nor to be cited up to civil judgment, nor to be drawn out or oppressed with any injury. And if any man shall vex them he shall incur such punishment as the judge at his discretion shall award him. Their stipends moreover, and salaries, we command truly to be paid them, whereby they may more freely instruct others in arts and sciences,” etc. <sup>f1640</sup>

Over and besides this, so far did his godly zeal and princely care and provision extend to the church of Christ, that he commanded and provided books and volumes of the Scripture, diligently and plainly to be written and copied out, to remain in public churches to the use of posterity. Whereupon writing to Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, in a special letter, he willeth him with all diligence to procure fifty volumes of parchment well bound and compacted, wherein he should cause to be written out copies of the Scripture in a fair legible hand, the provision and use whereof he thought necessary and profitable for the instruction of the church; and

alloweth him the use of two public carriages to convey them when finished to the emperor's inspection, and engageth to pay one of his deacons for the conveyance thereof: he also writeth concerning the same to the superintendent of the diocese, <sup>f1641</sup> to support and further him with such necessaries, as thereunto should appertain. <sup>F1642</sup>

In viewing, perusing, and writing this story, and in considering the christian zeal of this emperor, I wish that either this our printing and plenty of books had been in his days, or that this so heroical heart toward Christ's religion, as was in this so excellent monarch, might something appear in inferior princes reigning in these our printing-days.

The liberal hand of this emperor born to do all men good, was no less also open and ready toward the needy poverty of such, which either by loss of parents or other occasions were not able to help themselves: to whom he commanded and provided due subvention both of corn and raiment to be ministered out of his own coffers, to the necessary relief of the poor men, women, children, orphans, and widows. <sup>F1643</sup>

Finally, among all the other monuments of his singular clemency and munificence, this is not to be pretermitted; that through all the empire of Rome and provinces belonging to the same, not only he diminished such taxes, revenues, and imposts, as publicly were coming to him, but also clearly remitted and released to the contributors the fourth part of the same.

This present place would require something to be said of the donation of Constantine, whereupon, as upon their chiefest anchor-hold, the bishops of Rome do ground their supreme dominion and right, over all the political government of the West parts, and the spiritual government of all the other sees and parts of the world. Which donation to be falsely feigned and forged, and not to proceed from Constantine, many arguments might here be inferred, if leisure from other matters would suffer me. <sup>F1644</sup>

**First**, for that no ancient history, nor yet doctor, maketh any mention thereof.

**2.** Nauclerus reporteth it to be affirmed in the history of Isidore. But in the old copies of Isidore no such thing is to be found.

3. Gratian, the compiler of the Decrees, <sup>f1645</sup> reciteth that decree, not upon any ancient authority, but only under the title of “Palea.”
4. Gelasius is said to give some testimony thereof, in Dist. 15, “Sancta Romana Ecclesia.” But that clause of the said distinction touching that matter in the old ancient books is not extant.
5. Otho of Frisingen, <sup>f1646</sup> who was about the time of Gratian, after he hath declared the opinion of the favorers of the papacy, affirming this donation to be given of Constantine to Silvester the pope, induceth consequently the opinion of them that favor the empire, affirming the contrary.
6. How doth this agree, that Constantine did yield up to Silvester all the political dominion over the West? whereas the said Constantine at his death, dividing the empire to his three sons, gave the West part of the empire to one, the East part to the second, the middle part to the third.
7. How is it likely that Theodosius after them, being a just and a religious prince, would or could have occupied the city of Rome, if it had not been his right, but had belonged to the pope? and so did many other emperors after him.
8. The phrase of this decree, being conferred with the phrase and style of Constantine in his other edicts and letters above specified, doth nothing agree.
9. Seeing the papists themselves confess that the decree of this donation was written in Greek, how agreeth that with truth? when both it was written not to the Greeks, but to the Romans, and also Constantine himself, for lack of the Greek tongue, was fain to use the Latin tongue in the council of Nice.
10. The contents of this donation (whosoever was the forger thereof) doth bewray itself; <sup>f1647</sup> for if it be true (which therein is confessed), that he was baptized at Rome of Silvester and that this patrimony was given on the fourth day after his baptism (which was before his battle against Maximin in the year of our Lord 815, as Nicephorus recordeth), <sup>f1648</sup> how then accordeth this with that which followeth in the

donation, for him to have given jurisdiction to the bishop of Rome over the other four principal sees of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem? whereas the city of Constantinople was not yet begun (as Nicephorus recordeth) before the fall of Licinius, viz. in the tenth year of Constantine; and was not finished before the eight and twentieth year of the reign of Constantine, <sup>f1649</sup> A.D. 334; or if it be true as Jerome counteth, it was finished the three and twentieth year of his reign, which was A.D. 328, long after this donation, by their own account.

**11.** Furthermore, whereas in the said Constitution it is said that Constantine was baptized at Rome of Silvester, <sup>f1650</sup> and thereby was purged of leprosy; the fable thereof agreeth not with the truth of history, forsomuch as Eusebius, Jerome, Ruffinus, Socrates, Theodoret, and Sozomen, do all together consent that he was baptized, not at Rome, but at Nicomedia; <sup>f1651</sup> and that moreover, as by their testimony doth appear, not of Silvester, but of Eusebius bishop of Nicomedia; not before his battle against Maximin or Licinius, but in the thirty-first year of his reign, a little before his death.

**12.** Again, whereas Constantine in this donation appointed him to have the principality over the other four patriarchal sees, that maketh Constantine contrary to himself; who, in the council of Nice, afterward agreed with other bishops, that all the four patriarchal sees: should have equal jurisdiction, every one over his own territory and precinct.

**13.** In sum, briefly to conclude: whoso desireth more abundantly to be satisfied touching this matter, let him read the book of Marsilius Patavinus, <sup>f1652</sup> intituled, “Defensor Pacis,” A.D. 1324; of Laurentius Valla, A.D. 1440; of Antoninus archbishop of Florence, who, in his history, plainly denieth the tenor of this donation to be found in the old books of the decrees; of cardinal Cusan, lib. 3 cap. 2, writing to the council of Basil, in 1460; of Aeneas Sylvius in “Dialogo;” of Hieronymus Paulus Catalanus, <sup>f1653</sup> in 1496; of Raphael Volateran, in 1500; of Luther, in 1537, etc.; all which, by many and evident probations, dispute and prove this donation (taken out of a Greek book in the pope’s library, and translated by one Bartholomeus Picernus out of Greek into Latin) not to proceed from Constantine, but

to be a thing untruly pretended, or rather a fable imagined, or else to be the deed of Pipin or Charlemagne, or some such other, if it were ever the deed of any. <sup>F1654</sup>

And thus hast thou, beloved reader, briefly collected the narration of the noble acts and heavenly virtues of this most famous emperor, Constantine the Great: a singular spectacle for all Christian princes to behold and imitate, and worthy of perpetual memory in all congregations of christian saints; whose fervent zeal and piety in general, to all congregations and to all the servants of Christ, was notable. But especially the affection and reverence of his heart toward them was admirable, which had suffered any thing for the confession of Christ in the persecutions before: them had he principally in price and veneration, insomuch that he embraced and kissed their wounds and stripes, and their eyes being put out. And if any such bishops or any other ministers brought to him any complaints one against another (as many times they did), he would take their bills of complaint, and burn them before their faces; so studious and zealous was his mind to have them agree, whose discord was to him more grief than it was to themselves. All the virtuous acts and memorable doings of this divine and renowned emperor to comprehend or commit to history, it were the matter alone of a great volume: wherefore contented with these above premised, because nothing of him can be said enough, I cease to discourse of him any further.

One thing yet remaineth not to be omitted, wherein as by the way of a note, I thought good to admonish the learned reader, such as love to be conversant in reading of ancient authors; that in the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius, <sup>f1655</sup> whereas in the latter end of the book is added a certain oration, “Ad conventum Sanctorum,” under the name of Eusebius Pamphilus, here is to be understood, that the said oration is wrongfully intituled upon the name of Eusebius, which in very truth is the oration of Constantine himself. For the probation whereof (beside the style and matter therein contained, and tractation heroical lively declaring the religious vein of Constantine) I allege the very testimony of Eusebius himself, in his fourth book, “De Vita Constantini;” where he, in express words, not only declareth that Constantine wrote such an oration, intituled “Ad Conventum Sanctorum,” but also promiseth, in the end of his book to

annex the same: declaring, moreover, what difficulty the interpreters had to translate the same from the Roman speech to their Grecian tongue. <sup>F1656</sup>

And here an end of these lamentable and doleful persecutions of the primitive church, during the space of three hundred years from the passion of our Savior Christ, till the coming of this Constantine; by whom, as by the elect instrument of God, it hath so pleased his Almighty Majesty, by his determinate purpose, to give rest after long trouble to his church, according to that which St. Cyprian declared before to be revealed of God unto his church: that after darkness and stormy tempest, should come peaceable, calm, and stable quiet-hess to his church, meaning this time of Constantine now present. At which time it so pleased the Almighty, that the murdering malice of Satan should at length be restrained, and himself tied up for a thousand years, through his great mercy in Christ; to whom there-for be thanks and praise, now and for ever! Amen.

**END OF BOOK THE FIRST.**

## BOOK 2. f1657

### CONTAINING

*The Next Three Hundred Years Following, With Such Things Specially Touched As Have Happened In England, From The Time Of King Lucius To Gregory, And So After, To The Time Of King Egbert.*

BY these persecutions hitherto in the book before precedent thou mayest understand, christian reader, how the fury of Satan and rage of men have done what they could to extinguish the name and religion of Christ: for what thing did lack, that either death could do, or torments could work, or the gates of hell could devise? all was to the uttermost attempted. And yet, all the fury and malice of Satan, all the wisdom of the world and strength of men, doing, devising, practising what they could, notwithstanding, the religion of Christ (as thou seest) hath had the upper hand; which thing I wish thee greatly, gentle reader, wisely to note and diligently to ponder in considering these former histories. And because thou canst not consider them, nor profit by them, unless thou do first read and peruse them; let me crave, therefore, thus much at thine hands, to turn and read over the said histories of those persecutions above described, especially, above all the other histories of this present volume, for thy especial edification, which I trust thou shalt find not unworthy the reading.

Now because the tying up of Satan giveth to the church some rest, and to me some leisure to address myself to the handling of other stories, I mind therefore (Christ willing) in this present book,—leaving awhile the tractation of these general affairs pertaining to the universal church,—to prosecute such domestical histories as more nearly concern this our country of England and Scotland done here at home; beginning first with king Lucius, with whom the faith first began here in this realm, as the sentence of some writers doth hold. And forsomuch as here may rise, yea and doth rise, a great controversy in these our popish days, concerning the first origin and planting of the faith in this our realm, it shall not be greatly out of our purpose somewhat to stay and say of this question, Whether the church of England first received the faith from Rome or not? The which

although I grant so to be, yet, being so granted, it little availeth the purpose of them which would so have it. For be it that England first received the christian faith and religion from Rome, both in the time of Eleutherius their bishop, one hundred and eighty years after Christ, and also in the time of Augustine whom Gregory I. sent hither six hundred years after Christ; yet their purpose followeth not thereby, that we must therefore fetch our religion from thence still, as from the chief well-head and fountain of all godliness. And yet as they are not able to prove the second, so neither have I any cause to grant the first, that is, that our christian faith was first derived from Rome; as I may prove by six or seven good conjectural reasons, whereof,

**The first** I take of the testimony of Gildas, our countryman; who in his history affirmeth plainly, that Britain received the gospel in the time of Tiberius the emperor, under whom Christ suffered; <sup>F1658</sup> and saith moreover, that Joseph of Arimathea, **after the dispersion** <sup>a111</sup> of the early church by the Jews, was sent of Philip the apostle from France to Britain, about the year of our Lord 63, and here remained in this land all his time; and so, with his fellows, laid the first foundation of christian faith among the British people, whereupon other preachers and teachers coming afterward, confirmed the same and increased it. <sup>F1659</sup>

**2.** The second reason is out of Tertullian; who, living near about, or rather somewhat before, the time of this Eleutherius, in his book “Contra Judaeos,” manifestly importeth the same; where the said Tertullian, testifying how the gospel was dispersed abroad by the sound of the apostles, and there reckoning up the Medes, Persians, Parthians, and dwellers in Mesopotamia, Jewry, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Egypt, Pamphylia, with many more, at length cometh to the coast of the Moors, and all the borders of Spain, with divers nations of France; and there amongst all other reciteth also the parts of Britain which the Romans could never attain to, and reporteth the same now to be subject to Christ; as also reckoneth up the places of Sarmatia, of the Dacians, the Germans, the Scythians, with many other provinces and isles to him unknown; in all which places (saith he) reigneth the name of Christ, which now beginneth to be common. This hath Tertullian. <sup>F1660</sup> Note here how among other divers believing nations, he mentioneth also the wildest places of Britain to be of the same number; and these, in his time, were christened; who was in

the same Eleutherius' time, as is above said. Then pope Eleutherius was not the first which sent the christian faith into this realm, but the gospel was here received before his time, either by Joseph of Arimathea (as some chronicles record), or by some of the apostles or of their scholars, which had been here preaching Christ before Eleutherius wrote to Lucius.

**3.** My third probation I deduct out of Origen; whose words be these, "Britanniam in Christianam consentire religionem." Whereby it appeareth, that the faith of Christ was sparsed here in England before the days of Eleutherius. <sup>F1661</sup>

**4.** For my fourth probation I take the testimony of Bede; where he affirmeth, that in his time (seven hundred years after Christ) here in Britain Easter was kept after the manner of the east church, in the full of the moon, what day in the week so ever it fell on, and not on the Sunday, as we do now. Whereby it is to be collected, that the first preachers in this land had come out from the east part of the world, where it was so used, rather than from Rome. <sup>F1662</sup>

**5.** Fifthly, I may allege the words of Nicephorus; where he saith that Simon Zelotes did spread the gospel of Christ to the west ocean, and brought the same unto the isles of Britain. <sup>F1663</sup>

**6.** Sixthly, may be here added also the words of Peter of Clugni; who, writing to Bernard, affirmeth that the Scots in his time did celebrate their Easter, not after the Roman manner, but after the Greeks, etc. And as the said Britons were not under the Roman order in the time of this abbot of Clugni, so neither were they, nor would be, under the Roman legate in the time of Gregory, nor would admit any primacy of the bishop of Rome to be above them. <sup>F1664</sup>

**7.** For the seventh argument, moreover, I may make my probation by the plain words of Eleutherius; by whose epistle written to king Lucius we may understand, that Lucius had received the faith of Christ in this land before the king sent to Eleutherius for the Roman laws; for so the express words of the letter do manifestly purport, as hereafter followeth to be seen. <sup>F1665</sup>

By all which conjectures it may stand probably to be thought, that the Britons were taught first by the Grecians of the east church, rather than by the Romans.

Peradventure Eleutherius might help something either to convert the king, or else to increase the faith then newly sprung among the people; but that he precisely was the first, that cannot be proved. But grant he were, as indeed the most part of our English stories confess, neither will I greatly stick with them therein; yet what have they got thereby when they have cast all their gain? In few words, to conclude this matter; if so be that the christian faith and religion was first derived from Rome to this our nation by Eleutherius, then let them but grant to us the same faith and religion which then was taught at Rome, and from thence derived hither by the said Eleutherius, and we will desire no more. For then, neither was any universal pope above all churches and councils, which came not in before Boniface: III.'s time, which was four hundred years after; neither any name or use of the mass, the parts whereof how and by whom they were compiled, hereafter in this book following appear to be seen. Neither was any sacrifice propitiatory for the scouring of purgatory then offered upon hallowed altars, but only the communion frequented at christian tables, where oblations and gifts were offered, as well of the people as of the priests, to God, because they should appear neither empty nor unkind before the Lord; as we may understand by the time of Cyprian. Neither was then any transubstantiation heard of, which was not brought in before a thousand years after. Neither were then any images of saints departed set up in churches; yea, a great number of the saints worshipped in this our time were not as yet born, nor the churches wherein they were worshipped yet set up, but came in long after, especially in the time of Irene and Constans the emperor. Likewise neither relics nor peregrinations were then in use. Priests' marriage was then as lawful (and no less received) as now; neither was it condemned before the days of Hildebrand, almost a thousand years after that. Their service was then in the vulgar tongue, as witnesseth Jerome. The sacraments were ministered in both kinds, as well to laymen as to priests, the witness whereof is Cyprian. Yea, and temporal men which would not then communicate at Easter, Whitsuntide, and Christmas, were not then counted for catholics, the pope's own distinction can testify. <sup>f1666</sup> In funerals, priests then flocked

not together, selling trentals and dirges for sweeping of purgatory; but only a funeral concio was used, with psalms of praises and songs of their worthy deeds, and hallelujah sounding on high, which did shake the gilded ceilings of the temple; as witness Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, and Jerome. In the supper of the Lord, and at baptism, no such ceremonies were used as now of late have been intruded: insomuch that (as in this story is showed hereafter), both Augustine and Paulinus baptized then in rivers, not in hallowed fonts; as witness Fabian,<sup>f1667</sup> and the portues<sup>f1668</sup> of Sarum, of York, of Bangor, with matins and evensong of the day. Again, neither were the orders and religions of monks and friars yet dreamed of, to the space almost of a thousand years after. So that, as I said, if the papists would needs derive the faith and religion of this realm from Rome, then let them set us and leave us there where they had us; that is, let them suffer us to stand content with that faith and religion which then was taught and brought from Rome by Eleutherius (as now we differ nothing from the same), and we will desire no better. And if they will not, then let the wise reader judge where the fault is, in us, or them, who neither themselves will persist in the antiquity of the Romish religion which they so much brag of, neither will they permit us so to do.

And thus much by the way, to satisfy the aforesaid objection; whereby we may have now a more ready passage into the order and course of the history. It being therefore granted unto them which they so earnestly stick upon, that the christian faith and religion of this realm was brought from Rome, first by Eleutherius, then afterward by Augustine; thus write the chronicles of that matter:—

About the time and year of the Lord 180, king Lucius son of Coilus, which builded Colchester, king of the Britons, who then were the inhabitors and possessors of this land, which now we Englishmen call England, hearing of the miracles and wonders done by the Christians at that time in divers places (as Geoffry of Monmouth writeth), directed his letters to Eleutherius, bishop of Rome, to receive of him the christian faith; although about the computation of the year and time, great difference there is in authors when this should be.<sup>f1669</sup> Naeulerus saith, it was anno 156:<sup>f1670</sup> but that cannot be, forsomuch as Eleutherius was not yet bishop by the space of twenty years after that. Henry of Herford. saith it was A.D. 169, in the nineteenth year of Verus, emperor. But that agreeth not with

approved histories, which all consent that Verus reigned not nineteen years; and if he had, yet that year cometh not to the year of our Lord 169, but to the year 179. <sup>f1671</sup> Some others say that Eleutherius was made bishop in the sixth year of Commodus, which was the year of our Lord 185: but that seemeth to go too far. But let the authors agree as they can. Let us return to Eleutherius, the good bishop, who, hearing the request of this king, and glad to see the godly-towardness of his well-disposed mind, sendeth him certain teachers and preachers called Fugatius, or by some Fagan, and Damian or Dimian, which first converted the king and people of Britain, and baptized them with the baptism and sacrament of Christ's faith. The temples of idolatry and all other monuments of gentility they subverted, converting the people from their divers and many gods, to serve one living God. Thus true religion with sincere faith increasing, superstition decayed, with all other rites of idolatry. There were then, in Britain twenty-eight head-priests, which they called "Flamins," <sup>f1672</sup> and three arch-priests among them, which were called "Arch-Flamins," having the oversight of their manners, and as judges over the rest. These twenty-eight Flamins they turned to twenty-eight bishops, and the three arch-flamins to three archbishops, having then their seats in three principal cities of the realm; that is, in London, in York, and in Glamorgantia, videlicet in Urbe Legionum, <sup>f1673</sup> by Wales. Thus the countries of the whole realm being divided every one under his own bishop, and all things settled in a good order; the foresaid king Lucius sent again to the said Eleutherius for the Roman laws, thereby likewise to be governed, as in religion now they were framed accordingly; unto whom Eleutherius again writeth after the tenor of these words ensuing:

**THE EPISTLE OF ELEUTHERIUS, BISHOP OF ROME,  
SENT TO KING LUCIUS.** <sup>F1674</sup>

Anno 169 a passione Christi, <sup>f1675</sup> scripsit Dominus Eleutherius papa Lucio regi Britanniae, ad correctionem regis et procerum regni Britanniae; and so forth, as followeth in English.

Ye require of us the Roman laws and the emperor's to be sent over to you, which you may practice and put in use within your realm. The Roman laws and the emperor's we may ever reprove, but the law of God we may not. Ye have received of late, through God's

mercy, in the realm of Britain, the law and faith of Christ; ye have with you within the realm, both the parts of the Scriptures. Out of them, by God's grace, with the council of your realm, take ye a law, and by that law, through God's sufferance, rule your kingdom of Britain. For you be God's vicar in your kingdom, according to the saying of the Psalm, "O God, give thy judgment to the king, and thy righteousness to the king's son," <sup>fl676</sup> etc He said not, the judgment and righteousness of the emperor, but thy judgment and justice; that is to say, of God. The king's sons be the christian people and folk of the realm, which be under your government, and live and continue in peace within your kingdom, as the gospel saith, "Like as the hen gathereth her chickens under her wings," so doth the king his people. The people and folk of the realm of Britain be yours: whom if they be divided, ye ought to gather in concord and peace, to call them to the faith and law of Christ, and to the holy church, to cherish and maintain them, to rule and govern them, and to defend them always from such as would do them wrong, from malicious men and enemies. A king hath his name of ruling, and not of having a realm. You shall be a king, while you rule well; but if you do otherwise, the name of a king shall not remain with you, and you shall lose it, which God forbid. The Almighty God grant you so to rule the realm of Britain, that you may reign with him for ever, whose vicar you be in the realm!

After this manner (as you have heard) was the christian faith either first brought in, or else confirmed in this realm of Britain by the sending of Eleutherius, not with any cross or procession, but only at the simple preaching of Fagan and Damian, through whose ministry this realm and island of Britain was eftsoons reduced to the faith and law of the Lord, according as was prophesied by Isaiah, as well of that as other islands more, where he saith, "He shall not faint nor give over, till he hath set judgment in earth; and islands shall wait for his law." (Isaiah 42:4.) The faith thus received of the Britons, continued among them, and flourished the space of two hundred and sixteen years, till the coming of the Saxons, who then were pagans; whereof more followeth hereafter to be said, the Lord Christ assisting thereunto. In the mean time something to speak of this space before, which was betwixt the time of Lucius, and the first

coming in of the Saxons; first, it is to be understood that all this while, as yet, the emperors of Rome had not received the faith, what time the kings of Britain and the subjects thereof were converted now, as is said, to Christ: for the which cause much trouble and perturbation was sought against them, not only here in Britain, but through all parts of Christendom, by the heathen infidels; insomuch that in the persecution only of Dioclesian and Maximian, reigning both together, within one month seventeen thousand martyrs are numbered to have suffered for the name of Christ, as hath been hitherto in the book before sufficiently discoursed.

F1677

Thus therefore, although the foresaid, Lucius the British king, through the merciful providence of God, was then christened, and the gospel received generally almost in all the land, yet the state thereof, as well of the religion as of the commonwealth, could not be quiet, for that the emperors and nobles of Rome were infidels, and enemies to the same; but especially for this cause, it so happening that Lucius the christian king died without issue. For thereby such trouble and variance fell among the Britons (as it happeneth in all other realms, and namely in this realm of England, whensoever succession lacketh), that not only they brought upon them the idolatrous Romans, and at length the Saxons, but also enwrapped themselves in such misery and desolation, as yet to this day amongst them remaineth. Such a thing it is where a prince or a king is in a kingdom, there to lack succession, as especially in this case may appear. For after the death of Lucius, when the barons and nobles of the land could not accord within themselves upon succession of the crown, the Romans stept in and got the crown into their own hands, whereupon followed great misery and ruin to the realm. For sometimes the idolatrous Romans, sometimes the Britons, reigned and ruled as violence and victory would serve; one king murdering another, till at length the Saxons came and deprived them both, as in process hereafter followeth to be seen. <sup>F1678</sup>

In the mean season touching the story of king Lucius, here is to be reproved the fable of some writers falsely feigning of him that he did, after his baptism received, put off all his kingly honor, forsake the land, and become a preacher, <sup>f1679</sup> who, after long travail in preaching and teaching in France, in Germany, [especially] at Augsburg, and in Swabia, at length was made doctor and rector of the church of Coire, where (as this fable saith)

he suffered martyrdom. But this fancy, of whomsoever it first did spring, disagreeth from all our English stories, who with a full consent do for the most part concord in this, that the said Lucius, after he had founded many churches, and given great riches and liberties to the same, deceased with great tranquillity in his own land, and was buried at Gloucester the fourteenth year after his baptism, as the book, “Flores Historiarum,” doth count, which was the year of our Lord, as it saith, 201; and reckoneth his conversion to be in the year 187. <sup>F1680</sup> In some I find his decease to be the fourth, and in some the tenth, year after his baptism; and some hold that he reigned all the space of seventy-seven years. And thus much concerning king Lucius.

Now to proceed in order of the story, briefly to touch the state of the aforesaid land of Britain, between the time of king Lucius, and the entering of the Saxons, who were the kings thereof, and in what order they succeeded, or rather invaded one after another, this catalogue hereunder written will specify.

A Table of the Kings of Britain from the time of Lucius, till the coming of the Saxons. <sup>F1681</sup>

*Lucius*, a Briton.

*Severus*, a Roman.

*Bassian*, a Roman by the father.

*Carausius*, a Briton.

*Alectus*, a Roman.

*Asclepiodotus*, a Briton.

*Coilus*, a Briton.

*Constantius*, a Roman.

*Constantine*, a Briton by the mother, named Helena. <sup>F1682</sup>

*Octavius*, a Gewissian. <sup>F1683</sup>

*Maximian*, a Roman born, but his mother a Briton.

*Gratiain*, a Roman.

*Constantine II.*, a Briton by the mother.

*Constans*, a Roman by the father.

*Vortigern*, a Gewissian or Briton.

*Vortimer*, a Briton.

*Vortigern*, the same.

By this table may appear a lamentable face of a commonwealth so miserably rent and divided into two sorts of people, differing not so much in country as in religion; for when the Romans reigned, they were governed by the infidels; when the Britons ruled they were governed by Christians. Thus what quietness was or could be in the church in so unquiet and doubtful days, may easily be considered.

Albeit, notwithstanding all these foresaid heathen rulers of the Romans which here governed, yet (God be praised) we read of no persecution during all these ten persecutions above mentioned, that touched the christian Britons, before the last persecution only of Dioclesian and Maximian Herculus, who here then exercised much cruelty. This persecution, as it was the last among the Roman Christians, so it was the first of many and divers that followed after in this church and realm of England; whereof we will hereafter entreat (Christ willing) as order of the matter shall lead us. In the mean time this rage of Dioclesian, as it was universally through all the churches in the world fierce and vehement, so in this realm of Britain also it was so sore, that, as all our English chronicles do testify and record, all Christianity almost in the whole land was destroyed, churches were subverted, all books of the Scriptures burned, many of the faithful, both men and women, were slain. Among whom the first and chiefest was Alban, then Julius, Aaron, and Amphibalus, of whom sufficiently hath been said before. What were the others, or how many they were that suffered besides, stories make no rehearsal. And thus much thereof.

Now as concerning the government of these above-named kings of Britain, although I have little or nothing to note which greatly appertaineth to the matter of this ecclesiastical history, yet this is not to be past over. First, how in the order of these kings cometh Constantine, the great and worthy emperor, who was not only a Briton born, by his mother Helena (being king Coilus' daughter), but also by the help of the British army (under the power of God), which the said Constantine took with him out of Britain to Rome, obtained, with great victory, peace and tranquillity to the whole universal church of Christ; having three legions with him out of this realm, of chosen and able soldiers, whereby the strength of the land was not a little impaired and endangered, as afterwards in this story followeth.

After him likewise Maximus, following his steps, took with him also (as stories record) all the power and strength which was left, and whatsoever he could make of able and fighting men to subdue France; besides the garrisons which he had out with him before, sending for more to the number of a hundred thousand soldiers at once, to be sent to him out of Britain into France. At which time also Conan his partner, being then in France, sent over for virgins from Britain, to the number of eleven thousand, **who with Ursula** <sup>a115 A</sup>, <sup>f1684</sup> the prince Dionet's daughter, being shipped over, many perished in the sea, some were taken of the infidels marching upon the borders; by whom because they would not be polluted, all were destroyed, being miserably dispersed (some one way, some another), so that none escaped.

Thus poor Britain, being left naked and destitute on every side, as a maimed body, without might or strength, was left open to its enemies, not able to succor itself without help of foreign friends; to whom they were then constrained to fly, especially to the Romans, to whom the Britons sent this word or message: "AETio ter consuli gemitus Britannorum. Repellunt nos Barbari ad mare: repellit nos mare ad Barbaros. Hinc oriuntur duo funerum genera, quia aut jugulamur, aut submergimur." But the Romans then began to forsake them, whereby they were in nearer danger to be oppressed by Gwanus and Melga, had not Gwetalinus the archbishop of London made over to Lesser Britain; and, obtaining their help, had brought Constantine the king's brother, to rescue his country against the infidels. This Constantine was brother to Aldroenus, king of Little Britain, and father to Constans, Aurelius Ambrosius, and Uther, who after reigned kings in Britain. <sup>F1685</sup>

Thus, by the means of the good archbishop and Constantine, the state of the religion and realm of Britain was in some mean, quiet, and safety, during the time of the said Constantine, and of the good archbishop. But as the realm of Britain almost from the beginning was never without civil war, at length came wicked Vortigern, who cruelly causing Constans his prince to be murdered, ambitiously invaded the crown; who then, fearing the other two brethren of Constans, which were Aurelius and Uther, being then in Little Britain, did send over for the aid of the Saxons, being then infidels; and not only that, but also married with an infidel, the daughter of Hengist, called Rowena. Whereupon the said Vortigern, not long after, by

the said Hengist and the Saxons, was with like treachery dispossessed of his kingdom, and the people of Britain driven out of their country, after that the Saxons had slain of their chief nobles and barons at one meeting (joining together subtlety with cruelty) to the number of two hundred and seventy-one; some stories say four hundred and sixty. This wicked act of the Saxons was done at Amesbury, or at a place called Stonehenge; by the monument of which stones, there hanging, it seemeth that the noble Britons there were buried. (The fabulous story of the Welchmen, <sup>f1686</sup> of the bringing of these stones from Ireland by Merlin, I pass over.) Some stories record that they were slain, being bid to a banquet. Others say that it was done at a talk or assembly, where the Saxons came with privy knives, contrary to promise made; with the which knives they, giving a privy watch-word in their Saxon speech, “Neme your sexes,” <sup>f1687</sup> slew the Britons unarmed. And thus far concerning the history of the Britons.

As this great plague could not come to the Britons without God’s permission, so Gildas showeth in his chronicle the cause thereof, writing thus: “Quod Britones propter avaritiam et rapinam principum, propter iniquitatem et injustitiam iudicum, propter desidiam praedicationis episcoporum, propter luxuriam et malos mores populi, patriam perdidisse.”

### **THE ENTERING AND REIGNING OF THE SAXONS IN THE REALM OF ENGLAND.**

This was the coming in first of the Angles or Saxons into this realm being yet unchristened and infidels, which was about the year of our Lord, as William of Malinesbury testifieth, 449; the captains of whom were Hengist and Horsa. Although the said Hengist and Saxons at their first coming, for all their subtle working and cruel attempt, had no quiet settling in Britain, but were driven out divers times by the valiantness of Aurelius Ambrosias, and his brother Uther abovementioned, who reigned after that among the Britons; yet, notwithstanding, they were not so driven out, but that they returned again, and at length possessed all, driving the Britons (such as remained) into Cambria, which we call now Wales. Hengist (as some chronicles record) reigned three and forty years, and died in Kent. Geoffrey of Monmouth, in his history of Britain, saith, that he was taken

in war by Aurelius Ambrosias, and beheaded at Coningsburgh, after he had reigned nine and thirty years. <sup>F1688</sup>

After the death of Hengist, his son Osca reigned four and twenty years, who also was slain by Uther Pendragon, leaving his son Octa, to whose reign with his son Imenricus histories do attribute three and fifty years. <sup>F1689</sup>

The Saxons, after they were settled in the possession of England, distributed the realm among themselves first in seven parts, every part to have his king; that is, the first to be the king of Kent; the second to be king of Sussex and Southery, holding his palace at Cicester; the third king was of Westsex; the fourth king, of Essex; the fifth king was of the East Angles, that is, of Cambridgeshire, Norfolk, and Suffolk; the sixth king of Merceland, or Mercia; and in his kingdom were contained the counties of Lincoln, Leicester, Huntingdon, Northampton, Oxford, Derby, Warwick, etc.; the seventh king had all the counties beyond Humber, and was called king of Northumberland.

Of the seven kingdoms, although they continued not long, but at length joined all in one, coming all into the possession and subjection of the West Saxons; yet for the space they continued (which was with continual trouble and wars among themselves), this is the race and order of them, as in this Table particularly followeth to be seen.

#### **A TABLE DESCRIBING THE SEVEN KINGDOMS OF THE SAXONS REIGNING HERE IN ENGLAND.** <sup>F1690</sup>

In the time of Vortigern above mentioned, began the reign of the Saxons in this land; the which, coming out of three sorts of the German people (to wit, the Saxons, the Jutes, and Angles), replenished the land, Of them called now Anglia. Of whom first Hengist reigned in Kent, which country of Kent he had obtained by Rowena his daughter, of king Vortigern, which was about the year of our Lord, as some do count, 476, or, as I find in the computation of our English Tables 456, in some 463. After Hengist came in Osca, with Eosa or Isse, his kinsman; who afterward succeeded the said Hengist in Kent. Not long after came in another company of the Saxons, with Elle their captain, which planted themselves in

South-sax. And after them again another garrison of the Saxons, with Cerdic their captain, which did occupy the west part of the land, called by them West-sax. And so, likewise, the other multitude of the Saxons after them, which (as yet being unchristened and infidels) divided the whole land among themselves into seven kingdoms, as in this Table followeth:-

### KENT.

*The Kings of Kent with the Years they reigned.*

A.D	NAME	YEARS
456	Hengist (slain) reigned	31
488	Eosa, or Issel <sup>f1691</sup>	24
512	Ocha, or Ocha	
542	Emeric, or Emeric	26
560	Ethelbert <sup>f1692</sup> the first of the Saxon kings that received the faith by Augustine, anno regni 35	56
616	Edbald	24
640	Ercombert <sup>f1693</sup>	24
664	Egebert, or Edbrieth (slain) <sup>f1694</sup> ...	9
673	Lotharius (slain)	12
685	Eadric <sup>f1695</sup>	6
685	Nidred	7
685	Wilhard <sup>f1696</sup>	7
694	Withred	33
728	Egfert, or Egbert	23
748	Ethelbert	11
748	Alric <sup>f1697</sup>	34
760	Eadbert, surnamed Pren	2
760	Cuthred	18
760	Baldred (expulsed)	18

In the reign of this Baldred the kingdom of Kent was translated to Egbert, otherwise called Egbrict, king of the West Saxons; who, subduing the aforesaid Baldred in the year 832, gave the said kingdom to Athelstan his younger son. After whose decease it came to Ethelwolf, the elder son of Egbrecht, and so was united to the West Saxons, who then began to be the monarch of the whole land. This kingdom began near about the year of our Lord 456, and continued 376 years, and had fifteen kings.

### SUSSEX.

*The Kings of Southsax, now called Sussex, with the Years they reigned.*

A.D	NAME	YEARS
478	Elle, or Alle, reigned	31
	Cissa. <sup>f1698</sup>	
	Nancanleus, or Naucanleod. <sup>f1699</sup>	
	Porth. <sup>f1700</sup>	
	Ethelwolf. <sup>f1701</sup>	
	Condebert <sup>f1702</sup>	
	Ethelred, or Ethereus.	
	Adelwold, or Ethelwald (slain.) <sup>f1703</sup>	
	Redwall	
	Adelbrich, or Berethunus (slain.)	
	Aldhume.	

This kingdom endured the shortest season of all others, and soonest passed into other kingdoms, in the days (as some write) of Ina king of West-sax; and so endured not above two hundred and ten years, under seven, or at most eleven kings, beginning first in the year of the Lord 478, and about the thirtieth year from the first coming of the Saxons.

**WESSEX.**

*The Kings of Westsax, and the Years they reigned.*

<b>A.D</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>YEARS</b>
<b>495</b>	Cerdic, or Credic, <sup>f1704</sup> reigned ...	<b>17</b>
<b>534</b>	Kenric	<b>26</b>
<b>560</b>	Cheling	<b>30, 33</b>
<b>591</b>	Celtic, or Celfric	<b>5</b>
<b>597</b>	Celwulf, or Ceolulf	<b>1</b>
<b>611</b>	Kinigilsus, <sup>f1705</sup> and Quicelinus ...	<b>32</b>
<b>643</b>	Kinewalkins	<b>31</b>
<b>672</b>	Sexburga	<b>1</b>
<b>674</b>	Escwin, Ascwin, or Elkwin ...	<b>2</b>
<b>676</b>	Centwine (died at Home) .....	<b>7</b>
<b>685</b>	Cadwalla <sup>f1706</sup>	<b>3</b>
<b>688</b>	Inn, or Ine <sup>f1707</sup> ..	<b>35</b>
<b>728</b>	Edelard, or Athelard	<b>14</b>
<b>741</b>	Cuthred, or Cuthbert	<b>16</b>
<b>754</b>	Sigebert, or Sigher (slain) <sup>f1708</sup> ...	<b>1</b>
<b>755</b>	Kinulf, or Kinewlf (slain) ...	<b>31</b>
<b>784</b>	Brithric	<b>13</b>
<b>800</b>	Egbert, or Egbricht, <sup>f1709</sup> otherwise Athelbert, or Athelbrich, etc	<b>37</b>

This Egbert subdued all the other seven kingdoms, and first begun the monarchy of all the Saxons, which after by Alfred was perfected, as hereafter followeth (the Lord willing) to be declared. This kingdom of the West Saxons began the year of grace 495; and as it subdued all the others, so it did the longest continue, till about the coming of William the Conqueror, which is about the time of 571 years.

**NORTHUMBERLAND.**

*The Kings of Northumberland, with the Years they reigned.*

<b>A.D</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>YEARS</b>
547	Ida, <sup>f1710</sup> reigned After Ida the kingdom of Northumberland was divided into two provinces, Deira and Bernicia	12
560	Alle or Elle, <sup>f1711</sup> for Deira	30
560	Adda, of Bernicia <sup>f1712</sup>	7
588	Alric, or Alfric, of Deira <sup>f1713</sup>	5
593	Ethelfrid, of Bernicia. <sup>F1714</sup>	
617	Edwin, of Northumberland (slain) <sup>f1715</sup>	17
634	Osric, of Deira (slain)	
634	Eanfrid, of Bernicia (slain) <sup>f1716</sup>	
634	Oswald, <sup>f1717</sup> of Northumberland (slain).	
642	Oswy, <sup>f1718</sup> of Northumberland	28
644	Oswin, <sup>f1719</sup> reigned together with Oswy, in Deira, (slain)	7
670	Egfrid, <sup>f1720</sup> of Northumberland (slain)	15
685	Alfred, <sup>f1721</sup> of Northumberland (slain)	20
705	Osred, <sup>f1722</sup> of Northumberland (slain)	11
716	Kenred, of Northumberland..	2
	Osric, <sup>f1723</sup> of Northumberland ...	20
731	Celulf, <sup>f1724</sup> of Northumberland, (made a monk)	9
738	Edbert, or Eadbart, of Northumberland (monk)	21
757	Osulf, of Northumberland, (slain) .	1
759	Mollo, <sup>f1725</sup> or Ethelwold, of Northumberland (in some chronicles six years)	11
765	Alcred, <sup>f1726</sup> of Northumberland (expulsed)	10
774	Ethelbert, or Edelred, of Northumberland (expulsed)	5
778	Alfwold, of Northumberland (slain)	11
779	Osred II	
780	Ethelbert, or Adelwald, of Northumberland (slain)	16

After this Ethelbert, the kingdom of Northumberland ceased the space of 25 years, till Egbert, king of the West Saxons, subdued also them, as he did the other Saxons, to his dominion. After the which Egbert, king of the West Saxons, succeeded his son in Northumberland.

## KINGS OF WEST SAXONS, REIGNING IN NORTHUMBERLAND.

*Ethelwolf.*

*Ethelbert.*

*Ethelbald.*

*Ethelred.*

In the time of this Ethelred, there were two under-kings in Northumberland, Ella and Osbright, whom the Danes overcame, and reigned in their place, whose names were these:

*Erbert, Richsi, Egbert, Gurthed, Gurthrid; Danes.*

After the reign of these foresaid Danes, the kingdom of Northumberland came into the hands of the West Saxons, in the time of Athelstan and his brother Edmund. It began first in the year 547 [and ended in the year 938], and so endured 391 years. It contained Yorkshire, the bishopric of Durham, Copeland, and others.

## MERCIA.

*The Kings of Mercia, or Merceland, with the Years of their Reign.*

A.D	NAME	YEARS
583	Crida, or Creodda, reigned	35
	Wibba	20
	Ceorlus	10
626	Penda, <sup>f1727</sup> (slain)	30
635	Peda, <sup>f1728</sup> or Weds (slain by his wife).	
656	Ulfer <sup>f1729</sup>	29
675	Adelred, or Ethelred, <sup>f1730</sup> (made a monk)	30 or 19

<b>704</b>	Kenred made also monk at Rome	<b>5</b>
<b>709</b>	Ceolred, or Kelred <sup>f1731</sup>	
<b>716</b>	Ethelbald (slain) <sup>f1732</sup>	<b>41</b>
<b>755</b>	Bernred <sup>f1733</sup>	<b>1</b>
<b>755</b>	Offa <sup>f1734</sup>	<b>39</b>
<b>794</b>	Egfred	<b>1</b>
<b>794</b>	Kenulph, (slain)	<b>20 or 16</b>
	Kenelm (murdered) <sup>f1735</sup>	
<b>819</b>	Ceolwolf (expelled)	<b>3</b>
<b>821</b>	Bernulf (slain)	<b>2</b>
	Ludecane (slain) <sup>f1736</sup>	
	Some chronicles here insert Milefred, Wilasius, or	
<b>828</b>	Withlacus (beheaded)	<b>12</b>

This Withlacus, in the beginning of his reign, was vanquished by Egbert king of West-sax, to whom he became tributary, with his successors here following:

Bernulf, 12 years; Buthred, 20 years; Celust, 1 year; Elfrid, 1 year. Some writers say that these four kings were subdued by the Danes.

After this Elfred, the kingdom of the Mercians was translated unto the West Saxons, in the latter time of king Alfred, or in the beginning of Edward the eldest; and so was adjoined to the West Saxons, beginning in the year 586. It endured for the space of 315 years, till about the latter end of Alfred, by whom it was joined to the kingdom of the West Saxons. This kingdom stretched out to Huntingdonshire, Herefordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcester, Warwick, Litchfield, Coventry, Chester, Derbyshire, Staffordshire, Shrewsbury, Oxford, Buckingham, Dorchester, Lincoln, Leicester, etc.

## EAST SAXONS.

*The Kings of the East Saxons, with the Years of their Reign.*

A.D	NAME	YEARS
561	Erchwin, reigned	35
	Sledda	17
604	Sebert, or Sigebert <sup>f1737</sup>	14
	Sexred, Seward, and Sigebert, <sup>f1738</sup> brethren (slain)	
	Sigebert, the Little	23
	Sigebert, the Good, <sup>f1739</sup> or Sibert (slain)	
	Switheline	14
	Sigherius, son of Sigebert the Little. <sup>F1740</sup>	
	Sebbi, son of Seward, which was made a monk.	
	Sigehard and Suefrid, brethren	8
	Offa <sup>f1741</sup>	5
	Selred, or Colred (slain)	38
	Swithred	

This Swithred was subdued unto Egbert, king of West Saxons, albeit London remained under the Mercians to the time that they also were subdued to the West Saxons. This kingdom began in the year 561, and so continued till the time of Egbert. Some stories say it continued till the time of Edward son of Alfred, about the coming of the Danes, and contained under it the lordship of Middlesex and London. The metropolitan see of this province of Essex was London, where the famous church of St. Paul was builded by Ethelbert king of Kent, and Sebert king of Essex, whom Ethelbert had lately before turned to Christ's faith; whereof the first bishop was Mellitus, the second bishop was Cedda, the third came in by simony, whose name was Wine. <sup>F1742</sup> After him was Erkenwald, of whom writeth Bede, that he, being diseased in his legs so that he

could not go nor ride, yet would be carried about in a litter, to preach in his diocese, etc. Although William of Malmesbury, writing of the bishops of London in his book “De Vitis Pontificum,” saith that Maurice, first the king’s chancellor, then bishop there, did first begin this so large and famous building of the church of St. Paul in London; which work after him Richard, his successor, did prosecute, bestowing all the rents of his bishopric upon the same, and yet was scarcely seen [to make any progress].

<sup>f1743</sup> Yet herein may be answered peradventure, that the church builded before by king Ethelbert and king Sigebert, might be overthrown by the Danes, and afterward was re — EDified by these bishops above mentioned.

### EAST ANGLIA.

*The Kings of East Angles, with the Years of their Reign.*

A.D	NAME	YEARS
	Uffa, or Ulfa, <sup>f1744</sup> reigned	30
	Titulus, or Titila	13
	Redwald <sup>f1745</sup>	12
	Erpwald, or Corpwalous (slain)	38
	Sigebert, or Sibrect, <sup>f1746</sup> first a monk (slain)	3
	Egnic, or Egric (slain)	3
	Anna (slain) <sup>f1747</sup>	3
	Adelhere, or Adelred (slain)	2
	Adelwold, or Ethelbald	9
	Adulph	25
	Elkwold	12
	Beorna	26
	Ethelred (slain)	52
	Ethelbright, or Ethelbert <sup>f1748</sup> (slain)	5

After the sinful murder of Ethelbert, the kingdom of East Angles, during the term of certain years, was in great troubler and desolation, under divers kings and tyrants; sometimes the king of Westsax, sometimes of Kent or of Mercia, having dominion over them; till the coming of St. Edmund, who was the last king there ruling under the West Saxons.

St. Edmund (martyred) reigned 16 years.

After the death of St. Edmund, being slain of the infidel Danes, the kingdom remained with the Danes fifty years, till at length Edward, king of the West Saxons, expelled the Danes, and joined it to his kingdom. It began about the year of our Lord 561, and continued near about 350 years. Fabian numbereth but twelve kings, but in others I find more.

The metropolitan see of this province of East Angles was first at a town called Dunmoke, or Dunwich, <sup>f1749</sup> which in times past hath been a famous and populous town, with a mayor and four bailiffs, and also divers parish churches and hospitals, whereunto great privileges by divers kings have been granted; which town is now fallen into ruin and decay, and more than half consumed by the eating in of the sea, as also greatly impoverished by loss of the haven, which heretofore, hath flourished with divers tall ships belonging to the same (the inhabitants thereof being not able of themselves to repair it without the help of other good people); where the first bishop was Felix, a Burgundian, who sat there fourteen years. After this, unto the time of Egbert king of Westsax, this province was ever ruled by two bishops, whereof the one had his see at Dunmoke, now called Dunwich; the other at Hemaham <sup>f1750</sup> where ten sat one after another. From thence it was translated to Thetford, where sat two bishops. At last, by bishop Herbert it was removed to Norwich, where he erected a monastery of monks.

And thus standeth the order and race of the Saxon kings, reigning together with the Britons in this realm. Now followeth the description of the British kings, reigning with the Saxons in like manner.

Although the miserable Britons thus were bereaved of their land, by the cruel subtlety of the Saxons, yet were they not so driven out or expelled, but that a certain kingdom remained among them in some part of the land, namely about Cornwall, and the parts of Cambria, which is divided in two parts, South Wales called Demetia, and North Wales called Venedocia. The said Britons, moreover, through the valiant acts of their kings, sometimes reigned also in other countries, displacing the Saxons, and recovering again their own, sometimes more, sometimes less, till the time of Carecius, when the Britons, being deposed by Gormund (whose help they themselves sent for out of Ireland against Carecius their wicked king), utterly lost their land and kingdom; being thence driven utterly into Wales and Cornwall, A.D. 586. What the order of these kings was, what were their acts, their names and times when they reigned, in this brief table underwritten is expressed. Wherein, first, is to be premonished that Constantine the Second had three children, to wit, Constans, who was made a monk in Winchester, and after made a king; the second was Aurelius Arabrosins; the third was Uther Pendragon. This being premised, we will now enter the description of our Table, beginning with Vortigern.

**A TABLE DECLARING THE KINGS OF BRITAIN WHICH  
REIGNED TOGETHER WITH THE SAXONS, AFTER THEIR  
COMING INTO THEIR LAND.**

*Vortigern.*

*Vortimer.*

*Vortigern again*

*Aurelius Ambrosius.*

*Uther Pendragon.*

*Arthur.*

*Constantine III.*

*Aurelius Conanus.*

*Vortiporius.*

*Malge.*

*Carecius, or Careticus.*

Here is to be understood that these British kings above mentioned did not so reign here in this land from the time of Vortigern, that they had the full government over all the whole realm, but only over parcels or parts, such

as by force of arms they could either hold or win from the Saxons; who, coming in daily, and growing upon them, did so replenish the land with multitudes of them, that the Britons at length were neither able to hold that which they had, nor to recover that which they lost; leaving example to all ages and countries, what it is first to let in foreign nations into their dominion, but especially what it is for princes to join in marriage with infidels, as this Vortigern did with Hengist's daughter, which was the mother of all this mischief; giving to the Saxons not only strength, but also occasion and courage to attempt that which they did. Neither was this unconsidered before of the British lords and nobility, who, worthily being therewith offended, justly deposed their king, and enthroned Vortimer his son in his room. By the which Vortimer, being a puissant prince, the Saxons were then repulsed, and driven again into Gemany, where they stayed a while till the death of Vortimer, whom Rowena, daughter of Hengist, caused traitorously to be poisoned. Then Vortigern being restored again to his kingdom, through the entreaty of Rowena his wife, sent into Germany again for Hengist, who, eftsoons making his return, came in with a navy of three hundred ships well appointed. <sup>F1751</sup>

The nobles of Britain, hearing this, prepared themselves on the contrary side in all forceable wise to put them off. But Hengist, through Rowena his daughter, so labored the king, excusing himself, and saying that he brought not the multitude to work any violence either against him or against his country, but only thinking that Vortimer had yet been alive, whom he minded to impugn for the king's sake, and to take his part. And now, forsomuch as he heareth of the death of Vortimer his enemy, he therefore committeth both himself and his people to his disposition, to appoint how few or how many of them he would, to remain within his land; the rest should return. And if it so pleased the king to appoint day and place where they might meet and talk together of the matter, both he and his would stand to such order as the king with his council should appoint. With these fair words well contented, the king and his nobles did assign to them both day and place, which was in the town of Ambry, <sup>f1752</sup> where he meant to talk with them; adding this condition withal, that each part should come without any manner of weapon. Hengist, showing himself well agreed thereto, gave privy intelligence to his side, that each man should carry with him secretly in his hose a long knife, with their watch-word also given unto

them, when they should draw their knives, wherewith every Saxon should (and so did) kill the Briton with whom he talked, as is above declared. The British lords being slain, the Saxons took Vortigern the king and bound him; for whose ransom they required to be delivered to them the cities of London, York, Lincoln, Winchester, with other the most strong holds within the land; which being to them granted, they begin to make spoil and havoc of the British nation, destroying the citizens, plucking down churches, killing up the priests, burning the books of the holy Scripture, leaving nothing undone that tyranny could work; which was about the year of our Lord 462. The king, seeing this miserable slaughter of the people, fled into Wales. <sup>F1753</sup>

This while, Aurelius Ambrosius and Uther Pendragon, brethren to king Constans above mentioned, whom Vortigern wickedly caused to be killed, were in Little Britain. <sup>F1754</sup> To whom the Britons sent word, desiring their aid in helping their country. Aurelius, understanding the woful state of the realm, speedeth him over to satisfy their desire, and to rescue (what in him was) their necessity; who at his first coming eftsoons being crowned for their king, seeketh out wicked Vortigern, the cause of all this trouble and murder of king Constans, his brother. And finding him in Wales, in a strong tower wherein he had immured himself, setteth him and his castle on fire. That done, he moved his power against the Saxons, with whom and with Elle, captain of the South Saxons (who then was newly come over), he had divers conflicts.

Our old English chronicles make record, that Horsa the brother of Hengist was slain before in the time of Vortimer. <sup>F1755</sup> The same also do:record that this Hengist was taken prisoner in the field, fighting against Aurelius Ambrosius; who then consulting with his nobles and barons what was to be done with him, the bishop of Gloucester, called Eldad, standing up gave this counsel, saying, that if all men would deliver him, yet he with his own hands would cut him in pieces; alleging the example of Samuel against Agag king of the Amalekites, taken by king Saul in the field, whom the said Samuel caused to be cut in pieces. "Even so," saith he, "do you to this Agag here; that as he hath made many a woman widow, and without children, so his mother may be made this day of him likewise." And so was Hengist taken out of the city <sup>f1756</sup> by Eldol consul or mayor of Gloucester, and there was beheaded, if truth or credit be to be given to

these our old British stories, <sup>f1757</sup> whereof I have nothing certainly to pronounce, but that I may suspect the truth thereof; which was about the year of our Lord 488.

A certain ancient written history I have in Latin, compiled in the fourteenth year of king Richard II., and by him caused to be written as the title declareth; which, because it beareth no name of the author, I call it by the name of him of whom I borrowed this book, with many others likewise without name, "Historia Cariana." This history recordeth, that Hengist died in Kent the two and thirtieth year of his reign; which if it be true, then is it false that he was taken at Cuninburgh, and slain in the north. This Aurelius Arabrosins before-mentioned is thought of Polydore Virgil; citing the authority of Bede, <sup>f1758</sup> to descend of the stock of the Romans; which as it is not impossible to be true, so this is certain by the full accord of all our old written stories, that both the said Aurelius and his brother Uther Pendragon, being the sons of Constantine, brother to Audroenus king of Little Britain, were nursed and brought up in England in their tender age, and instructed by Guitelinus, archbishop of London; and, after the murder of Constans their elder brother, were conveyed from hence to Little Britain; whereby it is manifest that they were born in this land; and though their father were a Roman, as Polydore pretendeth, yet likely it is that they were Britons born, and had a Briton <sup>f1759</sup> to their mother.

After the death of Aurelius, who (as the story saith) was poisoned by the crafty means of Pascentius son of Vortigern (suborning one under the weed of a monk to play the physician, and so to poison him), next succeeded his brother Uther, surnamed Pendragon, about the year of our Lord 497, who, fighting against Osca <sup>f1760</sup> and Eosa, took them and brought them to London there to be kept; but they, breaking out of prison, returned into Germany for more aid. In this mean time daily recourse was of Saxons, with great companies coming out of Saxony, with whom the Britons had divers and sundry conflicts, sometimes winning, sometimes losing. Not long after, Osca and Eosa, renewing their power in Germany, in all most speedy haste did return again and join with the other Saxons against the Britons. Here began the state of miserable Britain more and more to decay, while the idolatrous Saxons prevailed in number and strength against the christian Britons; oppressing the people, throwing down churches and monasteries, murdering the prelates, sparing neither age nor person, but

wasting Christianity almost through the whole realm. To these miseries it fell, moreover, that Uther their king was sick, and could not come out: notwithstanding, being grieved with the lamentable destruction of his people, he caused his bed to be brought into the camp, where God gave him victory, Osca and Eosa there being slain. After this victory, in short space Uther died of poison (as is said) put into a fountain, whereof the king was wont to drink; about the year of our Lord 516. <sup>F1761</sup>

About which time and year came in Scupha and Whigarus, two nephews of Cerdic king of West Saxons, with their companies, so violently upon the Britons, that they of the west part of the realm were not able to resist them. Then the merciful providence of Almighty God raised up for them king Arthur, the son of Uther, who was; then crowned after him, and victoriously reigned. To this Arthur the old British histories do ascribe twelve great victories against the heathen Saxons; whose notorious and famous conquests mentioned in the British stories I leave as I find them, referring them to the credit of their authors in whom they are found. Notwithstanding, as I do not think contrary, but God, by the aforesaid Arthur, gave to the Britons some stay and quietness during his life, and certain of his successors; so, touching certain of his great victories and conquests, not only over this land, but also over all Europe, I judge them more fabulous, than that any credit should be gram unto them; and more worthy to be joined with the Iliads of Homer, than to have place in any ecclesiastical history. After Arthur, the next king of the Britons was Constantine III. After him Aurelius Conanus. Then Vortiporius; after whom followed Malgo, noted in stories to be a Sodomite. And after him the last king of the Britons was Carecius, all given to civil war, execrable to God and man; who being chased out by the Britons themselves, the land fell into possession of the Saxons, about the year of our Lord 586, by whom all the clergy and the christian ministers of the Britons were then utterly driven out: insomuch that Theon, archbishop of Lolldon, and Thadioc, archbishop of York, seeing their churches all wasted, and parishes dispersed, with their carriages and monments, left their sees in Britain, and fled into Cambria, which we now call Wales. <sup>F1762</sup> Touching which matter, and touching also the cause of this desolation and ruin of the Britons' kingdom, the first fountain and origin thereof partly before is declared; where was showed in the time of Constantine the Great and Maximian,

how these noble princes, with others, achieving their venturous affairs in other countries, took with them great multitudes and armies out of Britain; through the occasion whereof the land was greatly impaired, and deprived of the most chief and principal nobles, being carried away to serve in foreign wars, which was no small cause why the realm of Britain (being so wasted) was the less able to help itself against their enemies. <sup>F1763</sup>

Although this was not the chief occasion, but other causes there were greater, wherefore God by his just judgment suffered this plague and overthrow to fall upon that people; as here out of an old author, and partly out of Gildas, I have found it, so I thought to annex it in his own words, first in Latin, <sup>f1764</sup> then afterward Englishing the same, for the more credit of that which shall be alleged, in tenor as followeth:

“The nobles of this realm following the princes and captains above named, the vulgar and rascal sort remained behind at home. Who, when they had gotten the rooms and places of the nobles, advanced themselves above that which their, dignity required; and through, their abundance of riches, being surprised with pride, they began to fall into such and so great fornication, as was never heard of even among the Gentiles. And as Gildas the Historiographer witnesseth, not into this vice only, but also into all manner of wickedness whereto man’s nature is inclined: and especially into that which is the overthrow of all good estate, the hatred of the truth, love of lies, embracing of evil instead of goodness, regarding of mischief instead of virtue, receiving of the devil as an angel of light. They anointed kings, not such as could well rule a commonwealth, but those which exceeded all other in cruelty; and if any might be perceived to be somewhat more humble or meek, or to be more inclined to favor the truth than the residue, him aid every one hate and backbite as the overthrower and destroyer of Britain. All things, whether they pleased or displeased God, they regarded alike. And not secular men only did this, but also the congregation of the Lord, and their bishops and teachers, without any difference at all. Therefore it is not to be marvelled that such people, so degenerating and going out of kind, should lose that country which they had after this manner defiled.”

And thus much hitherto concerning the history of the Britons, till (by the grace of Christ) the order of time shall bring us hereafter to treat of Cadwalla and Cadwallader. Now remaineth it, in returning again to the matter of the Saxons, to discourse particularly, that which before in the table above we have summarily comprehended. In this order and race of the Saxon kings above specified, which had thus thrust out the Britons, and now divided their land in seven kingdoms, as there were many naughty and wicked kings (whose pernicious examples, being all set on war and bloodshed, are greatly to be detested and eschewed of all true godly princes), so some there were again (although but few) very sincere and good. But no one almost from the first to the last, who was not either slain in war, or murdered in peace, or else constrained to make himself a monk. Such was the rage then, and the tyranny of that time. Whether we should impute it to the corruption of man's nature, or to the just judgment of God's hand, so disposing the matter that, as they had violently and falsely dispossessed the Britons of their right; so they most miserably were not only vexed of the Danes, and conquered at last by the Normans; but also more cruelly devoured themselves, one warring still against another, till they were neither able to help themselves, nor yet to resist others. Of them which are noted for good among these Saxon kings, the first and principal is Ethelbert, or Ethelbriht, the first king in Kent above specified: who by the means of Austin, and partly through his wife named Bertha, <sup>f1765</sup> first received and preferred the christian faith in all this land of the English Saxons, whereof more followeth hereafter to be said (the Lord so permitting) as place and opportunity shall require. The next place I give to Oswald of Northumberland, who not only did his endeavor in furthering the faith of Christ amongst his people; but also, being king, disdained not himself to stand up, and interpret to his nobles and subjects the preaching of Aidan, preaching Christ to them in his Scottish language. In the same commendation also, like as in the same line, cometh his uncle Edwin king of Northumberland, a good prince and the first receiver of Christ's faith in that land, by the means of his wife, and Pauline, a bishop. Add to these also Sigebert, first christened king of the East Angles, and Sebert, first christened king of Essex: of whom the one was a great furtherer of religion, and setter up of schools; the other, which is Sebert or Serbriht, was nephew to Ethelbert of Kent, under whom he ruled in Essex. By the which Ethelbert, in the time of the said Sebert, the church of Paul's was builded

at London, and christian faith much enlarged. Of the same name there was also another Ethelbert king of the East Angles, a good prince; who, by the advice of his council, being persuaded to marriage (though against his will), went peaceably to king Offa for espousage of Ethelreda his daughter; where the good king meaning innocently, through the sinister and devilish counsel of king Offa's wife, was secretly beheaded and made away. Whereupon Offa, through repentance thereof, made the first Peter-pence to be given to St. Peter's church in Rome.

In the catalogue of these good kings is also to be numbered Kenelm king of the Mercians, and Edmund king of the East Angles; of the which two, the first was falsely and abominably circumvented and beheaded, by the means of his cruel sister and his tutor, as he was; in his hunting at Corfe castle. The other, who is called king Edmund the Martyr, was slain at Bury, or (as some write) at the castle of Halesdon, by the Danes: upon what occasion, histories do vary. The author of "Flores Historiarum" saith, <sup>f1766</sup> it was by reason of one Lothbroke, a Dane, <sup>f1767</sup> who, being of the king's blood, and being with his hawk on the sea-side in a little boat, was driven by the force of the weather into the coast of Norfolk, where he, being presented to king Edmund, was retained in the court with great favor; till at length one Berike, the king's falconer, envying and despiteing him for his great dexterity in that faculty, privily did murder him in a wood. This being at last spied, as murder lightly will come out, Berike was set in Lothbroke's boat alone, without all tackling, to be committed unto the sea; and, as it chanced, was driven into Denmark, who there being seen in Lothbroke's boat, was strictly examined of the party. He then, to excuse himself, falsely said he was slain by the commandment of the king. Upon the occasion whereof, Inguar and Hubba, sons to the said Lothbroke, gathering an army of Danes, invaded first Northumberland; after that, bursting into Norfolk on every side, sent this message to king Edmund after this tenor, signifying, that king Inguar, the victorious prince (dreaded both by sea and land), as he had subjected divers other lands under him, so, arriving now to the coasts of Norfolk, where he intendeth to winter, chargeth and commandeth him to divide with him his old treasures, and his father's riches, and so to rule under him: which if he would not do, but would contemn his power so strongly furnished with such an army, he should be judged as unworthy both of kingdom and life, etc. The king

hearing this message, not a little astonished hereat, calling his council about him, consulted with them, especially with one of his bishops, being then his secretary, what was best to be done; who, fearing the king's life, exhorteth him by words and divers examples to agree to the message. At this the king awhile holding his peace, at length thereto made answer again in these words, saying, "Go," saith he, "tell your lord, and let him know, that Edmund the christened king, for the love of this temporal life, will not subject himself to a pagan duke, unless before he become a Christian," etc. The messenger, taking his answer, was not so soon out of the gates, as Inguar, meeting him and bidding him to be short in declaring his answer, caused all the king's garrison to be set round about. Some say, that the king flying to Thetford there pitched a field with the Danes; but the Danes prevailing, the good king from thence did fly to the castle of Halesdon above mentioned; where he, being pursued of the Danes, was there taken, and at length, being bound to a stake, there, of the raging Danes was shot to death. And thus much for the good kings.

Now as concerning those kings which made themselves monks, which in number be seven or eight, although the example be rare and strange, and much commended of the chroniclers of that time; yet I cannot rashly assent to their commendation, albeit the case thereof is no matter of our history. First, in altering their estate from kings to monks, if they did it to find more ease, and less trouble thereby, I see not how that excuse standeth with the office of a good man, to change his public vocation for respect of private commodity. If fear of jeopardy and danger did drive them thereunto, what praise or commendation deserve they in so doing? let the monkish histories judge what they list. Me-seemeth, so much praise as they deserve in providing their own safety, so much they deserve again to be discom-mended in forsaking the commonwealth. If they did it (as most like it is) for holiness' sake, thinking in that kind of life to serve and please God better, or to merit more toward their salvation than in the estate of a king, therein they were far deceived; not knowing that the salvation which cometh of God, is to be measured and esteemed, not by man's merits, or by any perfection of life, or by difference of any vocation, more of one than another, but only by the free grace of the gospel, which freely justifieth all them that faithfully believe in Christ Jesus. But here will be said again; peradventure, in the solitary life of monkery be fewer occasions

of evils than in king's courts; wherefore that life serveth more to holiness, and is more to be preferred than the other. To this I answer, to avoid the occasions of evil is good, where strength lacketh to resist: but otherwise, where duty and charge bind to tarry, there to avoid the occasions of evil, where rather they are to be resisted, rather declareth a weakness of the man, than deserveth any praise. As it is truly said of Tully, "Out of Asia," saith he, "to live a good life, is no Godamercy; but in Asia, where so great occasions of evils abound, there to live a good man, that is praiseworthy." With the like reason I may infer, if a man be called to be a king, there not to change the vocation for avoiding of occasions, but rather to resist occasions, and to keep his vocation, declareth a good and perfect man. But of these by-matters hitherto sufficient.

These things now thus premised, concerning the order and reign of kings, as is above prefixed; consequently it remaineth to enter the tractation of such things, as, in the time and reign of the aforesaid kings, happened in the church; first putting the reader again in mind of the former persecutions within the realm, partly before touched in the time of the British kings, which especially were three or four, before the coming of Augustine into England.

1. The first was under Dioclesian; and that not only in England, but generally throughout all the Roman monarchy, as is above specified. In this persecution Alban, Julius, Aaron, with a great, number more of other good christian Britons, were martyred for Christ's name. <sup>F1768</sup>
2. The second persecution or destruction of christian faith, was by the invading of Guanius and Melga, whereof the first was captain of the Huns, the other of the Picts. These two tyrants, after the cruel slaughter of Ursula and other eleven thousand noble virgins, made their road into Britain, hearing the same to be destitute of the strength of men. At which time they made miserable murder of Christ's saints, spoiling and wasting churches, without mercy either of women or children; sparing none.
3. The third persecution came by Hengist and the Saxons; who likewise destroyed and wasted the christian congregations within the land, like raging wolves flying upon the sheep, and spilling the blood of

Christians, till Aurelius Ambrosius came, and restored again the churches destroyed.

4. The fourth destruction of the christian faith and religion was by Gormund, a pagan king of the Africans, <sup>f1769</sup> who, joining in league with the Saxons, wrought much grievance to the Christians of the land. <sup>F1770</sup> Insomuch that Theon bishop of London, and Thadioc archbishop of York, with the rest of the people, so many as were left, having no place wherein to remain with safety, did fly some to Cornwall, and some to the mountains of Wales, about the year of our Lord 586; <sup>f1771</sup> and this persecution remained to the time of Ethelbert king of Kent, in the year 595. <sup>F1772</sup>

In the reign of this Ethelbert, who was then the fifth king of Kent, the faith of Christ was first received of the Saxons or English men, by the means of Gregory bishop of Rome, in manner and order as here followeth, out of old histories collected and recorded.

First then, to join the order of our history together, the christian faith first received of king Lucius, endured in Britain till this time, near upon the season of four hundred years and odd, <sup>f1773</sup> when by Gormundus Africanus (as is said) fighting with the Saxons against the Britons it was near extinct in all the land, <sup>f1773</sup> during the space of about forty-four <sup>f1774</sup> years. So that the first springing of Christ's gospel in this land, was A.D. 180. The coming of the Saxons was in the year 449. The coming of Augustine was in the year 596. From the first entering in of the Saxons to their complete conquest, and the driving out of the Britons (which was about the latter time of Cadwallader) were two hundred and forty years. In sum, from Christ to Lucius were one hundred and eighty years. The continuance of the gospel from Lucius to the entering of the Saxons, was two hundred and sixty-nine years. The decay of the same to the entering of Augustine was one hundred and forty-seven years, which being added together make from Lucius to Augustine four hundred and sixteen years; from Christ to Augustine they make five hundred and ninety-six years. In this year then, five hundred and ninety-six, Augustine, being sent from Gregory, came into England; the occasion whereupon Gregory sent him hither was this.

<sup>F1775</sup>

In the days of Pelagius bishop of Rome, Gregory, chancing to see certain children in the market-place of Rome (brought thither to be sold, out of England), being fair and beautiful of visage, demanded out of what country they were? And, understanding they were heathenish, out of England, he lamented the case of the land, being so beautiful and angelical, so to be subject under the prince of darkness. And asking, moreover, out of what province they were? it was answered, "Out of Deira, a part of Northsaxons;" whereof, as it is to be thought, that which we now call Durham taketh its name. Then he, alluding to the name of Deira; "These people," saith he, "are to be delivered de Dei ira," which is, "from God's wrath." Moreover, understanding the king's name of that province to be Alle (above mentioned), alluding likewise to his name, "There," saith he, "ought Alleluja to be sung to the living God." Whereupon he, being moved, and desirous to go and help the conversion of that country, was not permitted of Pelagius and the Romans for that time to accomplish his desire. <sup>F1776</sup> But afterward, being bishop himself next after Pelagus, he sent thither the foresaid Augustine with other preachers near about to the number of forty. But by the way, (how it happened I cannot say,) as Augustine with his company were passing in their journey, such a sudden fear entered into their hearts, that, as Antoninus saith, they returned all. Others write, that Augustine was sent back to Gregory again, to release them of that voyage so dangerous and uncertain, amongst such a barbarous people, whose language they never knew, nor were able to resist their rudeness. Then Gregory, with pithy persuasions confirming and comforting him, sent him again with letters to the bishop of Aries, willing him to help and aid the said Augustine and his company, in all whatsoever his need required, <sup>f1777</sup> Also other letters he directed to the foresaid Augustine and to his fellows, exhorting them to go forward boldly to the Lord's work, as by the tenor of the said epistle here following may appear.

### **THE EPISTLE OF GREGORY TO THEM WHICH WENT TO PREACH IN ENGLAND. <sup>F1778</sup>**

Gregory, the servant of God's servants, <sup>f1779</sup> to servants of the Lord. Forsomuch as it is better not to take good things in hand, than, after they be begun, to think to revolt back from the same again, therefore now you must needs go forward, dear children, in

that good business, which through the help of God you have well begun. Neither let the labor of your journey, nor the slanderous tongues of men appal you, but that with all instance and fervency ye proceed and accomplish the thing which the Lord hath ordained you to take in hand; knowing that your great travail shall be recompensed with the greater reward of eternal glory hereafter to come. Therefore, as we send here Augustine your chief back to you again, whom also we have ordained to be your abbot, so do you humbly obey him in all things, knowing that it shall be profitable for your souls, whatsoever at his admonition ye shall do. Almighty God with his grace defend you, and grant me to see in the eternal country the fruit of your labor; that, although I cannot labor as I would with you, yet I may be found partaker of your retribution, for that my will is good to labor in the same fellowship together with you. God keep you safe, most dear and well-beloved children!

Dated the tenth before the Calends of August, in the fourteenth year of the reign of our pious and most august lord, Maurice Tiberius; the thirteenth year after his consulship. The fourteenth indiction. <sup>F1780</sup>

Thus they, emboldened and comforted through the good words of Gregory, sped forth their journey till they came at length to the isle of Thanet, lying upon the east side of Kent. Near to the which landing place was then the manory or palace of the king, not far from Sandwich (eastward from Canterbury), which the inhabitants of the isle then called Risborough, whereof some part of the ruinous walls is yet to be seen. The king then reigning in Kent, was Ethelbert, as above appeareth, the fifth king of that province, who, at that time, had married to wife a Frenchwoman, being christened, named Bertha; <sup>f1781</sup> whom he had received of her parents upon this condition: that he should permit her, with her bishop committed unto her, called Luidhard, to enjoy the freedom of her faith and religion; by the means whereof he was more flexible, and sooner induced to embrace the preaching and doctrine of Christ. Thus Augustine being arrived, sent forth certain messengers and interpreters to the king, signifying that such a one was come from Rome, bringing with him glad tidings to him and all his people of life and salvation, eternally to reign in heaven, with the only true and living God for ever, if Ethelbert would so

willingly hearken to the same, as he was gladly come to preach and teach it unto him.

The king, who had heard of this religion before by means of his wife, within a few days after cometh to the place where Augustine was, to speak with him; but that should be without the house, after the manner of his law. Augustine against his coming, as stories affirm, erected up a banner of the crucifix (such was then the gossness of that time), and preached to him the word of God. The king answering again, saith in effect as followeth: “Your words and your promises be very fair: nevertheless, because they are to me new, and of uncertain import, I cannot soon start away from my country law, wherewith I have been so long inured, and assent to you. Albeit, yet notwithstanding, for that ye are come (as ye say) so far for my sake, ye shall not be molested by me, but shall be right well entreated, having all things to you ministered necessary for your supportation. Besides this, neither do we debar you, but grant you free leave to preach to our people and subjects, to convert whom ye may to the faith of your religion.” When they had received this comfort of the Icing, they went with procession to the city of Dorobernia, or Canterbury, singing Allelujah with this litany; which then by Gregory had been used at Rome, in the time of the great plague reigning then at Rome, mentioned in old stories. The words of the litany were these: “We beseech thee, O Lord, in all thy mercy, that thy fury and anger may cease from this city and from thy holy house, for we have sinned; Allehjah!” <sup>f1782</sup>

Thus they, entering into the city of Canterbury, the head city of all that dominion at that time (where the king had given them a mansion for their abode), there they continued, preaching and baptizing such as they had converted, in the east side of the city in the old church of St. Martin (where the queen was wont to resort), unto the time that the king was converted himself to Christ. At length, when the king had well considered the honest conversation of their life, and moved with the miracles wrought through God’s hand by them, he heard them more gladly; and lastly, by their wholesome exhortations and example of godly life, he was by them converted and christened in the year above specified, 596, and the thirty-sixth year of his reign. After the king was thus converted, innumerable others came in and were adjoined to the church of Christ; whom the king did specially embrace, but compelled none: for so he had learned, that the

faith and service of Christ ought to be voluntary, and not coerced. Then he gave to Augustine a place for the Bishop's see at Christ's Church in Canterbury, and builded the abbey of St. Peter and St. Paul in the east side of the said city, where, after, Augustine and all the kings of Kent were buried; and that place is now called St. Augustine. <sup>F1783</sup>

In this while Augustine sailed into France, unto the bishop of Arles, called Etherius, <sup>f1784</sup> by him to be consecrated archbishop by the commandment of Gregory; and was so. Also the said Augustine sent to Rome Laurence, one of his company, to declare to Gregory how they had sped, and what they had done in England; sending withal to have the counsel and advice of Gregory concerning nine or ten questions, whereof some are partly touched before.

The tenor of his questions or interrogations, with the answers of Gregory to the same, here follow in English briefly translated.

**THE QUESTIONS OF AUGUSTINE, ARCHBISHOP OF  
CANTERBURY, SENT TO GREGORY, WITH THE ANSWERS  
AGAIN OF GREGORY TO THE SAME.** <sup>F1785</sup>

*First Interrogation:*—’My first question, reverend father, is concerning bishops, how they ought to behave themselves toward their clerks; and of such oblations as the faithful offer upon the altar, what portions or dividends ought to be made thereof?’

*Answer:* —’How a bishop ought to behave himself in the church, the holy Scripture testifieth (which I doubt not but you know right well), especially in the epistle of St. Paul to Timothy, wherein he laboureth to inform the said Timothy how to behave himself in the house of the Lord. The manner is of the see apostolic to warn and charge all such as be ordained bishops, of all their stipend, or that which is given, to make four portions: one for the bishop, for hospitality and receiving comers-in; another for the clergy; the third for the poor; the fourth for the repairing of churches. But, because your brotherhood, instructed with rules of monastical discipline, cannot live separated from your clerks about you, therefore in the English church (which now through the providence of God is brought to the faith of Christ) you must observe that institution concerning your conversation, which was

among the first fathers in the beginning of the primitive church; among whom there was not one which counted anything to be his own property of all that he did possess, but all was common among them.”

**Second Interrogation** <sup>f1786</sup> :—”I desire to know and to be instructed, whether clerks that cannot contain, may marry: and if they do marry, whether then they ought to return to the secular state again or no?”

**Answer**: —”If there be any clerks out of holy orders, which cannot contain, let them have their wives, and take their stipends or wages abroad. For we read it so written of the foresaid fathers, that they divided to every person, according as their need was. <sup>f1787</sup> Therefore, as concerning the stipend of such, it must be provided and thought upon. And they must be also holden under ecclesiastical discipline, to live a godly conversation, to employ themselves in singing psalms, and to refrain their tongue, heart, and body (by the grace of God) from all things unseemly and unlawful. As for those which live in common, to describe what partitions to make, what hospitality to keep, or what works of mercy to exhibit, to such I have nothing to say, but to give of that which aboundeth (as our Master teacheth) in pious and religious works: of that,” saith he, “which aboundeth or is overplus, give alms, and behold all things be clean unto you.” (Luke 11.)

**Third Interrogation**: —”Seeing there is but one faith, how happeneth it then the ceremonies and customs of churches to be so diverse? as in the church of Rome there is one custom and manner of mass, and the French church hath another.”

**Answer**: —”The custom of the church of Rome, what it is, you know, wherein you remember that you have been brought up from your youth; but rather it pleaseth it me better, whether it be in the church of Rome, or the French church, where ye find anything that seemeth better to the service and pleasing of God, that ye choose the same, and so infer and bring into the English church (which is yet new in the faith) the best and pickedst things chosen out of many churches; for things are not to be beloved for the place’ sake, but the place is to be beloved for the things that be good therein: wherefore such things as be

good, godly, and religious, those choose out of all churches, and introduce to your people, that they may take root in the minds of Englishmen.”

***Fourth Interrogation:*** —”I pray you, what punishment adjudge you for him that shall steal or pilfer anything out of the church?”

***Answer:*** —”This your brotherhood may soon discern by the person of a thief, how it ought to be corrected. For some there be, that having sufficient to live upon, yet do steal: others there be which steal of mere necessity. Wherefore, considering the quality and difference of the crime, necessary it is, that some be corrected by loss of goods, some by stripes, some others more sharply, and some more easily. Yea, and when sharper correction is to be executed, yet that must be done with charity, and with no fury; for in punishing offenders, this is the cause and end wherefore they are punished, because they should be saved, and not perish in hell-fire. And so ought discipline to proceed in correcting the faithful, as do good fathers in punishing their children, whom they both chasten for their evil, and yet being chastened, they look to have them their heirs, and think to leave them all they have, notwithstanding they correct them sometimes in anger. Therefore this charity must be kept in mind; and in the correction there is a measure to be had, so that the mind never do anything without the rule of reason. You may add, moreover, that those things ought to be restored again, which be stolen out of churches. But God forbid that the church should ever require again with increase, that which is lost in outward things, and to seek her gain out of such vanities.”

***Fifth Interrogation:*** —”Item, whether two brethren may marry two sisters, being far off from any part of kindred?”

***Answer:*** —”This in no part of Scripture is forbidden, but it may well and lawfully be done.”

***Sixth Interrogation:*** —”Item, to what degree of kindred may the matrimony of the faithful extend with their kindred; or whether is it lawful to marry with the stepmother and other kinsfolks?”

**Answer:** —"A certain terrene law amongst the old Romans doth permit, that either brother or sister, or the son and daughter of two brethren, may marry together. But by experience we learn, that the issue of such marriage doth never thrive, nor come forward. Also the holy law of God forbiddeth to uncover the turpitude of thy blood or kindred. Wherefore of necessity it must be the third or fourth degree in which the faithful may lawfully marry; for in the second (being an unlawful) they must needs refrain. To be coupled with the stepmother is utterly abominable, for it is written in the law, 'Thou shalt not uncover the turpitude of thy father.' Forsomuch then as it is so written in the law, 'And they shall be two in one flesh;' the son then that presumeth to uncover the turpitude of his stepmother, which is one flesh with his father, what doth he then but uncover the turpitude of his own father? Likewise it was forbidden and unlawful to marry with thy kinswoman, which by her first marriage was made one flesh with thy brother; <sup>f1788</sup> for the which cause John the Baptist also lost his head, and was crowned a martyr: who, though he died not for the confession of Christ, yet, forsomuch as Christ saith 'I am the truth,' therefore, in that John Baptist was slain for the truth, it may be said his blood was shed for Christ."

**Seventh Interrogation:** —"Item, whether such as so be coupled together in filthy and unlawful matrimony ought to be separated, and denied the partaking of the holy communion?"

**Answer:** —"Because there be many of the nation of Englishmen, which being yet in their infidelity, were so joined and coupled in such execrable marriage; the same coming now to faith, are to be admonished hereafter to abstain from the like, and be made to know the same to be a grievous sin: and let them dread the dreadful judgment of God, lest for their carnal delectation they incur the torments of eternal punishment. And yet, notwithstanding, they are not to be secluded there-for from the participation of Christ's body and blood; lest we should seem to revenge those things in them which they, before their baptism, through ignorance did commit. For in his time the holy church doth correct some faults more fervently, some faults she suffereth again through mansuetude and meekness; some wittingly and willingly she doth wink at and dissemble; that many times the evil, which she

doth detest, through bearing and dissembling she may stop and bridle. All they therefore which are come to the faith, must be admonished that they commit no such offense. Which thing if they do, they are to be deprived of the communion of the Lord's body and blood. For like as in them that fell through ignorance, their default in this case is tolerable; so in them again it is strenuously to be prosecuted, who knowing they do naught, yet fear not to commit."

***Eighth Interrogation:*** —"Item, in this I desire to be satisfied, after what manner I should deal or do with the bishops of France and of Britain?"

***Answer:***—"As touching the bishops in France, I give you no authority of power over them. For the bishop of Arles hath of old time received the pall of our predecessors, whom now we ought not to deprive, of his authority. Therefore, when your brotherhood shall go unto the province of France, whatsoever ye shall have there to do with the bishop of Aries, so do, that he lose nothing of that which he hath found and obtained of the ancient ordinance of our fore elders. <sup>f1789</sup> But as concerning the bishops of Britain, we commit them all to your brotherhood; that the ignorant may be taught, the infirm by persuasion may be confirmed, the wilful by authority may be corrected.

***Ninth Interrogation:*** —"Whether a woman being great with child, ought to be baptized? Or, after she hath had children, after how long time she ought to enter into the church? Or else, that which she hath brought forth, lest it should be prevented with death, after how many days it ought to receive baptism? Or after how long time after her child-birth is it lawful for her husband to resort to her? Or else, if she be in her monthly courses after the disease of women, whether then she may enter into the church, and receive the sacrament of the holy communion? Or else her husband, after the lying with his wife, whether is it lawful for him to enter the church, and to draw unto the mystery of the holy communion, before he be washed with water?— All which things must be declared and opened to the rude multitude of Englishmen."

**Answer:** <sup>f1790</sup> — The childing or bearing woman, why may she not be baptized, seeing that the fruitfulness of the flesh is no fault before the eyes of Almighty God? For our first parents in Paradise, after they had transgressed, lost their immortality which they had received before, by the just judgment of God. Then, because Almighty God would not mankind utterly to perish because of his fall (although he lost now his immortality for his trespass), of his benign pity, he left to him, notwithstanding, the fruit and generation of issue. Wherefore the issue and generation of man's nature, which is conserved by the gift of Almighty God, how can it be debarred from the grace of holy baptism?  
<sup>f1791</sup>

“As concerning the churching of women, after they have travailed, whereas ye demand after how many days they ought to go to the church, this you have learned in the old law, that for a man-child thirty-three days, after a woman-child sixty and six days be appointed her to keep in: albeit this you must take to be understood in a mystery. For if she should, the very hour of her travail, enter into the church to give thanks, she committeth therein no sin: for why? the lust and pleasure of the flesh, and not the travail and pain of the flesh, is the sin. In the conjunction of the flesh is pleasure, but in the travail and bringing forth of the child is pain and groaning: as unto the mother of all it is said, ‘In sorrow thou shalt travail.’ Therefore, if we forbid the woman after her labor to enter into the church, then what do we else but make a crime of the very punishment? <sup>f1792</sup> For a woman after her labor to be baptized (if present necessity of death doth so require), yea, in the selfsame hour that she hath brought forth; or that which she hath brought forth, in the same hour when it is born, to be baptized—we do not forbid.

“Moreover, for the man to company with his wife, that he must not do before the child that is born be weaned. But now there is a lewd and naughty custom risen in the condition of married folks, that mothers do contemn to nurse their own children which they have borne, but set them to other women out to nurse, which seemeth only to come of the cause of incontineny; for because

they will not contain themselves, therefore they put from them their children to nurse, etc.

“As concerning the woman in her menstruous course, whether she ought to enter the church? To this I answer, she ought not to be forbid. For the superfluity of nature in her ought not to be imputed for any fault, neither is it just that she should be deprived of her access to the church, for that which she suffered against her will. And if the woman did well, presuming in touching the Lord’s coat in the time of her bloody issue; why then may not that be granted unto all women infirmed by the fault of nature, which is commended in one person done in her infirmity? Therefore to receive the mystery of the holy communion, it is not forbidden them. Albeit if she dare not so far presume in her great infirmity, she is to be praised; but if she do receive, she is not to be judged: for it is a point of a good mind in some manner to acknowledge faults there, where is no fault, because many times that is done without fault, which cometh of fault—as when we be hungry, we eat without fault, notwithstanding it cometh by the fault of our first father to us, that we are hungry, etc.

“Whereas ye ask, if a man after the company with his wife may resort to the church, or to the holy communion, before he be purged with water? the law given to the old people, commanded that a man (after the company with his wife) both should be purified with water, and also should tarry the sunset before he came to the congregation. Which seemeth to be understood spiritually: for then most true it is, that the man companieth with the woman, when his mind through delectation is led to unlawful concupiscence in his imagination. At that time, before the said fire of concupiscence shall be removed, let the person think himself unworthy the entrance to the congregation, through the viciousness of his filthy will. But of this matter sundry nations have every one their sundry customs; some one way, and some another. The ancient manner of the Romans from our forefathers, hath been, that in such case, first they purge themselves with water, then, for a little, they abstain reverently, and so resort to the church,” etc.

After many other words debated of this matter, thus he inferreth:

“But if any person not for voluptuousness of the flesh, but for procreation of children, do company with his wife, that man concerning either the coming to the church, or the receiving the mysteries of the Lord’s body and blood, is to be left to his own judgment; for he ought not to be forbid of us to come, who, when he lieth in the fire, will not burn,” etc.

There is another question also to these adjoined, with his answer likewise to the same, concerning pollutions in the night: but I thought these at this present to our English ears sufficient.

To return now to the story again: Gregory, after he had sent these resolutions to the questions of Augustine, sendeth moreover to the church of England more coadjutors and helpers; as Mellitus, Justus, Pauline, and Rufinian, with books and such other implements as he thought necessary for the English church. He sendeth, moreover, to the aforesaid Augustine a pall,<sup>f1793</sup> with letters, wherein he setteth an order between the two metropolitan sees, the one to be at London, the other to be at York. Notwithstanding, he granteth to the said Augustine during his life, to be the only chief archbishop of all the land; and, after his time, then to return to the two foresaid sees of London and York, as is in the same letter contained, the tenor whereof here followeth in his own words, as ensueth.

### **THE COPY OF THE EPISTLE OF GREGORY, SENT TO AUGUSTINE INTO ENGLAND.** <sup>F1794</sup>

To the reverend and virtuous brother Augustine, his fellow bishop, Gregory the servant of the servants of God. Although it be most certain, that unspeakable rewards of the Eternal King be laid up for all such as labor in the word of the Almighty God; yet it shall be requisite for us to reward the same also with our benefits, to the end they may be more encouraged to go forward in the study of their spiritual work. And forsomuch now, as the new church of Englishmen is brought to the grace of Almighty God, through his mighty help and your travail, therefore we have granted to you the use of the pall, only to be used at the solemnity of your mass: so that it shall be lawful for you to ordain twelve bishops, who shall

be subject to your jurisdiction. So that hereafter always the bishop of the city of London shall be consecrated by his own proper synod; and receive the pall of honor from this holy and apostolic see, wherein I here (by the permission of God) do serve. And as touching the city of York, we would have you send also a bishop thither, whom you may think meet to ordain; yet so, that, if that city with other places bordering thereby shall receive the word of God, he shall have power likewise to ordain twelve bishops, and have the honor of a metropolitan; to whom also, if God spare my life, I intend (by the favor of God) to send a pall: this provided, that, notwithstanding, he shall be subject to your brotherly authority. But after your' decease, the same metropolitan shall preside so over the bishops whom he ordereth, that he be in no wise subject to the metropolitan of London after you. And hereafter, betwixt these two metropolitans of London and York, let there be had such distinction of honor, that he shall have the precedence, which shall in time first be ordained. But with common counsel, and affection of heart, let them go both together, disposing with one accord such things as be to be done for the zeal of Christ; let them forethink and deliberate together prudently; and what they deliberate wisely, let them accomplish concordly, not jarring, nor swerving one from the other. But as for your part, you shall be endued with authority; not only over those bishops that you constitute, and over the others constituted by the bishop of York; but also you shall have all other priests of whole Britain subject unto you, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ: to the end that through your preaching and holiness of life, they may learn both to believe rightly, and to live purely; and so, in directing their life both by the rule of true faith and virtuous manners, they may attain, when God shall call them, the fruition and kingdom of Heaven. God preserve you in health, most reverend brother.

The thirteenth before the kalends of July, in the nineteenth year of the reign of our most pious lord and emperor Maurice, the eighteenth year after the consulship of our said lord. The fourth indiction.

Besides this, the said Gregory sendeth also another letter to Mellitus concerning his judgment, what was to be done with the idolatrous temples and fanes of the Englishmen newly converted; which fanes he thinketh not best to pluck down, but to convert the use thereof, and so let them stand: and likewise of their sacrifices, and killing of oxen, how the same ought to be ordered, and how to be altered; disputing by the occasions thereof, of the sacrifices of the old Egyptians, permitted of God unto the Israelites, the end and use thereof being altered, etc. <sup>f1795</sup>

He sendeth also another letter to the aforesaid Augustine, wherein he warneth him not to be proud or puffed up for the miracles wrought of God by him, in converting the people of England; but rather to fear and tremble, lest so much as he were puffed up by the outward work of miracles, so much he should fall inwardly through the vain glory of his heart: and therefore wisely exhorteth him to repress the swelling glory of his heart, with the remembrance of his sins rather against God, whereby he rather hath cause to lament than to rejoice for the others. “Not all the elect of God,” saith he, “work miracles; and yet have they all their names written in the book of life.” And therefore he should not count so much of those miracles done, but rather rejoice with the disciples of Christ, and labor to have his name written in the book of life, wherein all the elect of God be contained, neither is there any end of that rejoicing. And whatsoever miracles it hath pleased God by him to have been done, he should remember they were not done for him, but for their conversion, whose salvation God sought thereby, etc. <sup>f1796</sup>

Item, he directed another epistle to king Ethelbert, as is expressed at large in the chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, <sup>f1797</sup> in the which epistle, first he praiseth God, then commendeth the goodness of the king, by whom it pleased God so to work such goodness to the people. Secondly, he exhorteth him to persist and continue in the godly profession of Christ’s faith, and to be fervent and zealous in the same; in converting the multitude; in destroying the temples and works of idolatry; in ruling and governing the people in all holiness and godly conversation, after the godly example of the emperor Constantine the Great. Lastly, comforting him with the promises of life and reward to come, with the Lord that reigneth and liveth for ever; premonishing him, besides, of the terrors and distresses that shall happen, though not in his days, yet before the terrible day of

God's judgment. Wherefore he willeth him always to be solicitous for his soul, and suspectful of the hour of his death, and watchful of the judgment, that he may be always prepared for the same, when that judgment shall come. In the end, he desireth him to accept such presents and gifts which he thought good to send unto him from Rome, etc.

Augustine thus receiving his pall from Gregory, as is above said, and now of a monk being made an archbishop (after he had baptized a great part of Kent), afterward made two archbishops or metropolitans by the commandment of Gregory, as witnesseth Polychronicon, one at London, another at York. <sup>f1798</sup>

Mellitus, of whom mention is made before, was sent specially to the East Saxons in the province of Essex, where, afterwards, he was made bishop of London, under Sebert, king of Essex; which Sebert, together with his uncle Ethelbert, first builded the church and minster of St. Paul, London, and appointed it to Mellitus for the bishop's see. Augustine (associate with this Mellitus and Justus) through the help of Ethelbert assembled and gathered together the bishops and doctors of Britain in a place, which, taking the name of the said Augustine, was called Augustine's Oak. In this assembly he charged the said bishops, that they should preach with him the word of God to the Englishmen, and also that they should among themselves reform certain rites and usages in their church; specially for keeping of their Easter-tide, baptizing after the manner of Rome, and such other like. To this the Scots and Britons would not agree, refusing to leave the custom which they so long time had continued, without the assent of them all which used the same. Here the stories both of Beda, <sup>f1799</sup> Cestrensis in Polychronicon, Henry of Huntingdon, Jornalensis, <sup>f1800</sup> Fabian, and others, write of a certain miracle wrought upon a blind Englishman; whom when the Britons could not help, Augustine, kneeling down and praying, restored the blind man to sight before them all, for a confirmation (as these authors say) of his opinion in keeping of Easter. But concerning the credit of this miracle, that I leave to the authors of whom I had it.

Then Augustine gathered another synod, to the which came seven bishops of Britain, with the wisest men of that famous abbey of Bangor. But first they took counsel of a certain wise and holy man amongst them what to

do; and whether they should be obedient to Augustine or not.<sup>f1801</sup> And he said, “If he be the servant of God, agree unto him.” “But how shall we know that?” said they. To whom he answered again, “If he be meek and humble of heart, by that know that he is the servant of God.” To this they said again, “And how shall we know him to be humble and meek of heart?” “By this.” quoth he, “seeing you are the greater number, if he at your coming into your synod rise up, and courteously receive you, perceive him to be an humble and a meek man; but if he shall contemn and despise you (being as ye are the greater part), despise you him again.” Thus the British bishops entering into the council, Augustine, after the Romish manner, keeping his chair, would not remove. Whereat they being not a little offended, after some heat of words, in disdain and great displeasure, departed thence. To whom then Augustine spake, and said, “That if they would not take peace with their brethren, they should receive war with their enemies; and if they disdained to preach with them the way of life to the English nation, they should suffer by their hands the revenge of death.” Which not long after so came to pass by the means of Ethelfrid, king of Northumberland, who being yet a pagan, and stirred with fierce fury against the Britons, came with a great army against the city of Chester,<sup>f1802</sup> where Brocmaile, the consul of that city, a friend and helper of the Britons’ side, was ready with his force to receive him. There was at the same time at Bangor in Wales an exceeding great monastery, wherein was such a number of monks, as Geoffrey with other authors do testify,<sup>f1803</sup> that if the whole company were divided into seven parts, in every of the seven parts were contained not so few as three hundred monks; which all did live by the sweat of their brows, and labor of their own hands, having one for their ruler, named Dino.<sup>f1804</sup> Out of this monastery came the monks to Chester, to pray for the good success of Brocmaile, fighting for them against the Saxons. Three days they continued in fasting and prayer. When Ethelfrid, the foresaid king, seeing them so attentive to their prayers, demanded the cause of their coming thither in such a company, and when he perceived it was to pray for their consul, “Then,” saith he, “although they bear no weapon, yet they fight against us, and with their prayers and preachings they persecute us.” Whereupon, after that Brocmaile, being overcome, did flee away, the king commanded his men to turn their weapons against the silly unarmed monks, of whom he slew the same time, or rather martyred, **twelve hundred**,<sup>a116</sup> only fifty persons<sup>f1805</sup> of that

number did fly and escape away with Brocmaile; the rest were all slain. The authors that write of: this lamentable murder, declare and say how the fore-speaking of Augustine was here verified upon the Britons; who, because they would not join peace with their friends, he said, should be destroyed of their enemies. Of both these parties the reader may judge what he pleaseth; I cannot see but both together were to be blamed. And as I cannot but accuse the one, so I cannot defend the other. First, Augustine in this matter can in no wise be excused; who, being a monk before, and therefore a scholar and professor of humility, showed so little humility in this assembly, to seven bishops and an archbishop, coming at his commandment to the council, that he thought scorn once to stir at their coming in. Much less would his pharisaical solemnity have girded himself, and washed his brethren's feet after their travel, as Christ, our great Master, did to his disciples; seeing his lordship was so high, or rather so heavy, or rather so proud, that he could not find in his heart to give them a little moving of his body, to declare a brotherly and an humble heart. Again, the Britons were as much or more to blame, who so much neglected their spiritual duty, in revenging their temporal injury, that they denied to join their helping labor to turn the idolatrous Saxons to the way of life and salvation, in which respect all private cases ought to give place, and to be forgotten. For the which cause, although lamentable to us, yet no great marvel in them, if the stroke of God's punishment did light upon them, according to the words of Augustine, as is before declared. But especially the cruel king in this fact was most of all to blame, so furiously to fly upon them, which had neither weapon to resist him, nor yet any will to harm him. And so likewise the same or like happened to himself afterward. For so was he also slain in the field by christian Edwin, who succeeded him, as he had slain the Christians before, which was about the year of our Lord 610. <sup>f1806</sup> But to return to Augustine again, who by report of authors was departed before this cruelty was done; after he had baptized and christened ten thousand Saxons or Angles in the west river, that is called Swale, beside York, <sup>f1807</sup> on a Christmas-day, perceiving his end to draw near, he ordained a successor, named Laurence, to rule after him the archbishop's **see of Canterbury**. <sup>a117</sup> Where note by the way, christian reader, that whereas Augustine baptized then in rivers, it followeth there was then no use of fonts. <sup>f1808</sup> Again, if that be true which Fabian saith, that he baptized ten thousand in one day, the rite then of baptizing at Rome was

not so ceremonial, neither had so many trinkets at that time, as it hath had since, or else it could not be that he could baptize so many in one day.

In the mean season, about this time departed Gregory, bishop of Rome; of whom it is said, that of the number of all the ‘first bishops before him in the primitive time, he was the basest; of all of them that came after him, he was the best. About which time also died in Wales, David, archbishop first of Caerleon, who then translated the see from thence to Menevia, which therefore is called St. David’s in Wales. <sup>f1809</sup> Not long after this also deceased the aforesaid Augustine in England, after he had sat there fifteen or sixteen years; by the which count we may note it not to be true, what Henry of Huntingdon and others do witness, that Augustine was dead before that battle of Ethelfrid against the monks of Bangor. For if that be true which Polychronicon testifieth of this murder, to be done about the year of our Lord 609, and the coming of Augustine first into the realm to be in the year 596, then Augustine enduring sixteen years, could not be dead at this battle. Moreover, Geoffrey of Monmouth <sup>f1810</sup> declareth concerning the same battle, that Ethelbert, the king of Kent, being (as is said) converted by Augustine to Christ’s faith, after he saw the Britons to disdain and deny their subjection unto Augustine, neither would assist him with preaching to the English nation—therefore stirred up the foresaid Ethelfrid to war against the Britons. But that seemeth rather suspicious than true, that he being a christian king, either could so much prevail with a pagan idolater, or else would attempt so far to commit such a cruel deed; but of uncertain things I have nothing certainly to say, much less to judge.

About this present time above prefixed, which is the year 610, I read in the story of Ranulphus Cestrensis (the writer of Polychronicon) <sup>f1811</sup> of John the patriarch of Alexandria, whom for his rare example of hospitality and bountifulness to the poor, I thought no less worthy to have place amongst good men, than I see the same now to be followed of few. This John (being before belike a hard and sparing man) as he was at his prayer, upon a time, it is said, there appeared to him a comely virgin, having on her head a garland of olive leaves, who named herself Mercy, saying to him, and praising, that if he would take her to wife, he should prosper well. This, whether it were true or not, or else invented for a morality, I would wish this flourishing damsel to be married to more than to this John, <sup>f1812</sup> that she should not live so long a virgin as now she doth, because no man will

marry her. But to return to this patriarch, who after that day (as the story recordeth) was so merciful and so beneficial, especially to the poor and needy, that he counted them as his masters, and himself as a servant and steward unto them: this patriarch was wont commonly twice a week to sit at his door all the day long, to take up matters, and to set unity where was any variance. One day it happened, as he was sitting all the day before his gate, and saw no man come, he lamented that all that day he had done no good: to whom his deacon standing by answered again, that he had more cause to rejoice, seeing he had brought the city in that order and in such peace, that there needed no reconciliation amongst them. Another time, as the said John the patriarch was at service, and reading the gospel in the church, the people (as their used manner is) went out of the church to talk and jangle: he, perceiving that, went out likewise, and sat amongst them; whereat they marvelled to see him do so. “My children,” said he, “where the flock is, there ought the shepherd to be: wherefore either come you in, that I may also come in with you; or else, if you tarry out, I will likewise tarry out together with you,” etc.

As touching the acts and deeds of Gregory above mentioned, how he withstood the ambitious pride of John, patriarch of Constantinople, who would be the universal priest, and only chief bishop of all others, declaring him to be no less than the forerunner of Antichrist, that would take that name upon him; and how and with what reasons he answered again the letters of the emperor Maurice in that behalf, sufficient relation is made thereof in the first entry and beginning of this history.<sup>f1813</sup> This Gregory, among many other things induced into the church (the specialties whereof hereafter shall follow, Christ willing, more at large), first began and brought in this title among the Roman bishops, to be called, “*Servus servorum Dei*,” putting them in remembrance thereby, both of their humbleness, and also of their duty in the church of Christ. Moreover, as concerning his act for the single life of priests, first began and then broken again; also concerning the order of Gregory’s Mass-book to be received in all churches, hereof whoso listeth to read more, shall find the same in other places hereafter; namely, when we come to the time of pope Adrian the first.

After the death of Gregory above-mentioned, first came Sabinian, who, as he was a malicious detractor of Gregory<sup>f1814</sup> and of his works, so he

continued not long, scarce the space of two years. After whom succeeded next Boniface III., who, albeit he reigned but one year, yet in that one year did more hurt than Gregory with so much labor, and in so many years, could do good before. For that which Gregory kept out, he brought in, obtaining of Phocas the wicked emperor, for him and his successors after him, that the see of Rome, above all other churches, should have the pre-eminence; and that the bishop of Rome should be the universal head through all churches of Christ in Christendom: alleging for him this frivolous reason, that St. Peter had and left to his successors in Rome, the keys of binding and loosing. And thus Rome first began to take a head above all other churches, by the means of Boniface III., who, as he lacked no boldness nor ambition to seek it, so neither lacked he an emperor fit and meet to give such a gift. This emperor's name was Phocas, a man of such wickedness and ambition (most like to his own bishop Boniface) that, to aspire to the empire, he murdered his own master, the emperor Maurice, and his children. Thus Phocas coming up to be emperor, after his detestable villany done, thinking to establish his empire with friendship and favor of his people, and especially with the bishop of Rome, quickly condescended to all his petitions, and so granted him (as it is said) to be what he would, rather universal and head bishop over all christian churches. But as blood commonly requireth blood again, so it came to pass on the said Phocas; for, as he had cruelly slain his lord and emperor Maurice before, so he, in like manner, of Heraclius (the emperor who succeeded him) had his hands and feet cut off, and so was cast into the sea. And thus wicked Phocas, which gave the first supremacy to Rome, lost his own. But Rome would not so soon lose its supremacy once given, as the giver lost his life: for ever since, from that day it hath holden, defended, and maintained the same still, and yet doth to this present day, by all force and policy possible. And thus much concerning Boniface, whom, by the words of Gregory, we may well call "the runner before antichrist;" for, as Gregory brought in their style, "Servus servorum Dei;" this Boniface brought in their heads first, "Volumus ac mandamus, statuimus ac praecipimus:" that is, "We will and command, we enjoin and charge you," etc.

Mention was made a little before, of Ethelbert, king of Kent, and also of Ethelfrid, king of North-Saxony or Northumbria. This Ethelbert, having

under his subjection all the other Saxon kings unto the Humber, after he had first received himself, and caused to be received of others, the christian faith by the preaching of Augustine, confirmed afterward in the same faith, amongst other costly deeds, with the help of Sebert king of Essex, his nephew, then reigning under him, began the foundation of Paul's church within the city of London, and ordained it for the bishop's see of London. <sup>f1815</sup> For the archbishop's see, which before-time had been at London, was by Augustine and this Ethelbert, at the prayer of the citizens of Canterbury, translated to the said city. <sup>f1816</sup> Wherefore such authors as say that Paul's was builded by Sebert say not amiss: which Sebert was the king of Essex, in which province standeth the city of London. This Ethelbert also founded the church of St. Andrew in the city of Dorubrevi in Kent, now called Rochester of one Rof, distant from Canterbury four and twenty miles. Of this city Justus was bishop, ordained before by Augustine. <sup>f1817</sup> Moreover, the forenamed Ethelbert stirred up a dweller or citizen of London, to make a chapel or church of St. Peter in the west end of London (then called Thorny, now the town of Westminster), which church or chapel was after by Edward the Confessor <sup>f1818</sup> enlarged or new builded: lastly, of Henry III. it was newly again re — EDified, and made, as it is now, a large monastery. After these christian and worthy acts, this Ethelbert, when he had reigned the course of fifty and six years, changed this mortal life about the year of our Lord, 616; whom some stories say to be slain in a fight between him and Ethelfrid king of North-Saxons.

In the mean time the foresaid Ethelfrid, king of Northumberland, after the cruel murder of the monks of Bangor, escaped not long unpaid his hire: for after he had reigned four and twenty years he was slain in the field by Edwin, who succeeded in Northumberland after him.

This Edwin, being the son, not of Ethelfrid (as Geoffrey of Monmouth saith) but rather of Ella (as Giraldus Cambrensis <sup>f1819</sup> seemeth to witness more truly), was first a paynim or idolater; afterward by Paulinus was christened, and the first christened king in Northumberland. The occasion of which his calling or conversion, as is in sundry stories contained, was this.

Edwin being yet a pagan, married the daughter of Ethelbert, king of Kent, called Ethelburga, a christian woman, otherwise called Tate. But before this

marriage, Edwin being yet young, Ethelfrid the king, conceiving envy against him, persecuted him so sore, that he was forced to fly to Redweld, king of East-Angles, as in the table of the kings is expressed; the which Redweld, what for fear, what with bribes, being corrupted of Ethelfrid, at length privily had intended to have betrayed Edwin. But, as God's will was, Edwin, having warning thereof by a secret friend of his, was moved to fly, and to save himself; being promised also of his friend to be safely conveyed away, if he would thereto agree. To whom Edwin said, "Whither shall I fly, that have so long fled from the hands of mine enemies, through all provinces of the realm? and if I must needs be slain, I had rather he should do it, than another unworthy person." Thus he remaining by himself alone and solitary, sitting in a great study, there appeared unto him suddenly a certain stranger to him unknown, and said, "I know well the cause of thy thought and heaviness. What wouldst thou give him that should deliver thee out of this fear, and should reconcile king Redwald to thee again?" "I would give him," said Edwin, "all that I ever could make." And, he said again, "And what if he make thee a mightier king than was any of thy progenitors?" He answered again as before. "Moreover," saith he, "and what if he show thee a better kind and way of life, than ever was showed to any of thine ancestors before thee, wilt thou obey him and do after his counsel?" "Yea," said Edwin, promising most firmly with all his heart so to do. Then he, laying his hand upon his head: "When," said he, "this token happeneth unto thee, then remember this time of thy tribulation, and the promise which thou hast made, and the word which now I say unto thee." And with that he vanished out of his sight suddenly. After this so done, as Edwin was sitting alone by himself pensive and sad, his foresaid friend, which moved him before to fly, cometh to him, bidding him be of good cheer; "For the heart," said he, "of king Redwald, which had before intended thy destruction, is now altered through the counsel of the queen, and is fully bent to keep his promise with you, whatsoever shall fall thereupon." To make the story short, Redwald the king <sup>f1820</sup> (although Fabian, following Henry of Huntingdon, saith it was Edwin) with all convenient speed assembled a host, wherewith he, suddenly coming upon Ethelfrid, gave battle to him about the borders of Mercia, where Ethelfrid, king of Northumberland, with Reignher, Redwald's son, was slain in the field. By reason whereof, Edwin (his enemies now being destroyed) was quietly placed in the possession of Northumberland. All

this while yet Edwin remained in his old paganism; albeit his queen, king Ethelbert's daughter, a christian woman (as is above declared), <sup>f1821</sup> with Paulinus the bishop, ceased not to stir and persuade the king to christian faith. But he, taking counsel with his nobles and counsellors upon the matter, was hard to be won. Then the Lord, who disposeth all things after his purpose, to bring all good things to pass, sent another trouble upon him, by means thereof to call him: for by affliction God useth commonly to call them whom he will save, or by whom he will work salvation unto others. So his divine wisdom thinketh good to make them first to know themselves, before they come to know him, or to teach him to others. So it was with Paul (who was stricken down before he was lifted up); with Constantine, Edwin, and many more. How long was Joseph in prison before he bare rule! How hardly escaped this our queen now being (queen Elizabeth), by whom, notwithstanding, it hath pleased God to restore this his gospel now preached amongst us! In what conflicts and agonies inwardly in his spirit was Martin Luther, before he came to preach the justification of Christ openly! And so be all they most commonly, which come to any lively feeling or sensible working of Christ the Lord.

But to return to Edwin again. The occasion of his trouble was this.

Quiceline <sup>f1822</sup> with Kinegils <sup>f1823</sup> his brother, kings of West-Saxons (as above is mentioned in the table of the Saxon kings), conspiring the death of Edwin, now king of Northumberland, upon envy and malice sent upon an Easter day a sword-man, named Eomer, privily to slay the said Edwin.

<sup>F1824</sup> This sword-man or cut-throat came to a city beside the water of Derwent in Derbyshire, <sup>f1825</sup> there to wait his time; and lastly, found the king smally accompanied, and intended to have run the king through with a sword envenomed. But one Lilla, the king's trusty servant, disgarnished of a shield or other weapon to defend his master, started between the king and the sword, and was stricken through the body, and died; and the king was wounded with the same stroke. And after, he wounded also the third, which was a knight; and so was taken, and confessed by whom he was sent to work that treason. The other knight that was secondly wounded, died; and the king lay long after sick, ere he were healed. <sup>F1826</sup>

After this, about Whitsuntide, the king being scantly whole of his wound, assembled his host, intending to make war against the king of West-Saxons, promising to Christ to be christened, if he would give him victory over his

enemies: and in token thereof caused his daughter, named Eanfleda, born of Ethelburga, the same Easter day when he was wounded, to be baptized of Paulinus, with twelve others of his family. Thus Edwin proceeded to the battle against Quiceline, and Kinegils with his son Kenwalc, and other enemies; who in the same battle being all vanquished and put to flight, Edwin, through the power of Christ, returneth home victor. But for all this victory and other things given to him of God, as he was in wealth with the world, he forgot his promise made, and had little mind thereof, save only that he, by the preaching of Paulinus, forsook his maumetry; and for his excuse said, that he might not clearly deny his old law, which his forefathers had kept so long, and suddenly be christened without authority and good advice of his council. <sup>f1827</sup>

About the same season pope Boniface the fifth sent also to the said Edwin letters exhortatory, with sundry presents from Rome to him, and to Ethelburga the queen: but neither would that prevail. <sup>f1828</sup> Then Paulinus seeing the king so hard to be converted, poured out his prayers unto God for his conversion; who the same time had revealed to him, by the Holy Ghost, the oracle above mentioned, which was showed to the king when he was with Redwald, king of the East-Angles. Whereupon Paulinus, coming after to the king on a certain day, and laying his hand upon the king's head, asked him if he knew that token. The king hearing this, and remembering well the token, was ready to fall down at his feet. But Paulinus, not suffering that, did lift him up again, saying unto him, "Behold, O king, you have vanquished your enemies, you have obtained your kingdom; now perform the third thing, which you promised, that is, to receive the faith of Christ, and to be obedient to him." <sup>f1829</sup> Whereupon the king, conferring with his council and his nobles, was baptized of Paulinus at York, <sup>f1830</sup> with many of his other subjects with him; insomuch that Coifi, <sup>f1831</sup> the chief of the prelates of his old maumetry, armed himself with his idolatrous bishops, and bestrode a stallion, which before, by their old law, they might not do, nor ride but only a mare: and so destroyed he all the altars of the maumetry, and their temple of idols, which was at Godmundham, not far from York. And this was in the eleventh year of his reign. <sup>f1832</sup>

From that time forth, during the life of Edwin, which was the term of six years more, Paulinus christened continually in the rivers of Gwennie <sup>f1833</sup>

and. Swala, <sup>f1834</sup> in both provinces of Bernicia, and Deira; using the said rivers for his fonts, and preached in the shire of Lindsey, where he builded also a church of stone at Lincoln. <sup>f1835</sup>

This Paulinus was the first archbishop of York, and as he was of Justus, archbishop of Canterbury, ordained archbishop of the see of York, so he again, after the decease of Justus, ordained Honorius to be archbishop of Canterbury. <sup>f1836</sup>

In this time was so great peace in the kingdom of Edwin after his conversion, that a woman laden with gold <sup>f1837</sup> might have gone from the one sea-side to the other, and no man molest her. Moreover, by the highway sides, through all his kingdom, he caused by every well or spring to be chained a dish or bowl of brass, to take up water for the refreshing of such as went by the way, which bowls of brass there remained safe, that no man touched them during all the life of the said Edwin. Such was then the tender care and study of christian princes, for the refreshing of their subjects. But that was then the brasen world, which now is grown to iron and lead, called *oetas ferrea*, or rather *plumbea*.

This Edwin who first brought in the faith in the north parts, continuing after his baptism six years, at length was slain in battle by Cadwalla, king of the Britons, and by wicked Penda, king of the Mercians, with his son Osfrid also, in the field called Hatfield. <sup>F1838</sup>

Paulinus, after the death of godly Edwin, seeing unmerciful Cadwalla or Cadwallo, with his Britons, and wicked Penda, with the idolatrous Mercians, to spoil the land in such sort, as they made no spare neither of age, nor sex, nor religion, was compelled to fly with Ethelburga, the queen, and Eanfleda, her daughter, by water into Kent, where the said archbishop Paulinus remained bishop of Rochester the said space of nineteen years.

<sup>F1839</sup> And so the church of Northumberland lacked a bishop for the space of thirty years after. Notwithstanding he left there one James his deacon, a good man, who continued there baptizing and preaching in the north parts, till that, peace being recovered, and the number of the faithful increasing, the church came again to his stay. <sup>F1840</sup>

By means of this Edwin, Erpwald, king of the East-Angles, son to Redwald above-mentioned, was reduced to Christ's faith. <sup>F1841</sup>

After the decease of Edwin and his son Osfrid, both slain in battle, reigned Osric and Eanfrid, the one in Deira, the other in Bernicia. Osric was the son of Elfric, who was uncle to Edwin. Eanfrid was the eldest son of Ethelfrid; for Ethelfrid had three sons, to wit, Eanfrid, Oswald, and Osric. These two kings of Deira and Bernicia, Osric and Eanfrid, being first christened in Scotland, after being kings returned to their idolatry; and so in the year following were slain, one after the other, by the aforesaid Cadwalla and wicked Penda, as in the table above expressed.

After whom succeeded, in Northumberland, the second son of Ethelfrid, named Oswald, having rule on both the provinces, as well Deira as Bernicia. Whereof when the aforesaid Cadwalla, or Cadwallo, the British king, had understanding (who before had made havoc of the Saxons, and thought to have rooted them utterly out of England), he kept king Penda with a mighty host of the Britons, thinking to slay also Oswald, as he had before slain his brother Eanfrid, and king Edwin before them. But Oswald, when he was warned of the great strength of this Cadwalla and Penda, made his prayers to God, and besought him meekly of help to withstand his enemy, for the salvation of his people. Thus after Oswald had prayed for the saving of his people, the two hosts met in a field named Denesesburn, <sup>f1842</sup> some say Hevenfield, <sup>f1843</sup> where was fought a strong battle. But finally, the army and power of Penda and Cadwalla, which were far exceeding the number of Oswald's host, was chased, and most part slain of Oswald. Cadwalla himself, also, was there slain, after he had reigned over the Britons two and twenty years, leaving after him a son, whom Geoffrey calleth Cadwallader, the last king of the Britons. <sup>F1844</sup>

Of this Oswald much praise and commendation is written in authors, for his fervent zeal in Christ's religion, and merciful pity towards the poor; with other great virtues more. As touching the miracles of St. Oswald, what it pleased the people of that time to report of him, I have not here to affirm. This I find in stories certain, that he, being well and virtuously disposed to the setting forth of Christ's faith and doctrine, sent into Scotland for a certain bishop there called Aidan, who was a famous preacher. The king at what time he was in Scotland banished, had learned the Scottish tongue perfectly: wherefore as this Aidan preached in his Scottish tongue to the Saxons, the king himself interpreting that which he

had said, disdained not to preach and expound the same unto his nobles and subjects in the English tongue.

Moreover, towards the poor and needy his pity and tenderness was such, being notwithstanding of so high and princely calling, that upon a time being then Easter-day, he, sitting with the said Aidan at meat, and served after the manner of kings in silver, there cometh to him one of the servitors, bringing him word that there was a great multitude of poor people sitting in the street, which desired some alms; of the king. He, hearing this, commandeth not only the meat prepared for his own table to be carried to them, but also taking a silver platter which stood before him, brake it in pieces, and sent it amongst them, and so relieved his poor subjects, not only with the meat of his table, but with his dishes also. Aidan the bishop, seeing this and marvelling thereat, taketh him by the hand, wishing and praying in this wise: “This hand,” saith he, “I pray God may continue, and never putrefy.” <sup>F1845</sup> What the stories say more concerning this hand of Oswald, I intend not to meddle further, than simple, true, and due probability will bear me out. In those days, and partly by the means of the said Oswald, Kinigils, king of the West-Saxons, was converted to Christ’s faith; especially through the godly labor of Birinus, who was sent by pope Honorins to preach in England, and was then made bishop of Dorchester. <sup>F1846</sup> To whom Quiceline, brother of Kinigils, after he had also received baptism of the said Birinus, gave to him the said city to make there his see. And as Guido <sup>f1847</sup> witnesseth, the said Quiciline gave after to the bishop of Winchester seven miles compass of land, to build there the bishop’s see; the which was accomplished and finished by Kenwalc, his son. <sup>F1848</sup>

Of this Birinus Malmesbury <sup>f1849</sup> and Polychronicon, with divers other writers, do report a thing strange and miraculous; which if it be a fable, as no doubt it is, I cannot but marvel that so many authors so constantly agree in reporting and affirming the same. <sup>F1850</sup> The matter is this: This Birinus, being sent (as is said) by Honorins to preach in England, promiseth him to travel to the uttermost borders thereof, and there to preach the gospel, where the name of Christ was never heard; thus he, setting forward in his journey, passeth through France, and so to the seaside; where he found a passage ready, and the wind served so fair, that he was called upon in such haste, that he had no leisure to remember himself

to take all things with him which he had to carry. At length, as he was on the sea sailing, and, almost in the middle course of his passage, he remembered himself of a certain relic left behind him for haste, which Honorins had given him at his coming out. William of Malmesbury calleth it “Corporalia;” Histotis Jornalensis calleth it “Pallulam super quam corpus Christi consecraret,” which we call a corporas, or such a like thing; and what else enclosed within it, I cannot tell. Here Birinus, in great sorrow, could not tell what to do: if he should have spoken to the heathen mariners to turn their course back again, they would have mocked him, and it had been in vain. Wherefore, as the stories write, he boldly steppeth into the sea, and walking on foot back again, taketh with him that which was left behind, and so returneth to his company again, having not one thread of his garments wet. <sup>F1851</sup> Of this miracle, or whether I should call it a fable rather, let the reader judge as he thinketh; because it is not written in the Scripture, we are not bound to believe it. But if it were true, it is then to be thought wrought of God, not for any holiness in the man or in the corporas, but a special gift for the conversion of the heathen, for whose salvation God suffereth oft many wonders to be done. This Birinus, being received in the ship again with a great admiration of the mariners, who were therewith converted and baptized, was driven at last by the weather to the coast of the West-Saxons, where Kinigils and his brother Quiciline above-mentioned did reign: which two kings the same time, by the preaching of Birinus, were converted and made christian men, with the people of the country; being before rude and barbarous. It happened the same time, when the aforesaid king should be christened, that Oswald (mentioned a little before) king of Northumberland was then present, and the same day married Kinigilsus’s daughter, and also was godfather to the king.

Thus Oswald, after he had reigned nine years in such holiness and perfectness of life as is above specified, was slain at length in the field called Marfield, <sup>f1852</sup> by wicked Penda, king of the Mercians; which Penda, at length, after all his tyranny, was overcome and slain by Oswy, brother to Oswald, next king after Oswald of Northumberland, notwithstanding he had thrice the people which Oswy had. This Penda, being a paynim, had three sons, Wolfer, Weda, and Egfrid. <sup>F1853</sup> To the second son Weda, Oswy had before-time married his daughter, by consent of Penda his father; the

which Weda, by help of Oswy, was made king of South-Mercia, the which lordship is severed from North-Mercia by the river Trent. The same Weda, moreover, at what time he married the daughter of Oswy, promised to him that he would become a christian man; which thing he performed after the death of Penda his father: but afterward, within three years of his reign, he was, by reason of his wife, slain. And after him the kingdom fell to Wolfer, the other brother; who, being wedded to Ermenilda, daughter of Ercombent, king of Kent, was shortly after christened; so that he is counted the first christened king of Mercia. This Wolfer conquered Kenwalc, king of the West-Saxons, and got the Isle of Wight, which after he gave to Sigbert, king of the East-Angles, upon condition he would be christened. And thus the East-Angles, which before had expulsed Mellitus their bishop, as is declared, recovered again the christian faith under Sigbert their king, who, by the means of the aforesaid Wolfer, was reduced and baptized by Finian, the bishop. <sup>F1854</sup>

But to return again to Oswy, from whom we have a little digressed; of whom we showed before how he succeeded after Oswald in the province of Bernicia, to whom also was joined Oswin, his cousin, over the province of Deira, and there, with his fellow Oswy, reigned the space of seven years. This Oswin was gentle and liberal to his people, and no less devout toward God; who, upon a time, had given to Aidan, the bishop above-mentioned, a princely horse with the trappers, and all that appertained thereto, because he should not so much travel on foot, but sometimes ease himself withal. <sup>F1855</sup> Thus Aidan, the Scottish bishop, as he was riding upon his kingly horse, by the way meeteth him a certain poor man, asking and craving his charity. Aidan, having nothing else to give him, lighted down and giveth to him his horse, trapped and garnished as he was. <sup>F1856</sup> The king understanding this, and not contented therewith, as he was entering to dinner with the said Aidan, “What meant you, father bishop,” said he, “to give away my horse I gave you, unto the beggar? Had not I other horses in my stable that might have served him well enough, but you must give away that which of purpose was picked out for you amongst the chiefest?” To whom the bishop made answer again, saying, or rather rebuking the king: “What be these words, O king,” saith he, “that you speak? Why set you more price by a horse, which is but the foal of a horse, than you do by him which is the Son of Mary, yea, which is the

Son of God?" He said but this, when the king, forthwith ungirding his sword from about him (as he was then newly come in from hunting), falleth down at the feet of the bishop, desiring him to forgive him that, and he would never after speak a word to him for any treasure he should afterward give away of his. The bishop, seeing the king so meekly affected, he then taking him up, and cheering him again with words, began shortly after to weep, and to be very heavy. His minister asking the cause thereof, Aidan answered in his Scottish language, saying to him: "I weep," saith he, "for that this king cannot live long. This people is not worthy to have such a prince as he is, to reign amongst them." And so, as Aidan said, it came to pass: for not long after, Oswy, the king of Bernicia, disdainig at him, when Oswin either was not able, or not willing to join with him in battle, caused him traitorously to be slain. And so Oswy, with his son Egfrid, <sup>f1857</sup> reigned in Northumberland alone.

In the time, and also in the house of this Oswy, king of Northumberland, was a certain man named Benedict, who was the bringer-up of Bede from his youth, and took him to his institution when he was but seven years old, and so taught him during his life. This Benedict or Benet, descending of a noble stock and rich kin, and in good favor with Oswy, forsook service, house, and all his kindred, to serve Christ, and went to Rome (where he had been in his lifetime five times), and brought from thence books into monasteries, with other things which he thought then to serve for devotion. This Benedict, surnamed 'Biscop,' was the first that brought in the art and use of glazing into this land; for, before that, glass windows were not known, either in churches or in houses.

In the reign of the aforesaid Oswy and Egfrid, his son, was Botulph, an abbot, who builded in the east part of Lincoln an abbey, <sup>f1858</sup> Also Aidan, Finian, and Colman, three Scottish bishops of Northumberland, holy men, who held with the Britons against the Romish order for the keeping of Easter-day. Moreover, Cuthbert, Jaruman, Cedda, <sup>f1859</sup> and Wilfrid, lived the same time; whom as I judge to be bishops of holy conversation, so I thought it sufficient here only to name them. As touching their miracles where-for they were made saints in the pope's calendar, seeing they are not written in the gospel, nor in my creed, but in certain old chronicles of that age, so they are no matter of my faith: notwithstanding, as touching their conversation, this I read, and also do credit, that the clergy, both of

Britain and England, at that time plied nothing that was worldly, but gave themselves to preaching and teaching the word of our Savior, and followed the life that they preached by giving of good example. <sup>F1860</sup> And over that, as our histories accord, they were so void of covetousness, that they received no possessions or territories, but they were forced upon them.

About this season, or not much before, under the reign of Oswy and Oswin, <sup>f1861</sup> kings of Northumberland, another synod or council was holden against the Britons and the Scottish bishops, for the right observing of Easter, at Streaneshalch. <sup>F1862</sup> At that time Agilbert, bishop of the West-Saxons, came to Northumberland, to institute Wilfrid abbot of Ripon, where this question for Easter-day began to be moved: for Colman, then bishop of Northumberland, followed not the custom of Rome, nor of the Saxons, but followed the British and the Scottish bishops, his predecessors in the same see before. Thus, on the one side, was Colman, the archbishop of York, and Hilda, the abbess of Streaneshalch, which alleged for them the doings and examples of their predecessors, as Aidan and Finian, archbishops of that see of York before them, both godly and reverend bishops, and divers more, who had used always to celebrate the Easter from the 14th day of the first month, till the 20th of the same: and specially, for that St. John the evangelist, at Ephesus, kept and observed that day, etc. On the other side, was Agilbert, bishop of the West-Saxons, James, the deacon of Paulinus, above-mentioned, Wilfrid, abbot of Ripon, and king Alfrid, Oswy's son, with his queen, holding on the same side. The full contents of which disputation here followeth, according as in the story of Bede at large is described, with their reasons and arguments on both sides, as ensueth, <sup>f1863</sup> etc.

The question of Easter, and of shaving, and other ecclesiastical matters, being moved, it was determined, that in the abbey which is called Streaneshalch, of the which Hilda, a devout woman, was abbess, a convocation should be had, and this question there determined. To the which place came both the kings, the father and the son, bishop Colman, with his clergy of Scotland, Agilbert, with Agatho and Wilfrid, priests. James and Ronanus were on their sides; Hilda the abbess, with her company, was on the Scottish part; and the reverend bishop Cedda was appointed prolocutor for both parties in that parliament. King Oswy began first with an oration, declaring that it was necessary for such as

served one God, to live in one uniform order; and that such as looked for one kingdom in heaven should not differ in celebration of the heavenly sacraments, but should rather seek for the true tradition, and follow the same. This said, he commanded his bishop Colman to declare what the rite and custom was in this behalf that he used, and from whence it had its original.

Then Colman, obeying his prince's commandment, said:

“The Easter which I observe, I received of my elders that sent me hither a bishop, the which all our forefathers, being men of God, did celebrate in like manner: and lest it should be contemned or despised of any man, it is manifestly apparent to be the very same which the holy evangelist St. John (a disciple especially beloved of the Lord) did accustomedly use in all churches and congregations where he had authority.” <sup>F1864</sup>

When Colman had spoken many things to this effect, the king commanded Agilbert to declare his opinion in this behalf, and to show the order that he then used, from whence it came, and by what authority he observed the same. Agilbert requested the king that his scholar Wilfrid, a priest, might speak for him; inasmuch as they both were of one opinion herein with the rest of his clergy, and that the said Wilfrid could utter his mind better and more plainly in the English tongue, than he himself could by an interpreter.

<sup>F1865</sup>

Then Wilfrid, at the king's commandment, began on this sort, and said:

“The Easter which we keep, we have seen kept by all in Rome, where the holy apostles, Peter and Paul, did live and teach, did suffer and were buried. The same also is used in Italy and in France; the which countries we have traveled in for learning, and have noted it to be celebrated of them all. In Asia also, and in Africa, in Egypt and in Greece, and finally in all the world, the same manner of Easter is observed that we use, save only by these here present with their accomplices, the Picts and the Britons; the which, being the inhabitants of these two remote islands (and yet they not altogether agreeing), condescend and strive foolishly in this order against the universal world.”

To whom Colman replied, saying:

“I marvel you will call this order ‘foolish’ that so great an apostle as was worthy to lie in the Lord’s lap, did use, whom all the world doth well know, to have lived most wisely.”

And Wilfrid answered,

“God forbid that I should reprove St. John of folly; who kept the rites of Moses’ law according to the letter, the church being yet Jewish in many points, and the apostles not as yet able to abdicate all the observances of the law before ordained of God. As for example, they could not reject images invented of the devil (the which all men that believe on Christ, ought of necessity to forsake and detest), lest they should be an offense to those Jews that were amongst the Gentiles. For this cause did St. Paul circumcise Timothy; for this cause did he sacrifice in the temple, and did shave his head with Aquila and Priscilla, at Corinth: all which things were done to none other purpose, than to eschew the offense of the Jews. Hereupon also said James to Paul, ‘Thou seest, brother, how many thousand Jews do believe, and all these be zealous (notwithstanding) of the law. Yet seeing the gospel is so manifestly preached in the world, it is not lawful for the faithful to be circumcised, neither to offer sacrifice of carnal things to God.’ Therefore John, according to the custom of the law, the fourteenth day of the first month at evening, did begin the celebration of the feast of Easter, nothing respecting whether it were celebrated on the Saturday or any other day of the week. But Peter when he preached at Rome, remembering that the Lord did arise from death on the first day after the Sabbath, giving thereby an hope to the world of the resurrection, thought good so to institute Easter as that, after the use and precepts of the law, he waited for the rising of the moon on the fourteenth day of the first month, even as John did; and when that came, if the next day after were Sunday, which then was called the first day after the Sabbath, then did he celebrate the Easter of the Lord that very evening, like as we use to do even at this day. But if Sunday were not the next day after the fourteenth day, but fell on the sixteenth day, or seventeenth, or on

any other day unto the twenty-first, he tarried always for it, and did begin the holy solemnity of Easter on the Saturday evening next before. And so it came to pass, that Easter was always kept on the Sunday, and was not celebrated but from the fifteenth moon unto the twenty-first. Neither doth this tradition of the apostle break the law, but fulfill the same. In the which it is to be noted, that Easter was instituted from the fourteenth day of the first month at evening, unto the one and twentieth day of the same month at evening; the which manner all St. John's successors in Asia after his death did follow, and the Catholic church throughout the whole world. And that this is the true Easter, and only of all Christians to be observed, was not newly decreed, but only confirmed, by the council of Nice; as appeareth by the ecclesiastical history. <sup>F1866</sup>

Whereupon it is manifest that you [Colman] do neither follow the example of St. John, as ye think, nor of St. Peter, whose tradition you do willingly resist, nor of the law, nor yet of the gospel, in the celebration of Easter. For St. John, observing Easter according to the precepts of the law, kept it not necessarily on the first day after the Sabbath; but you precisely keep it only on the first day after the Sabbath. Peter did celebrate Easter Sunday from the fifteenth day of the moon to the one and twentieth day, but you keep Easter from the fourteenth unto the twentieth day; so that you begin Easter oftentimes the thirteenth day at night, of which manner neither the law nor the gospel maketh any mention. But the Lord, in the fourteenth day, either did eat the old passover at night, or else did celebrate the sacrament of the New Testament, in the remembrance of his death and passion. You do also utterly reject from the celebration of Easter, the one and twentieth day, the which the law hath chiefly willed to be observed: and therefore, as I said, in the keeping of Easter, you neither agree with St. John, nor with Peter, nor with the law, nor yet with the gospel,"

Then Colman again answered to these things, saying:

"Did then Anatolius, a godly man, and one much commended in the aforesaid Ecclesiastical History, against the law and the gospel, who writeth that the Easter of our Lord was to be kept from the fourteenth day unto the twentieth? Or shall we think that

Columba, our reverend father, and his successors, being men of God, who observed the Easter after this manner, did against the holy Scripture? Whereas some of them were men of such godliness and virtue, as was declared by their wonderful miracles. And I, hereby nothing doubting of their holiness, do endeavor to follow their life, order, and discipline.”

Then said Wilfrid;

“It is certain that Anatolius was both a godly man, and worthy of great commendation; but what have you to do with him, seeing you observe not his order? For he, following the true rule in keeping his Easter, appointed a circle of nineteen years; the which either you know not, or if you do, you condemn the common order observed in the universal church of Christ. And moreover, the said Anatolius doth so count the fourteenth day, in the observation of Easter, as he confesseth the same to be the fifteenth day at night, after the manner of the Egyptians; and likewise noteth the twentieth day to be, in the feast of Easter, the one and twentieth when the sun had set: the which distinction that you know not, by this may appear, for that you keep Easter before the full moon, i.e. on the thirteenth day. Or otherwise I can answer you touching your father Columba and his successors, whose order, you say, you follow, moved thereto by their miracles, on this wise, ‘that the Lord will answer to many that shall say in the day of judgment, that in his name they have prophesied and cast out devils, and have done many miracles,’ etc., ‘that he never knew them.’ But God forbid that I should say so of your fathers; because it is much better to believe well of those we know not, than ill. Whereupon I deny not but they were the servants of God; and holy men, which loved the Lord of a good intent, though of a rude simplicity: and I think that the order which they used in the Easter, did not much hurt them, so long as they had none amongst them that could show them the right observation of the same for them to follow. For I think, if the truth had been declared unto them, they would as well have received it in this matter, as they did in others. But you and your fellows, if you refuse the order of the apostolical see, or rather, of the universal church, which is confirmed by the holy Scripture; without all doubt

you do sin. And though your forefathers were holy men, is their fewness, being but a corner of an island, to be preferred before the universal church of Jesus Christ, dispersed throughout the whole world? <sup>F1867</sup> And if Columba your father (and ours also, being a servant of Christ Jesus) were mighty in miracles, is he therefore to be preferred before the prince of the holy apostles? To whom the Lord said, 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.'

Wilfrid having thus ended his argument, the king said to Colman: "Is it true, that the Lord spake these things to St. Peter?" And Colman answered, "Yea." Then said the king, "Can you declare any such power that the Lord gave to Columba?" Colman answered, "No." Then quoth the king, "Do both of you agree and consent in this matter without any controversy, that these words were principally spoken to Peter, and that the Lord gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven?" And they both answered, "Yea." Then concluded the king on this wise, "Forsomuch as St. Peter is the door-keeper of heaven, I will not gainsay him; but, in that I am able, I will obey his orders in every point: lest when I come to the gates of heaven, he shut them against me.

Upon this simple and rude reason of the king, the multitude eftsoons consented, and with them also Cedda was contented to give over; only Colman the Scot, being then archbishop of York, in displeasure left the realm, and departed into Scotland, carrying with him the bones of Aidan. <sup>F1868</sup> And thus much concerning this matter of Easter.

After the decease of Oswy, Egfrid his son was king after him in Northumberland fifteen years. By this Egfrid Cuthbert was promoted to the bishopric of the Isle of Lindisfarne: and Wilfrid, who before had been archbishop of York, was displaced through the means of Theodore archbishop of Canterbury, and Cedda possessed that see. <sup>F1869</sup> Wilfrid, when he was put out, went to Rome, and complained of him to Agatho the bishop, <sup>f1870</sup> and was well allowed in some things. But the king and Theodore had there such proctors and friends, that he returned without speeding of his cause. Wherefore he returned into the South-Saxons, and builded an abbey in Selesey, and preached unto the South-Saxons, fifteen

years. The king of the South-Saxons at that time was Ethelwold, to whom we declared a little before <sup>f1871</sup> that Wolfer king of the Mercians gave the Isle of Wight upon condition that he would be christened, and so was he baptized by Birinus; <sup>f1872</sup> the said Wolfer being his godfather, and son-in-law, <sup>f1873</sup> both in one day. Wherefore Wilfrid, now being licensed by Ethelwold the king, preached unto his nobles and people of South-Sax, and converted them to Christ. In the mean time of whose baptizing, the rain which before they lacked three years together was given them plentifully, whereby their great famine slacked, and the country was made fruitful, which before was dried up with barrenness; <sup>f1874</sup> insomuch that (as in some stories it is said) the people, penured with famine, would go forty together upon the [top of the] rocks [or] by the seaside, and taking hands together, would throw themselves down, [or into] the sea. <sup>F1875</sup> Moreover, whereas they lacked before the art of fishing, the foresaid Wilfrid taught them how with nets to fish.

And thus by process have we discoursed from time to time how and by what means the idolatrous people were induced to the true faith of Christ; of whom the South-Saxons with the Isle of Wight were the last.

After Egfrid, who was slain in the straits of Scotland, next succeeded Alfrid his brother, and bastard son to Oswy, and reigned eighteen or nineteen years in Northumberland. This Alfrid restored again the foresaid Wilfrid to the see of York, whom his brother had before expelled and put in Cedda. Notwithstanding, the same king within five years after expelled the said Wilfrid again, and so went he to Rome; but at length by Osred his successor was placed again in the archbishopric of York, and Cedda was by Theodore ordained bishop of Mercia. The which province of Mercia the said Theodore, archbishop of Canterbury, by the authority of the synod holden at Hatfield, did after divide into five bishoprics; that is, one to Chester, the second to Worcester, the third to Lichfield, the fourth to Cederna <sup>f1876</sup> in Lindsey, the fifth to Dorchester, which was after translated to Lincoln.

Near about this time in the year of our Lord 666, the detestable sect of Mahomet began to take strength and place. <sup>F1877</sup> Although Polychronicon, differing a little in years, accounteth the beginning of this sect somewhat before, but the most diligent searchers of them which write now, refer it to

this year, which well agreeth with the number of that beast signified in the Apocalypse,  $\chi\xi\varsigma$  that is, 666. Of this Mahomet came the kingdom of Agarens (whom he after named Saracens), to whom he gave sundry laws, patched of many sects and religions together; he taught them to pray ever to the south; and as we keep the Sunday, so they keep the Friday, which they call the day of Venus. He permitted them to have as many wives as they were able to maintain; to have as many concubines as they listed; to abstain from the use of wine, except on certain solemn days in the year; to have and worship only one God omnipotent, saying that Moses and the prophets were great men, but Christ was greater, and greatest of all the prophets, as being born of the Virgin Mary by the power of God, without man's seed, and at last was taken up to heaven; but was not slain, but another in his likeness for him; with many other wicked blasphemies in his law contained. At length this kingdom of the Saracens began to be conquered of the Turks, and in process of time wholly subdued to them.

F1878

But now to return again to the time of our English Saxons. In this mean season Theodore was sent from Italy into England by Vitalian the pope, to be archbishop of Canterbury, and with him divers other monks of Italy, to set up here in England Latin service, masses, ceremonies, litanies, with such other Romish ware, etc. This Theodore, being made archbishop and metropolitan of Canterbury, began to play the "Rex," placing and displacing the bishops at his pleasure. As for Cedda and Wilfrid, archbishops of York, he thrust them both out, under the pretense that they were not lawfully consecrated; notwithstanding they were sufficiently authorized by their kings, and were placed against their wills. Wherefore Wilfrid, as is before touched, went up to Rome, but could have no redress of his cause. Yet to show what modesty this Wilfrid used against his enemy, being so violently molested as he was, because the words of his complaint are expressed in William of Malmesbury, I thought here to express the same both for the commendation of the party, and also for the good example of others, in case any such there be whom good examples will move to well-doing. This Wilfrid therefore, having such injury and violence offered unto him by the hands of Theodore, although he had just cause to do his uttermost, yet in prosecuting his complaint how he tempered himself, what words of modesty he used, rather to defend his

innocency than to impugn his adversary, by this his suggestion offered up to the bishop of Rome may appear; whose words in effect were these. “How it chanceth that Theodore the most holy and reverend archbishop (myself being alive in the see, which I, though unworthy, did rule and dispose) hath of his own authority, without the consent of any bishop (neither having any simple voice agreeing to the same), ordained three bishops, I had rather pass over in silence than to stir any further therein, because of the reverence of that man; and no less thought I it my duty so to do. The which man, for that he hath been directed by the see apostolical, I will not, nor dare not, here accuse,” etc. <sup>f1879</sup> Thus the cause of the said Wilfrid, albeit it was sufficiently known in the court of Rome <sup>f1880</sup> to be well allowed for just and innocent, yet it was not then redressed: in such estimation was this Theodore then among the Romans. <sup>F1881</sup> Upon this controversy of these two bishops I may well here infer the words of William of Malmesbury, not unworthy in my mind to be noted, which be these in his story. “In the which Theodore,” saith he, “the weak and miserable infirmity of man be seen and also lamented; considering, that although a man be never so holy, yet in the same man is found something, whereby it may be perceived that he hath not utterly put off all his stubborn conditions,” etc. <sup>f1882</sup>

In the time of this Theodore, and by the means of him, a provincial synod was holden at Thetford, <sup>f1883</sup> mentioned in the story of Bede: <sup>f1884</sup> the principal contents whereof were these:

1. That Easter-day should be uniformly kept and observed through the whole realm, upon one certain day, videlicet prima, 14 luna mensis primi. <sup>F1885</sup>
2. That no bishop should intermeddle within the diocese of another.
3. That monasteries consecrated unto God should be exempt, and free from the jurisdiction of the bishops.
4. That the monks should not stray from one place (that is, from one monastery to another), without the license of their abbot; but to keep the same obedience which they promised at their first entering.
5. That no clergyman should forsake his own bishop, and be received in any other place, without letters commendatory of his own bishop.

6. That foreign bishops and clergymen coming into the realm, <sup>f1886</sup> should be content only with the benefit of such hospitality, as should be offered them: neither should intermeddle any further within the precinct of any bishop, without his special permission.
7. That synods, provincial should be kept within the realm twice a year. <sup>F1887</sup>
8. That no bishop should prefer himself before another, but must observe the time and order of his consecration.
9. That the number of bishops should be augmented, as the number of the believers increaseth. <sup>F1888</sup>
10. That no marriage should be admitted, but that which was lawful; no incest to be suffered; neither any man to put away his wife for any cause, except only for fornication—after the rule of the gospel. And these be the principal chapters of that synod, etc.

In the next year following <sup>f1889</sup> was the sixth general council kept at Constantinople, whereat this Theodore was also present <sup>f1890</sup> under pope Agatho: where marriage was permitted to Greek priests, and forbidden to the Latin. In this council the Latin mass was first openly said by John bishop of Porto, the pope's legate, before the patriarch and princes at Constantinople, in the temple of St. Sophia.

After the decease of Alfrid king of Northumberland (from whom it was digressed) succeeded his son Osred, reigning eleven years, after whom reigned Kenred two years, and next Osric after him eleven years.

In the time and reign of these four kings of Northumberland, king Iva or Ina reigned in West-Sax; who, succeeding after Cadwallader the last king of Britons, <sup>f1891</sup> began his reign about the year of our Lord 689, and reigned with great valiantness over the West-Saxons the term of thirty-seven years: concerning whose acts and wars maintained against the Kentish-Saxon and other kings, because I have not to intermeddle withal, I refer the reader to other chroniclers.

About the sixth year of the reign of this Ina, or Ine, Polychronicon <sup>f1892</sup> and others make mention of one Cuthlacus, whom they call St. Cuthlake, a confessor, who, about the four-and-twentieth year of his age, renouncing

the pomp of the world, professed himself a monk in the abbey of Repingdon;<sup>f1893</sup> and, the third year after, went to Crowland, where he led the life of an anchorite. In the which isle and place of his burying was builded a fair abbey, called afterward, for the great resort and gentle entertainment of strangers, “Crowland the courteous.”<sup>F1894</sup> But why this Cuthlake should be sainted for his doings, I see no great cause; as neither do I think the fabulous miracles reported of him to be true: as where the vulgar people are made to believe that he enclosed the devil in a boiling pot, and caused wicked spirits to erect up houses; with such other fables and lying miracles. Among which lying miracles also may be reckoned that which the stories mention in the eleventh year of the reign of Ina to be done of one Brithwald or Drithelme, who, being dead a long season, was restored to life again, and told many wonders of strange things that he had seen, causing thereby great alms and deeds of charity to be done of the people: and so he, disposing of his goods given in three parts, went to the abbey of Melrose, where he continued the rest of his life.<sup>F1895</sup>

Moreover, about the sixteenth year of the said Ina, Ethelred king of Mercia, after he had there reigned thirty years, was made a monk, and, after, abbot of Bardney.

And about the eighteenth year of the reign of Ina died the worthy and learned bishop Aldelm, first abbot of Malmesbury, afterwards bishop of Sherborne, of whom William of Malmesbury writeth plenteously with great commendation;<sup>f1896</sup> and that not unworthily, as I suppose: especially for the noble praise of learning and virtue in him above the rest of that time (next after Bede); as the great number of books and epistles, with poems by him set forth, will declare. Although, concerning the miracles which the said author ascribeth to him; as first, in causing an infant of nine days old to speak at Rome, to declare<sup>f1897</sup> pope Sergius, who was then suspected the father of the said child; also in hanging his casule upon the sunbeams; item, in making whole the altar-stone of marble brought from Rome; item, in drawing a-length one of the timber pieces, which went to the building of the temple in Malmesbury; item, in saving the mariners at Dover—as concerning these and such other miracles, which William of Malmesbury to him attributeth, I cannot consent to him therein; but think rather the same to be monkish devices, forged upon their patrons to maintain the dignity of their houses. And as the author was deceived (no doubt) in believing such

fables himself, so may he likewise deceive us, through the dexterity of his style and fine handling of the matter; but that further experience hath taught the world now-a-days more wisdom, in not believing such practices. This Aldelm was bishop of Sherborne; which see after was united to the see of Winchester: in which church of Winchester the like miracles also are to be read of bishop Adelwold and St. Swithin, whom they by canonized likewise for a saint.

Moreover, near about the five and twentieth of Ina, by the report of Bede, <sup>f1898</sup> St. John of Beverley, who was then archbishop of York, died, and was buried at the porch of the minster of Deirwood or Beverley. In the which porch it is recorded in some chronicles, <sup>f1899</sup> that as the said John upon a time was praying, being in the porch of St. Michael in York, the Holy Ghost, in the similitude of a dove, sat before him upon the altar, in brightness shining above the sun. This brightness being seen of others, first cometh one of his deacons running unto the porch, who, beholding the bishop there standing in his prayers, and all the place replenished with the Holy Ghost, was stricken with the light thereof, having all his face burnt, as it were, with hot burning fire. Notwithstanding, the bishop by and by cured the face of his deacon again, charging them (as the story saith) not to publish what he had seen during his life time. Which tale seemeth as true as that we read in Polychronicon about the same time done of St. Egwin, abbot of Evesham and bishop of Worcester (then called Wicts); <sup>f1900</sup> who upon a time, when he had fettered both his feet in irons fast locked for certain sins done in his youth, and had cast the key thereof into the river, afterward a fish brought the key again into the ship, as he was sailing homeward from Rome. <sup>F1901</sup>

But to leave these monkish phantasies, and return to the right course again of the story: in the time of this foresaid Ina, began first the right observing of Easter-day to be kept of the Picts and of the Britons. In the observation of which day (as is largely set forth in Bede and Polychronicon <sup>f1902</sup> ) three things are necessary to be observed: first, the full moon of the first month, that is, of the month of March; secondly, the Dominical letter; thirdly, the equinoctial day, which equinoctial was wont to be counted in the Eastern nations, and especially among the Egyptians, to be about the seventeenth day of March. So that the full moon on the equinoctial day, or after the equinoctial day, being observed, the next Dominical day following that full

moon is to be taken for Easter-day. Wherein are diligently to be noted two things: first, the fullness of the moon must be perfectly full, so that it be the beginning of the third week of the moon, which is the fourteenth or fifteenth day of the moon. Secondly, it is to be noted, that the said perfect fullness of the moon, beginning the third week, must happen either in the very evening of the equinoctial day, or after the equinoctial day: for else, if it happen either on the equinoctial day before the evening, or before the equinoctial day, then it belongeth to the last month of the last year, and not to the first month of the first year, and so serveth not to be observed.

F1903

This rite and usage in keeping Easter-day being received in the Latin church, began now to take place among the Picts and Britons, through the busy travail of Theodore and Cuthlake, but namely <sup>f1904</sup> of Egbert the holy monk, <sup>f1905</sup> as they term him, and of Ceolfrid abbot of Jarrow <sup>f1906</sup> in Northumberland, who wrote to Narcanus, or Naitonus the king of Picts, concerning the same: who also among other things writeth of the shaven crowns of priests, saying, that it was as necessary for the vow of a monk, or the degree of a priest, to have a shaven crown for restraint of their lust, as for any christian man to bless him against spirits, when they come upon him. <sup>F1907</sup> The copy of which letter, as it is in Bede, I have here annexed, not for any great reason therein contained, but only to delight the reader with some pastime, in seeing the fond ignorance of that monkish age. The copy of the letter thus proceedeth. <sup>F1908</sup>

### **OF THE SHAVING OF PRIESTS: COPIED FROM A MONKISH LETTER OF ELFRID [OR CEOLFRID] TO KING NAITON, FOR THE SHAVING OF PRIESTS' CROWNS.**

Concerning the shaving of priests (whereof also you desired me to write unto you), I exhort you that it be decently observed, according to the christian faith. We are not ignorant indeed that the apostles were not all shaven after one manner, neither doth the catholic church at this day agree in one uniform manner of shaving, as they do in faith, hope, and charity. Let us consider the former time of the patriarchs, and we shall find that Job (an example of patience), even in the very point of his afflictions, did shave his head; and so proved also, that in the time of his prosperity, he used

to let his hair grow. And Joseph an excellent doctor and executor of chastity, humility, piety, and other virtues, when he was delivered out of prison and servitude, was shaven: <sup>f1909</sup> whereby it appeareth, that whilst he abode in prison he was unshaven. Behold, both these, being men of God, did use an order in the habit of body one contrary to the other, whose consciences notwithstanding within did well agree in the like grace of virtues. But to speak truly and freely, the difference of shaving hurteth not such as have a pure faith in the Lord, and sincere charity towards their neighbor: especially for that there was never any controversy amongst the catholic fathers about the diversity thereof; as there hath been of the difference of the celebration of Easter, and concerning matters of faith. But of all these shavings that we find, either in the church or elsewhere, there is none in mine opinion so much to be followed and embraced, as that which he used on his head, to whom the Lord said, ‘Thou art Peter, <sup>f1910</sup> and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven.’ And contrariwise there is no shaving so much to be abhorred and detested, as that which he used, to whom the said St. Peter said, ‘Thy money perish with thee: because thou thinkest to possess the gift of God by money, therefore thy part and lot is not in this word.’ Neither ought we to be shaven on the crown, only because St. Peter was so shaven, but because Peter was so shaven in remembrance of the Lord’s passion. Therefore we that desire by the same passion to be saved, must wear the sign of the same passion with him upon the top of our head, which is the highest part of our body. For as every church, because it is made a church by the death of the Savior, doth use to bear the sign of the holy cross on the forehead, that it may the better by the defense of that banner be kept from the invasions of evil spirits; <sup>f1911</sup> and by the often admonition thereof be taught to crucify the flesh with the concupiscence of the same; in like manner it behoveth such as have the vows of monks, and degrees of the clergy, to bind themselves with a stricter bit of continency for the Lord’s sake. And as the Lord bare a crown of thorns on his head in his passion, whereby he took and carried away from us the thorns and pricks of our sins; so must every one of us, by shaving

our heads, show ourselves willing patiently to bear, and willingly to suffer the mocks and scorns of the world for his sake; and that we expect to receive the crown of eternal life, which God hath promised to all that love him; and that, for the gaining thereof, we contemn both the adversity and the prosperity of this world. <sup>F1912</sup>

But the shaving which Simon Magus used, what faithful man doth not detest, together with his magical art? the which at the first appearance hath a show of a shaven crown, but if you mark his neck, you shall find it curtailed in such wise, as you will say, it is rather meet to be used of the Simonites, than of Christians. Such, indeed, of foolish men be thought worthy of the glory of the eternal crown; whereas indeed for their ill living, they are worthy not only to be deprived of the same, but also are doomed to eternal punishment. I speak not this against them that use this kinder shaving, and live catholicly in faith and good works; for surely I believe there be divers of them be very holy and godly men; amongst the which is Adamnan, the abbot and worthy priest of the Columbians: who, when he came ambassador from his country unto king Aldfrid, desired greatly to see our monastery; where he declared a wonderful wisdom, humility, and religion both in his manners and words. Amongst other talk, I asked him, “Why, holy brother, do you, that believe to come to the crown of life that shall never have an end, use, by a habit contrary to your belief, the image of a crown on your head, which is terminated or rounded? And if you seek,” quoth I, “the fellowship of St. Peter, why do you use the fashion of his crown whom St. Peter did accurse, and not of his rather with whom you desire to live eternally?” Adamnan answered, saying, “Know right well, brother, that though I use Simon’s manner of shaving, after the custom of my country, yet notwithstanding do I detest, and with all my heart abhor, his infidelity; and I desire to imitate the footsteps of the most blessed prince of the apostles as far forth as my littleness will extend.” Then said I “I believe it is so: but then let it be apparent that you imitate those things which the apostle Peter did from the bottom of your heart, by using the same upon your face, that you know he did: for I suppose your wisdom understandeth, that it is right decent to differ in the trimming your face or shaving, from him

whom in your heart you abhor: and contrariwise, that, as you desire to imitate the doings of him whom you desire to have a Mediator between God and you, <sup>f1913</sup> so it is meet you imitate the manner of his apparel and shaving.” Thus much said I to Adamnan, who seemed then well to like our churches; and showed how much he had profited from seeing the statutes of our churches, When, returning into Scotland, he by his preaching brought numbers of that nation over to the catholic observance of the pascal time; though he was not yet able to gain the consent of the monks in the island of Hii, <sup>f1914</sup> over whom he presided. He endeavored also to have reformed their manner of shaving, if he had been able. And now, O king, I exhort your wisdom to labor with your people, over whom the King of kings and Lord of lords hath made you governor, to imitate likewise in all these points the catholic and apostolic church. So shall it come to pass, that at the end of this your temporal kingdom, the most blessed prince of the apostles shall open to you and yours the gates of the heavenly kingdom, together with the other elect of God. <sup>f1915</sup> The grace of the Eternal King preserve you, most dearly beloved son in Christ, long time to reign over us, to the peace of us all.

When this letter was read before king Naiton with other of his learned men, and diligently translated into his proper language, he seemed to rejoice very much at the exhortation thereof; insomuch that, rising up from among his noblemen, he kneeled on the ground, and gave God thanks that he had deserved to receive so worthy a present out of England; and so caused forthwith, by public proclamation, the circles or revolutions of nineteen years to be written out, learned, and observed throughout all the provinces of the Picts, suppressing the erroneous circles or revolutions of eighty-four years that had been used there. For all the ministers of the altar and all monks were shaven on the crown; and all the people rejoiced for having been put under the new discipline of the most blessed prince of the apostles, St. Peter, and under his protection. <sup>f1916</sup>

By this monkish letter above-prefixed (void of all Scripture, of all probation and truth of history) thou mayest note, gentle reader, how this vain tradition of shaven crowns hath come up, and upon how light and trifling occasion: which in very deed was none other but the dreaming

phantasies of monks of that time, falsely grounded upon the example of Peter, when by no old monument of any ancient record they can ever prove either Peter or Simon Magus to have been shaven. Moreover, in the said letter also is to be noted, how the Scottish clergy at that season, did wear no such priestly crowns as our English churchmen then did.

But to cut off this matter of shaving (more worthy to be laughed at than to be storied), let us now again return where we left at king Iva or Ina, of whom William of Malmesbury and Fabian in his chronicle do record, <sup>f1917</sup> that when the foresaid Ina had ruled the West-Saxons by the term of thirty-seven years, by the importunate persuasion and subtle policy of his wife Ethelburga he was allured to go to Rome, there to be made a monk. Which Ethelburga, after she had a long time labored him to leave the world, and could not bring about her purpose; upon a season, when the king and she had rested them in a fair palace richly hanged, and were upon the morrow thence departed, she, by her commandment, caused the palace to be replenished with all kind of filth and dung, and hogs and wild beasts therein to be laid, as well in the chambers, as other houses of office; and in their own chamber where they did lie, there was a sow laid with her young pigs. And when she knew that this palace was thus deformed, being a certain space out of the town, she besought the king to visit the said palace. And when she had brought him thereunto, she said to him, “I pray you, ray lord, behold now this house, where are now the rich tapets and clothes of gold and silk, and other rich apparel, that we left; here this other day? And where be the delicacies and pleasant servitors and costly dishes, that you and I lately were served with? Be not all these passed and gone? My lord,” said she, “in like manner shall we vanish away, as suddenly as you see these worldly things be passed; and our bodies, which now be delicately kept, shall fall and turn into the filth of the earth. Wherefore have in mind my words that before-time to you I have often showed and told, and busy you to purchase that palace that ever shall endure in joy, without transmutation.”

By means of these and other words the queen turned so the king’s mind, that shortly after he resigned the governance of his kingdom unto Ethelard his nephew; and, for the love of Christ, took on him the habit of a poor man, and, setting apart all the pomp and pride of this wicked world, associated himself in the fellowship of poor men, and traveled to Rome

with great devotion, when he had been king of West-Saxons (as before is said) thirty-seven years. After whose departing, the said Ethelburga, his wife, went unto Barking, seven miles from London, where, in the nunnery of Barking, before of Erkenwald [bishop of London] founded, she continued and ended the rest of her life, when she had been abbess of the place a certain time. The said Malmesbury in his story also testifieth, that this Ina was the first king that granted a penny of every fire-house through his dominion to be paid unto the court of Rome; which afterward was called Romescot, or Peterpence, <sup>f1918</sup> and long after was paid in many places of England.

This Ina, like as for his time he was worthy and valiant in his acts, so was he the first of the Saxon kings (that I read of) which set forth any laws to his country: the rehearsal of which laws, to the number of fourscore and odd, were not unprofitable here to be inserted, together with other laws of the West-Saxon kings after him, before the time of William the Conqueror; in case it were not for the length and prolixity of this present volume <sup>f1919</sup> And thus much concerning the reign of Ina, king of the West-Saxons, by the way. Now to repair again to the course of Northumberland kings, something intermitted.

Next unto the foresaid Osrice, followed Celulf, whom he had adopted, brother to Kenred above-specified. This Celulf, as he was himself learned, so were in his time divers learned men then flourishing in England, among whom was Bede, who unto the same king Celulf offered his story, intituled, “Anglorum Historia,” not only to be ratified by his authority, but also to be amended, as Malmesbury writeth, <sup>f1920</sup> by his knowledge and learning.

And forsomuch as I have here entered into the mention of Bede, a man of worthy and venerable memory; because of the certifying of the truth of that man, and for that I see all writers (as touching his life) do not agree, some saying that he was no Englishman born: I thought so much to report of him, as I find by his own words testified of himself in the latter end of his Ecclesiastical History of England, offered to the said Celulf above-mentioned, the words of whom be these.

“Thus much, by the help of God, I, Bede, the servant of Christ, and priest of the monastery of the blessed apostles Peter and Paul at Wiremuth and

Gurwum, <sup>f1921</sup> have compiled and digested concerning the ecclesiastical history of Britain, and especially of the English nation.” And so the same Bede, proceeding further in his narration, declareth that he, being born <sup>f1922</sup> in the territory of the said monastery, being of the age of seven years, was committed of his parents and friends, to the tuition and education of Benedict (of whom above relation is made), <sup>f1923</sup> and afterward of Ceolfrid, abbots of the aforesaid monastery. In the which place or monastery he, continuing from that time forth, all his life long gave himself and all his whole study to the meditating of holy Scripture. Whatsoever time or leisure he had from his daily service in the church, that he spent either in learning or teaching, or writing something. About the nineteenth year of his age he was made deacon; in the thirtieth year of his age he was made priest. From the which time, to the age of nine-and-fifty years, he occupied himself in interpreting the works of the ancient fathers for his own use and the necessity of others; and in writing of treatises, which came in all to the number of seven-and-thirty volumes, which he digested into threescore-and-eighteen books.

Some say that; he went to Rome, either there to defend his books to be consonant to catholic doctrine; or else, if they should be found faulty, to amend and correct the same, as he should thereto be commanded. Albeit the reporter of his life dare not certainly affirm that ever he was at Rome; <sup>f1924</sup> but that he was invited and called thither to come, both it is manifest in stories, and also this epistle of pope Sergius doth sufficiently prove; declaring moreover in what price and estimation Bede was accepted, as well in the court of Rome, as in other places besides. The epistle of Sergius sent to Ceolfrid thus proceedeth, in tenor and form as followeth, in Latin.

**THE EPISTLE OF POPE SERGIUS, SENT TO CEOLFRID, <sup>F1925</sup> ABBOT OF WIREMUTH ABBEY; REQUIRING BEDE TO BE SENT UP TO HIM TO ROME, FOR THE FAME OF HIS WORTHY LEARNING.**

Sergius episcopus servus servorum Dei, Celfrido religioso abbati, sal. Quibus modis ac verbis clementiam Dei nostri, atque inenarrabilem providentiam possumus effari, et dignas gratiarum actiones pro immensis ejus circa nos beneficiis persolvere, qui in tenebris et in umbra mortis positos ad lumen scientiae perducit? *Et Infra.* Benedictionis gratiam, quam nobis per praesentem

portitorem tua devota misit religio, libenti et hilari animo sicuti ab ea directa est, nos suscepisse, cognosce. Opportunis igitur ac dignis amplectendae tuae sollicitudinins petitionibus arctissima devotione satisfacientes, hortamur Deo dilectam religiositatis tuae bonitatem, ut, quia exortis quibusdam ecclesiasticarum causarum capitulis, non sine examinatione longius innotescendis, opus nobis sunt ad conferendum arte literaturae imbuti, sicut decet Deo devotum auxiliatorem sanctae matris universalis ecclesiae obedientem devotionem huic nostrae exhortation non desistas accommodare: sed absque aliqua immoratione religiosum Dei famulum Bedam, venerabilem monasterii tui presbyterum, ad limina apostolorum principum Dominorum meorum Petri et Pauli amatorum tuorum ac protectorum, ad nostrae mediocritatis conspectum non moreris dirigere. Quem, satisfaciante Domino sanctis tuis precibus, non diffidas prospere ad te redire (peracta praemissorum capitulorum eum auxilio Dei desiderata solennitate). Erit enim, ut confidimus, etiam cunctis tibi creditis profuturum, quicquid ecclesiae generali claruerit per ejus praestantiam impertitum, etc.

So notable and famous was the learning of this foresaid Bede, that the church of Rome (as by this letter appeareth) both stood in need of his help, and also required the same, about the discussing of certain causes and controversies appertaining to learning. Moreover, the whole Latin church at that time gave him the mastery in judgment and knowledge of the holy Scriptures. In all his explanations, his chiefest scope and purpose did ever drive to instruct and inform his reader, simply, and without all curiousness of style, in the sincere love of God and of his neighbor. As touching the holiness and integrity of his life, it is not to be doubted: for how could it be, that he should attend to any vicious idleness, or had any leisure to the same, who, in reading and digesting so many volumes, consumed all his whole cogitations in writing upon the Scriptures? For so he testifieth of himself in the third book of Samuel, saying in these words; "If my treatises and expositions," saith he, "bring with them no other utility to the readers thereof, yet to myself they conduce not a little thus; that while all my study and cogitation was set upon them, in the meanwhile, of slippery enticements and vain cogitations of this world I had little mind." Thus in this travail of study he continued till the age of sixty-two years. At length,

drawing to his latter end, being sick seven weeks together, besides other occupiyings of his mind, and other studies which he did not intermit, he translated also the Gospel of St. John into English. At length, with great comfort of spirit, he departed this life, pronouncing many comfortable sayings to them that stood about him, upon Ascension-day, the same year <sup>f1926</sup> when Nothelm was instituted archbishop of Canterbury. And thus much concerning the story of Bede.

This Celulf, king of Northumberland, afore-mentioned, after he had reigned eight years, was made a monk in the abbey of Fame, otherwise called Lindesfarne, or Holy Island; <sup>f1927</sup> where, by his means, license was given to the monks of that house to drink wine or ale, which before, by the institution of Aidan above-mentioned, drank nothing but milk and water. After whom succeeded Edbert, his cousin, brother to Egbert the same time being archbishop of York; who brought again thither the pall that his predecessors had foregone, since the time that Paulinus had left the see, and fled to Rochester, as is before declared. The said Egbert also erected a noble library in York, whose example I wish other bishops now would follow.

About the beginning of the reign of this Edbert was Cuthbert, archbishop of Canterbury, who collected a great synod of bishops and prelates A.D. 747, in the month of September, near to the place called Clovesho. <sup>f1928</sup> In the which synod assembled these decrees were enacted. <sup>f1929</sup>

- First**, That bishops should be more diligent in seeing to their office, and in admonishing the people of their faults.
2. That they should live in a peaceable mind together, notwithstanding they were in place dissevered asunder.
  3. That every bishop once a year should go about all the parishes of his diocese.
  4. That the said bishops, every one in his diocese, should monish their abbots and monks to live regularly: and that prelates should not oppress their inferiors, but love them.
  5. That they should teach the monasteries which the secular men had in-waded, and could not then be taken from them, to live regularly.

6. That none should be admitted to orders, before his life should be examined.
7. That in monasteries the reading of holy Scripture should be more frequented.
8. That priests should be no disposers of secular business.
9. That they should take no money for baptizing infants.
10. That they should both learn and teach the Lord's Prayer and Creed in the English tongue.
11. That all should join together in their ministry after one uniform rite and manner.
12. That in a modest voice they should sing in the church.
13. That all holy and festival days should be celebrated at one time together.
14. That the Sabbath-day be reverently observed and kept.
15. That the seven hours canonical every day be observed.
16. That the rogation-days, both the greater and lesser, should be observed. <sup>f1930</sup>
17. That the feast of St. Gregory, and St. Augustine our patron, should not be omitted.
18. That the fast of the four times should be kept and observed.
19. That monks and nuns should go regularly apparelled.
20. That bishops should see these decrees not to be neglected.
21. That the churchmen should not give themselves unto drunkenness.
22. That the communion should not be neglected of the churchmen.
23. Item, that the same also should be observed of laymen, as time required.

24. That laymen first should be well tried before they entered into monkery.
25. That alms be not neglected.
26. That bishops should see these decrees to be notified to the people.
27. They disputed of the profit of alms.
28. They disputed of the profit of singing psalms.
29. That the congregation should be constituted after the ability of their goods.
30. That monks should not dwell among laymen.
31. That public prayer should be made for kings and princes.

These decrees and ordinances being thus among the bishops concluded, Cuthbert the archbishop sendeth the copy thereof to Boniface; which Boniface, otherwise named Winfrid, an Englishman born, <sup>f1931</sup> was then archbishop of Mentz, and after made a martyr, as the popish stories term him.

This Boniface, being (as is said) archbishop of Mentz in the time of this aforesaid synod, wrote a letter to Ethelbald, king of Merce-land; which Ethelbald was also present in the same synod, of whom Bede maketh mention in his history, calling him proud Ethelbald, and the greatest of the Saxon kings in his time. First, this Ethelbald, after the departing of Celulf into his monkery, invaded and spoiled the country of Northumberland. Moreover, he exercised mortal and horrible war a long space with Cuthred, otherwise of some named Cuthbert, king of West-Saxons: furthermore he, with other Saxon kings, so impugned the Britons, that from that time they never durst provoke the Saxons any more. At length the said Cuthred, refusing the intolerable exactions <sup>f1932</sup> of proud Ethelbald, doth encounter with him in battle; where,, notwithstanding the great power that Ethelbald had to him adjoined, of the Mercians, of the East-Saxons, of the East-Angles, and of the men of Kent; yet the said Cuthred, through God's power, and the means of a certain valiant warrior, called Edelhilm, a consul, overthrew the pride of Ethelbald, after a sore and terrible conflict. Which Ethelbald, notwithstanding, repairing his power again the next year after,

renewed battle with the foresaid Cuthred; in the which battle Ethelbald (after he had reigned one and forty years in Mercia) was slain by one Beornred, who after reigned in that dition but a small time. For Offa, nephew to the said Ethelbald, expelled the said Beornred, and succeeded king in that province of Mercia, where he reigned nine and thirty years; of whom more followeth hereafter (the Lord Jesus speeding therein our purpose) to be declared, as place and time shall require. In the mean season, not to forget the before-mentioned letter of Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, sent unto this Ethelbald; I thought the same not unworthy here to be inserted (at the least the effect thereof), not so much for the author's sake, as for that some good matter, peradventure, may be picked thereout for other princes to behold and consider.

### **THE COPY AND TENOR OF THE LETTER OF BONIFACE,** <sup>F1933</sup>

Archbishop of Mentz, and Martyr of God (an Englishman), sent to Ethelbald, King of Mercia, freely and yet charitably admonishing him of his Adulterous Life, and Oppression of Churches.

Regi et filio charissimo, et in Christi amore caeteris regibus Anglorum praeferendo Ethelbaldo, Bonifacius archiepiscopus legatus Germanicus Romance ecclesiae perpetuam in Christo charitatis salutem. Confitemur coram Deo, qui novit an vere atque ex animo dicam: quia quando prosperitatem vestram, et fidem, et bona opera audimus, laetamur: quando autem aliquid adversum vel in eventu bellorum, vel de periculo animarum, de vobis cognoscimus,, tristamur. Audivimus enim quod eleemosynis intentus, furta et rapinas prohibes, et pacem diligis, et defensor viduarum et pauperum es, et inde gratias Deo agimus. Quod vero legitimum matrimonium spernis, si pro castitate faceres, esset laudabile: sed quia in luxu et adulterio et cum sanctimonialibus volutaris, est vituperabile et damnabile. Nam et famam gloriae vestrae coram Deo et hominibus confundit, et inter idolatras constitui, quia templum Dei violasti. Quapropter fill charissime poenitere, et memorare oportet, quam turpe sit, ut tu qui multis gentibus, dono Dei dominaris, ad injuriam ejus sis libidinis servus. Audivimus praterea quod optimates pene omnis gentis Merciorum tuo exemplo legitimas uxores deserant, et adulteras et

sanctimoniales constuprent. Quod quam sit peregrinum ab honestate, doceat vos alienae gentis institutio. Nam in antiqua Saxonia ubi nulla est Christi cognitio, si virgo in materna domo, vel maritata, sub conjugate fuerit adultera, manu propria strangulatam cremant, et supra fossam sepultae corruptorem suspendunt, aut cingulo tenus (vestibus abscissis) flagellat eam castae matronae et cultellis pungunt; et de villa in villam missae occurrunt novae flagellatrices, donec interimant. Insuper et Vinuli, <sup>f1934</sup> quod est foedissimum genus hominum, hunc habent morem, ut mulier viro mortuo se in rogo cremantis pariter arsura praecipitet. Si ergo gentiles Deum ignorantes, tantum zelum castitatis habent, quid tibi convenit fili charissime, qui christi-anus et rex es? Parce ergo animae tuae: parce multitudini, populi tui pereuntis. exemplo tuo: de quorum animabus redditurus es rationem. Attende et illud, quid si gens Anglorum (sicut in Francia, et Italia, et ab ipsis Paganis nobis impropertatur) spretis legitimis matrimoniis per adulteria deficit, nascituraque sit ex ea commixtione gens ignava et Dei contemptrix, quae perditis moribus patriam pessundet: sicut Burgundionibus et provincialibus, et Hispanis contigit, quos Saraceni multis annis infestarunt propter peccata praeterita? Praeterea nunciatum est nobis, quod multa privilegia ecclesiarum et monasteriorum auferens, ad hoc audendum duces tuos exemplo provocet. Sed cogita quaeso quam terribilem vindictam Deus in anteriores reges exereuit, ejusdem culpae conscios, quam in te arguimus. Nam Celredum praedecessorem tuum, stupratorem sanctimonialium et ecclesiarum privilegiorum fractorem, splendide cum suis comitibus epulantem spiritus malignus arripuit: et sine confessione et viatico, cum diabolo sermocinanti et legem Dei detestanti, animam extorsit. Osredum quoque regem Deiorum et Bericiorum, earundem culparum reum, ita effraenatum egit, ut regnum et juvenilem aetatem contemptibili morte amitteret. Carolus quoque princeps Francorum, monasteriorum multorum eversor, et ecclesiasticarum pecuniarum in usus proprios commutator, longa torsione et verenda metre consumptus est.

And a little after:

Quapropter fili charissime, paternis et obnixis precibus deprecamur, ut non despicias consilium patrum tuorum, qui pro Dei amore celsitudinem tuam appellare satagunt. Nihil enim boni regi salubrius, quam si talia commissa cum arguuntur, libenter emendentur, quid per Salomonem dicitur: qui diligit disciplinam, diligit sapientiam. Ideo, fili charissime, ostendentes consilium justum, contestamur et obsecramus per viventem Deum, et per filium ejus Jesum Christum, et per Spiritum Sanctum, ut recorderis quam fugitiva sit vita praesens, et quam brevis et momentanea delectatio spurcae carnis: et quam ignominiosum sit ut brevis vitae homo mala exempla in perpetuum posteris relinquat. Incipe ergo melioribus moribus vitam componere, et praeteritos errores juventutis corrigere, ut hic coram hominibus laudem habeas et in future aeterna gloria gaudeas. Valere celsitudinem tuam, et in bonis moribus proficere, optamus.

In this epistle here is to be seen and noted, first, the corruption and great disorder of life which alway, from time to time, hath been found in these religious houses of nuns; whose professed vow of co-acted chastity hath yet never been good to the church, nor profitable to the common-wealth, and least of all to themselves. Of such young and wanton widows St. Paul in his time complaineth, (1 Timothy 5.) which would take upon them the wilful profession of single life, which they were not able to perform, but falling into damnable luxury, deserved worthily to be reprehended. How much better had it been for these lascivious nuns not to have refused the safe yoke of christian matrimony, than to entangle themselves in this their superstitious vow of perpetual maidenhood, which neither was required of them, nor they were able to keep! Secondly, No less are they also to be reprehended, who maintained these superstitious orders of unprofitable nuns and of other religions. In the number of whom was this foresaid Boniface, otherwise called Winfrid; who, although in this epistle he doth justly reprehend the vicious enormities both of secular and of religious persons, yet he himself is not without the same, or rather greater, reprehension; for that he gave the occasion thereof in maintaining such superstitious orders of such lascivious nuns and other religious, and restraining the same from lawful marriage. For so we find of him in stories, that he was a great setter-up and upholder of such blind superstition, and

of all popery. Who, being admitted by pope Gregory II. archbishop of Mentz, and endued with full authority legantine over the Germans, <sup>f1935</sup> brought divers countries there under the pope's obedience, held many great councils, ordained bishops, builded monasteries, canonized saints, commanded relics to be worshipped, permitted religious fathers to carry about nuns with them a-preaching. Amongst all others he founded the great monastery of Fulda <sup>f1936</sup> in Germany, of English monks, into the which no women might enter but only Leoba and Tecla, two English nuns. Item, by the authority of the said archbishop Boniface, which he; received from pope Zachary, Childeric, king of France, was deposed from the right of his crown, and Pepin, betrayer of his master, was, confirmed, or rather intruded in. <sup>f1937</sup> From this Boniface proceeded that detestable doctrine which now standeth registered in the pope's decrees, Dist. 40, cap. "Si Papa." Which in a certain epistle of his is this: that in case the pope were of most filthy living, and forgetful or negligent of himself, and of the whole of Christianity, in such sort, that he led innumerable souls with him to hell, yet ought there no man to rebuke him in so doing, for he hath (saith he) power to judge all men, and ought of no man to be judged again.

In the time of this archbishop, pope Gregory II. also Gregory III. and pope Zachary, and before these also pope Constantine I., wrought great masteries against the Greek emperors Philippicus and Leo III., and others, for the maintaining of images to be set up in churches. <sup>f1938</sup> Of whom Philippicus lost both his empire and also his eyes: Leo for the same cause likewise was excommunicated of Gregory III. This Gregory III. <sup>f1939</sup> (so far as I can conjecture) was he that first wrote the four books of Dialogues in Greek (falsely i bearing the name of Gregory I. <sup>f1940</sup>); which books, afterward, Zachary his successor translated out of Greek into Latin. Item, the said Gregory III. first brought into the mass-canon the clause for relies, beginning "Quorum solennitates hodie in conspectu," etc. Item, he brought into the said canon the memorial, the offering and sacrifice for the dead; like as Zachary brought in the priests' vesture and ornaments, and as the foresaid Constantine also, was the first that gave his feet to be kissed of the emperors. <sup>f1941</sup> But to turn again into the course of our English story.

In the time of this Edbert, king of Northumberland, Sigebert or Sebright reigned in West-Saxony, a man of so cruel tyranny to his subjects (turning the laws and customs of his forefathers after his own will and pleasure),

that when he was somewhat sharply advertised by one of his nobles, an earl called Cumbra, to change his manners, and to behave himself more prudently toward his people; he there-for maliciously caused him to be put to cruel death. Whereupon the said king Sigebert, continuing his cruel conditions, by his subjects conspiring against him was put from his kingly dignity, and brought into such desolation, that, wandering alone in a wood without comfort, he was there slain even by the swineherd of the said earl, whom before he had so wrongfully murdered, as partly is above touched; whereby is to be seen the cruel tyranny of princes never to prosper well, without the just revenge both of God and man.

This Sigebert being slain, in his place succeeded Kenulph, <sup>f1942</sup> in the year of our Lord 78; who, with the agreement of the West-Saxons, was one of the chief doers against Sigebert his master. This Kenulph kept strongly his lordship against Offa, and against the power of all his enemies, till at length, after that he had reigned (as Fabian saith) one and thirty years, he, resorting to a paramour which he kept at Merton, was there beset, and likewise slain by the train and means of a certain kinsman of the foresaid Sigebert, named Clito or Cliton, <sup>f1943</sup> in revengement of king Sigebert's death.

Moreover, in the reign of the foresaid Edbert, king of Northumberland, and in the eighth year of Kenulph, king of West-Saxons; Offa, after he had slain the tyrant Beornred, who before had slain Ethelbald, king of Mercia and uncle to this foresaid Offa, reigned king of that province.

Of this Offa are told many notable deeds; which, because they concern rather political affairs, and do not greatly appertain to the purpose of this ecclesiastical history, I omit here to recite; as his wars and victories against Edbert, king of the Northumbers, as also against Ethelred, king of East-Angles. Item, against Earlbirt, king of Kent, otherwise called Pren, whom (as Fabian saith) he took prisoner, and led bound with him to Mercia. Malmesbury witnesseth otherwise this to be done not by Offa, but by Kenulph; as, Christ willing, hereafter shall appear. After these victories, Offa had such displeasure unto the citizens of Canterbury, that he [seized the] lands of Lambrith archbishop of Canterbury, and removed the archbishop's see (by the agreement of pope Adrian) unto Lichfield. <sup>f1944</sup> He also chased the Britons or Welshmen into Wales, and made a famous

dike between Wales and the utter bounds of Mercia, or middle England, which was called Offdike, <sup>f1945</sup> and builded there a church, which long time after was called Offkirke. This Offa also married one of his daughters to Brightric that was a king of West-Saxons. And, for that in his time was variance between him and the Frenchmen, insomuch that the passage of merchants was forbidden; therefore he sent Alcuin, <sup>f1946</sup> a learned man, unto Charlemagne, then king of France, to commune the means of peace; which Charlemagne had, after that, the said Alcuin in great favor and estimation, and afterwards made him abbot of Tours, in France.

About the latter time of the reign of Offa, king of Mercia, Ethelbert being then king of East-Angles (a learned and a right godly prince) came to the court of Offa, provoked by the counsel of his nobles to sue for the marriage of his daughter, well-accompanied like a prince, with his men about him. Whereupon the queen, conceiving a false suspicion, and fearing that which was never minded, that Ethelbert with his company, under the pretense and made-matter of marriage, was come to work some violence against her husband and the kingdom of Mercia; so she persuaded with king Offa and certain of her council that night, that the next, day following Offa caused him to be trained into his palace alone from his company, by one called Guimbert; who took him and bound him, and there struck off his head; which forthwith he then presented to the king and queen. And thus the innocent king Ethelbert was wrongfully murdered, shout the year of our Lord 793; but not without a just revenge at God's hands. For, as the story recordeth, <sup>f1947</sup> the foresaid queen, worker of this villany, lived not three months after, and in her death was so tormented, that she was fain to bite and rend her tongue in pieces with her own teeth. Offs, understanding at length the innocency of this king, and the heinous cruelty of his fact, gave the tenth part of his goods to holy church; and on the church of Hereford, in the remembrance of this Ethelbert, he bestowed great lands. Moreover, he builded the abbey of St. Alban's, with certain other monasteries besides. And so afterward he went; up to Rome for his penance, where he gave to the church of St. Peter a penny through every house in his dominion, which was called commonly Rome-scot or Peter-pence, paid to the church of St. Peter; and there at length was transformed from a king to a monk, about the year of our Lord 794 (with Kenred king

of Northumberland above-mentioned <sup>f1948</sup>); although some stories deny that he was a monk. <sup>f1949</sup>

After Offa king of Mercia, when he had reigned nine and thirty years, succeeded his son Egfert, who reigned but four months, of whom thus writeth the aforesaid Alcuin: <sup>f1950</sup> This noble young man died not so much for offenses of his own, as for that his father had spilled much blood to confirm him in his kingdom.”

Next to which Egfert succeeded Kenulph in the said kingdom of Mercia; which Kenulph keeping and retaining the hatred of Offs his predecessor against the men of Kent, made war upon them, where he took Eadbert their king, otherwise called Pren, whom he bound and led prisoner to Mercia. Notwithstanding, shortly after being mollified with princely clemency in the town of Winchcombe, where he had builded the same time a church, upon the day when he should dedicate the same in the presence of thirteen bishops, and of Cuthred, whom he had placed in the same kingdom of Canterbury before, and ten dukes, and many other great estates, king Kenulph brought the said Eadbert king of Kent out of prison into the church, where he enlarged him out of imprisonment, and restored him to his place again. At the sight whereof, not only Cuthred the aforesaid king rejoiced, but also all the estates and people being there present made such an exclamation of joy and gladness, that the church (and not only the church, but also the streets) rang withal. At which time such bountifulness of gifts and jewels was then bestowed, that from the highest estate to the lowest, none departed without something given, according as to every degree was thought meet. Although Fabian <sup>f1951</sup> referreth this story to king Offa, yet causes there be why I assent rather unto Malmesbury <sup>f1952</sup> and to Polychronicon, which attribute the same to Kenulph the second king of Mercia after Offa.

A little before, in speaking of certain bishops of Rome, mention was made of pope Constantine I., pope Gregory II., pope Gregory III., and of pope Zachary who deposed Childeric, and set up Pepin the French king. Next after this Zachary, in order, followed pope **Stephen II.**, <sup>a120</sup> to whom the aforesaid Pepin, to gratify again the see of Rome for this their benefit showed to him, gave and contributed to the said see of Rome the exarchate, or principedom, of Ravenna, <sup>f1953</sup> the kingdom of the Lombards, and many

other great possessions of Italy, with all the cities thereto adjoining unto the borders of Venice. And this donation of Pepin, no doubt, if the truth were rightly tried, should be found to be the same, which hitherto falsely hath been thought to be the donation of Constantine. For else, how could it be that the exarchate of Ravenna could belong all this while to the emperors of Constantinople, if Constantine, before, had given it and all Italy to the empyre of the see of Rome.

To this Pepin, as witnesseth Polychronicon, <sup>f1954</sup> was sent first into France the invention of the organs out of Greece, by Constantine V. emperor of Constantinople, A.D. 757.

Next to this Stephen II. succeeded Paul I., who, following his predecessors, thundered out great excommunication against Constantine V. the emperor of Constantinople, for abrogating and plucking down images set up in temples. Notwithstanding this, Constantine, neglecting the pope's vain curses, persevered in his blessed purpose, in destroying idolatry till the end of his life. Then came to be pope Constantine II., a layman, <sup>f1955</sup> and brother to Desiderius the king of Lombardy; for the which cause he was shortly deposed, and thrust into a monastery, having his eyes put out.

In whose stead succeeded Stephen III., who ordained <sup>f1956</sup> after, that no layman should be pope; condemning, moreover, the council of Constantinople (the seventh general) <sup>f1957</sup> for heretical, because in that council the worshipping of images was reprov'd and condemned. Contrary to the which council, this pope not only maintained the filthy idolatry of images in christian temples, but also advanced their veneration, commanding them most ethnically to be incensed. At this time Charlemagne, a little before mentioned, began to reign, by whom this pope caused Desiderius the Lombard king to be deprived.

**Then in this race of popes, after this Stephen III. cometh Adrian I., who likewise, following the steps of his fathers the popes, added and attributed to the veneration of images more than all the others had done before, writing a book for the adoration and utility proceeding of them, commanding them to be taken for laymen's calendars; <sup>f1958</sup> holding moreover a synod at Rome against Felix <sup>a121</sup> and all others that spake against the setting up of such stocks and images. And as Paul I.,**

before him, made much of the body of Petronilla, <sup>f1959</sup> St. Peter's daughter, so this Adrian clothed the body of St. Peter all in silver, and covered the altar of St. Paul with a pall of gold. This pope Adrian was he, whom we declared, in the former part of this treatise, <sup>f1960</sup> to ratify and confirm by revelation the order of St. Gregory's mass, above the order of St.

Ambrose's mass: for unto this time, which was about the year of our Lord 780, the liturgy of St. Ambrose was more used in the Italian churches. The story whereof, because it is registered in Durandus, Nauclerus, and Jacobus de Voragine, I thought here to insert the same to this especial purpose, for the reader to understand the time when this usual mass of the papists began first to be universal and uniform, and generally in churches to be received. <sup>f1961</sup> Thus it followeth in the story by the foresaid authors set forth. Jacobus de Voragine, in the life of pope Gregory I., telleth a tale concerning this matter.

“In times past,” saith he,” when the service which Ambrose made was more frequented and used in churches than was the service which Gregory had appointed, the bishop of Rome, then called Adrian, gathered a council together; in the which it was ordained, that Gregory's Service should be observed and kept universally. Which determination of the council Charles the emperor did diligently put in execution, while he ran about by divers provinces, and enforced all the clergy, partly with threatenings, and partly with punishments, to receive that order. And as touching the books of Ambrose's service, he burnt them to ashes in all places, and threw into prison many priests that would not consent and agree unto the matter. Blessed Eugene the bishop, coming unto the council, found that it was dissolved three days before his coming. Notwithstanding, through his wisdom he so persuaded the, lord pope, that he called again all the prelates that had been present at the council, and were now departed by the space of three days. Therefore when the council was gathered again together, in this all the fathers did consent and agree, that both the mass-books of Ambrose and Gregory should be laid upon the altar of blessed St. Peter the apostle, and the church doors diligently shut, and most warily sealed up with the signets of many and divers bishops. Again, that they should all the whole night give themselves to

prayer, that the Lord might reveal, open, and show unto them by some evident sign or token, which of these two services he would have used in the temples. Thus they, doing in all points as they had determined, in the morning opened the church doors, and found both the missals or mass-books open upon the altar: or rather, as some say, they found Gregory's mass-hook utterly plucked asunder, one piece from another, and scattered over all the church, <sup>f1962</sup> As touching Ambrose's book, they only found it open upon the altar in the very same place where they before laid it. This miracle pope Adrian, like a wise expounder of dreams, interpreted thus; that as the leaves were torn and blown abroad all the church over, so should Gregory's book be used throughout the world. Whereupon they thought themselves sufficiently instructed and taught of God, that the service which Gregory had made, ought to be set abroad and used throughout the world, and that Ambrose's service should only be observed and kept in his own church of Milan, where he sometime was bishop.

Thus hast thou heard, brother reader, the full and whole narration of this mystical miracle, with the pope's exposition upon the same; which seemeth to be as true as that which Daniel <sup>f1963</sup> speaketh of, how the idol Bel did eat up all the meat that was set before him all the night. Concerning the which miracle, I need not admonish thee to smell out the blind practices of these night-crows, to blind the world with forged inventions instead of true stories. Albeit to grant the miracle to be most true and infallible, yet as touching the exposition thereof, another man beside the pope perchance might interpret this great miracle otherwise, as thus: that God was angry with Gregory's book, and therefore rent it in pieces, and scattered it abroad; and the other as good, lay sound, untouched, and at the least so to be preferred. Notwithstanding, whatsoever is to be thought of this miracle with the exposition thereof, thus the matter fell out, that Gregory's service only had the place, and yet hath to this day, in the greatest part of Europe; the service of Ambrose being excluded. And thus much touching the great act of pope Adrian for the setting up of the mass; by the relation whereof, yet this knowledge may come to the reader, at least to understand how that commonly in christian nations abroad, as yet

no uniform order of any missal or mass-book was received, as hath been hitherto discoursed.

Now, from the popes to return again to the emperors, from whence we digressed: like as Pepin, the father of Charlemagne (as hath been before sufficiently told), had given to the papal see all the principedom of Ravenna, with other donations and revenues and lands in Italy; so this Charlemagne, following his father's devotion, did confirm the same; adding moreover thereunto, the city and dominion of Venice, Istria, the dukedom of Forojulien, <sup>f1964</sup> the dukedoms of Spoleto and Benevento, and other possessions more, to the patrimony of St. Peter, making him the prince of Rome and Italy. The pope again, to recompense his so gentle kindness, made him to be intituled "Most Christian King," and made him "Patricium Romanum;" moreover, ordained him only to be taken for emperor of Rome. For these and other causes more, Charlemagne bare no little affection to the said Adrian above all other popes; as may well appear by this letter of Charlemagne sent to king Offa, what time the said Offa (as is above prefixed) sent to him Alcuin for entreaty of peace: whereto the aforesaid Charlemagne answereth again to the message of Offa in a letter, the contents whereof be these:-

**THE TENOR OF A LETTER SENT BY CHARLEMAGNE TO KING OFFA, <sup>f1965</sup> ANSWERING TO HIS REQUEST CONCERNING THE TREATY OF PEACE BETWEEN THEM.**

Carolus Rex Francorum et: Longobardorum, patricius Romanorum, viro venerando et fratri charissimo Offae regi Merciorum salutem. Primo gratias agimus Omnipotenti Deo de Catholicae fidei sinceritate, quam in vestris laudabilibus paginis reperimus exaratam. De peregrinis vero, qui pro amore Dei et salute animarum suarum beatorum apostolorum limina desiderant adire, cum pace sine omni perturbatione vadant. Sed si aliqui religioni non servientes, sed luca sectantes, inveniantur inter eos, locis opportunis statuta solvant telonia. Negotiatores quoque volumus ut ex mandato nostro patrociniū habeant in regno nostro legitime, et si in aliquo loco injusta affligantur oppressione, reclament se ad nos vel nostros iudices, et plenam justitiam jubemus fieri. Cognoscat quoque dilectio vestra, quod aliquam benignitatem de dalmaticis nostris vel

palliis ad singulas sedes episcopales regni vestri vel Ethelredi direximus in eleemosynam domini apostolici Adriani, deprecantes ut pro eo intercedi jubeatis, nullam habentes dubitationem beatam illius animam in requie esse, sed ut fidem et dilectionem ostendamus in amicum nobis charissimum. Sed et de thesauro humanarum rerum, quem Dominus Jesus gratuita pietate concessit aliquid per metropolitanas civitates; direximus vestrae quoque dilectioni unum baltheum, et unum gladium, et duo pallia serica, etc.

The cause why this Charlemagne writeth so favorably of Adrian, partly is touched before; partly also it was because Caroloman his elder brother being dead, his wife called Bertha, <sup>f1966</sup> with her two children, came to Adrian, to have them confirmed in their father's kingdom; whereunto the pope, to show a pleasure to Charlemagne, would not agree, but gave the mother with her two children, and Desirerius the Lombard king with his whole kingdom, his wife and children, into the hands of the said Charlemagne, who led them with him captive into France, and there kept them in servitude during their life.

**Thus Charlemagne being proclaimed** <sup>a122</sup> emperor of Rome, through the preferment of pope Adrian I. and pope Leo III. (who succeeded next after him), the Empire was translated from the Grecians about the year of our Lord 800 unto the Frenchmen, where it continued about one hundred and two years, till the coming of Conrad and his nephew Otho, which were Germans; and so hath continued after them among the Almaines unto this present time. <sup>f1967</sup> This Charlemagne builded so many monasteries as there are letters in the row of "A B C;" he was beneficial chiefly to the churchmen; also merciful to the poor; in his acts valiant and triumphant; skilled in all languages. He held a council at Frankfort, where was condemned the council of Nice, and [the empress] Irene, for setting up and worshipping images, etc.

Concerning which council of Nice, and things there concluded and enacted (because no man shall think the detesting of images to be any new thing now begun), thus I find it recorded in an ancient History of Roger Hoveden, called "Continuationes Bedae:" his words be these: <sup>f1968</sup> —"In the year of our Lord 792 Charles the French king sent a book containing the acts of a certain synod, unto Britain, directed unto him from

Constantinople; in the which book (lamentable to be told) many things inconvenient, and clean contrary unto the true faith, are there to be found; especially for that, by the common consent of almost all the learned bishops of the East church, not so few as three hundred, it was there agreed, that images should be worshipped: which thing the church of God hath always abhorred. Against which book Albinus <sup>f1969</sup> wrote an epistle, substantially grounded out of the authority of holy Scripture, which epistle with the book the said Albinus, in the name and person of our bishops and princes, did present to the French king.”

And thus much by the way of Romish matters: now to return again to the Northumberland kings, where we left at Edbert, which Edbert (as is before declared) succeeded after Ceolulph, after he was made monk. And likewise the said Edbert also, following the devotion of his uncle Ceolwolp and of Kenred before him, was likewise shorn monk, after he had reigned twenty years in Northumberland; leaving his son Osulph after him to succeed. About which time, and in the same year when Ceolulph deceased in his monastery, which was the year of our Lord 764, divers cities were burnt with sudden fire, as the city of Venta, <sup>f1970</sup> the city of London, the city of York, Doncaster, with divers other towns besides. <sup>f1971</sup> In the first year of his reign (which was the year of our Lord 757), Osulph being innocently slain, next to him followed Mull, otherwise called Adelwald, who likewise, being slain of Alcred, after he had reigned eleven years departed. After, Alcred, when he had reigned ten years, was expelled out of his kingdom by his people. Then was Ethelbert, otherwise named Edelred, <sup>f1972</sup> the son of the foresaid Mull, received king of Northumberland; which Ethelbert or Edelred, in like sort, after he had reigned five years was expelled. After whom succeeded Alfwold, who, likewise, when he had reigned eleven years was unjustly slain. So likewise after him his nephew, and the son of Alcred, named Osred, reigned one year, and was slain. Then the foresaid Ethelbert, the son of Mull, after twelve years' banishment, reigned again in Northumberland the space of four years, and was slain. The cause whereof (as I find in an old written story) was that, forsaking his old wife, he married a new. Concerning the restoring of whom, Alcuin writeth in this manner: “Benedictus Deus qui facit mirabilia solus. Nuper Edelredus, filius Edelwaldi de carcere processit in solium, et de miseria in majestatem, cujus regni novitate detenti sumus ne veniremus ad vos,” etc. And afterward the

same Alcuin again speaking of his death, writeth unto king Offa in these words: “Sciat veneranda dilectio vestra quod dominus Carolus amabiliter et fideliter saepe mecum locutus est de vobis, et in eo habetis fidelissimum amicum. Ideo et vestrae directioni digna dirigit munera, et per episcopales sedes regni vestri; similiter et Edelredo regi, et ad suas episcoporum sedes direxit dons. Sed heu pro dolor, donis datis et epistolis in manus missorum, supervenit tristis legatio per missos qui de Scotia per nos reversi sunt, de infidelitate gentis, et nece regis. Its Carolus retracta donorum largitate in tantum iratus est contra gentem illam, ut sit, perfidam et perversam, et homicidam dominorum suorum, pejorem eam paganus aestimans, ut nisi ego intercessor essem pro ea, quicquid eis boni abstrahere potuisset, et mali machinari, jam fecisset,” etc.

### **THE KINGDOM OF NORTHUMBERLAND CEASETH.**

Thus, as you have heard, after the reign of king Edbert before-mentioned such trouble and perturbation was in the dominion of Northumberland, with slaying, expulsing, and deposing their kings one after another, that after the murdering of this Edelred above-specified none durst take the government upon him, seeing the great danger thereupon ensuing. Insomuch that the foresaid kingdom did lie void and waste, the space of three-and-thirty years together; after the term of which years, this kingdom of Northumberland, with the kingdoms also of the other Saxons besides, came altogether into the hands of Egbert, king of West-Saxons, and his progeny; which monarchy began A.D. 827, and in the eight-and-twentieth year of the reign of the said Egbert; whereof more shall be said (Christ willing) hereafter. Of this troublesome and outrageous time of Northumberland people speaketh also the said learned man Alcuin, otherwise called Albinus, in the same country born, writing out of France into England, and complaining of the same in divers of his letters; as first to Offs, where he thus writeth: “Ego paratus eram cum muneribus Caroli regis ad vos venire, et in patriam reverti. Sed melius visum est propter pacem gentis meae in peregrinatione remanere, nesciens quid fecissem inter eos, ubi nullus securus esse vel in salubri consilio proficere potest. Ecclesia sancta a paganis vastata, altaria perjuriiis foedata, monasteria adulteriis violata, terra sanguine Dominorum et principum foedata,” etc. Moreover, the said Alcuin, writing to the foresaid Edelred a little above mentioned,

after the same tenor reporteth: “Ecce ecclesia sancti Cutberti sacerdotum Dei sanguine aspersa (,omnibus spoliata ornamentis), locus cunctis in Britannia venerabilior, paganis gentibus datur ad depraedandum. Et ubi primum, post decessum S. Cutberti ab Eboraco, <sup>f1973</sup> Christiana religio in nostra gente sumpsit exordium, ibi miseriae et calamitatis coepit initium,” etc. Item, writing to Osbert a noble peer of the Mercians, complaining on the same matter, he saith: “Regnum nostrum Northumbrorum pene periit, propter intestinas dissensiones, et fallaces conjurationes,” etc. Item, in another place the said Alcuin, writing to Adelard archbishop of Canterbury, complaineth moreover: “Hoc dico propter flagellum, quod nuper accidit pattibus insulae nostrae, quae prope trecentis et quadraginta annis a parentibus inhabitata est nostris. Legitur in libro Gildae sapientissimi Britonum, quod iidem Britones, propter avaritiam et rapinam principum, propter iniquitatem et injustitiam iudicum, propter desidiam predicationis episcoporum, propter luxuriam et malos mores populi, patriam perdidere. Cavesinus haec eadem vitia nostris temporibus inolescere, quatenus benedictio divina nobis patriam conservet in prosperitate bona quam nobis misericordissima pietate perdonare dignatus est,” etc.

Over and besides, the same author, Alcuin, writing unto the foresaid Edelred, king of Northumberland, maketh record of a strange sight which he himself did see, the same time, in the city of York,—it rained blood: <sup>f1974</sup> whereof his words which he wrote concerning the same, unto the said king Edelred, be these: “What signifieth the rain-blood which in time of Lent, in the city of York, the chief city of that dominion, and in the church of St. Peter the chief of the apostles, we ourselves did see to fall from the church top (the element being clear) out of the north parts of the temple,” etc. This wondrous sight, testified by Malmesbury, is thought of Fabian to happen in the second year of the reign of Brightric, <sup>f1975</sup> (as with the time doth well agree), which was the year of our Lord 786, and is thought of some expositors to betoken the coming of the Danes into this land, who entered shortly after [; and again in] about seven years, in the ninth year of the reign of Brightric, king of the West-Saxons. Which Brightric, in defense thereof, sent forth his steward of his household with a small company, which shortly was slain: but by the strength of the said Brightric and the other Saxon kings, they were compelled to void the land for that time,

which was in the year 787. <sup>F1976</sup> To this Brightric king Offs, as is aforesaid, gave his daughter Edelburga, or Edburga, to wife, by whom he at length was impoisoned; besides certain other of his nobles, upon whom the said queen before him had practiced the same wickedness. Who then, after that, fled over to Charlemagne, into France; where she, being offered for her beauty to marry either to him or his son, because she choosed rather his son, married neither the one, nor yet the other, but was thrust into a monastery; where she, then playing the harlot with a monk, was expelled from thence, and ended her life in penury and misery.

In the mean time, while this Edelburga was thus working her feats in England, Irene, empress of the Greeks, was as busy also for her part at Constantinople: who first, through the means of pope Adrian, took up the body of Constantine V., emperor of Constantinople, her own husband's father; and when she had burned the same, she caused the ashes to be cast into the sea, because he disannulled images. Afterwards, reigning with her son Constantine the Sixth, son to Leo the Fourth (whom also we declared before to be excommunicated for taking away images), being at dissension with him, she caused him to be taken and laid in prison; who afterward through power of friends being restored to his empire again, at last she caused the same her own son to be cast into prison, and his eyes to be put out so cruelly, that within short space he died. <sup>F1977</sup> After this the said Irene empress, with the counsel of Tarasius bishop of Constantinople, held a council at Nice, where it was decreed, that images should again be restored unto the church; which council after was repealed by another council holden at Francfort by Charlemagne. At length she was deposed by Nicephorus (who reigned after), and was ex-pulsed the empire; who, after the example of Edelburga abovementioned, condignly punished for her wickedness, ended likewise her life in much penury and misery.

About the time when the foresaid Brightric was impoisoned by Edelburga his wife, died also king Offa, which was about the year of our Lord 795, or (as some say) 802. After which Offa (as is aforesaid) succeeded Egfert; then Kenulph: after whom succeeded Kenelm his son, <sup>f1978</sup> who in his younger age was wickedly murdered by his sister Quendrida <sup>f1979</sup> and Askebert, about the year of our Lord 819, and in the church of Winchcombe was counted for a holy martyr. After him succeeded his uncle Ceolulph, whom Bernulph in the first year of his reign expelled, and

reigned in his place. Who likewise, in the third year of his reign, was overcome, and expelled by Egbert king of the West-Saxons, and afterward slain by the East-Angles. And the kingdom of Mercia also ceased, and came into the hands of the West-Saxons.

Hitherto I have brought (as thou seest, good reader) the confused and turbulent reigns of these seven Saxon kings, who, after the expulsion of the Britons, ruled and reigned asunder in sundry quarters of this land together, unto this present time of Egbert king of the West-Saxons, by whom it pleased God to begin to reduce and unite all these scattered kingdoms into one monarchical form of dominion. Wherefore, as in the aforesaid Egbert beginneth a new alteration of the commonwealth here in this land among the Saxons, so my purpose is (the Lord willing), with the same Egbert to enter a new beginning of my third book, after a brief recapitulation first made of such things as in this second book before are to be collected and noted, especially touching the monasteries builded, the kings who have entered the life and profession monastic; also queens and queens' daughters, who the same time professed solitary life in monasteries, which they or their ancestors had erected.

### **THE CONCLUSION OF THE PRECEDING STORY, CONCERNING THE SEVEN KINGDOMS OF THE SAXON KINGS, ABOVE MENTIONED.**

And thus hast thou, gentle reader, concerning the seven kingdoms of these Saxons, ruling all together in England, the course and order of their doings briefly described and discoursed unto thee, in such order, as the matter being so intricate, in such confusion and diversity of things incident together, would permit: following especially in this story hitherto the line of the Northumberland kings, as the other stories most follow the line of West-Saxon kings. The which seven kingdoms of these said Saxons, after they had untruly expelled and chased out the Britons from their land, like as they never were in quietness among themselves (reigning thus together) till the time of this Egbert; so also, after the reign of Egbert, the whole realm being reduced into one regiment, no less were they impugned and afflicted by the Danes continually from time to time, till the last conquest of William the Norman. Thus it pleased God (ever lightly <sup>f1980</sup>) to revenge with blood bloody violence, and the unjust dealings of men with just and like retribution. But of this let the christian reader consider, as God's grace

shall work in him. In the mean time we, as much as in us did lie, satisfying the part of an historian, have thus hitherto set forth and declared concerning these seven foresaid kingdoms: first, the names and lineal descent of the kings severally by themselves, as by the table precedent may appear: then, what were the doings and acts of the same; how first being pagans, they were converted to the christian faith; what things in their time happened in the church; how many of them, of kings were made monks; how devout they were then to holy church and to the churchmen, and especially to the church of Rome. But the churchmen then were much otherwise in life, than afterward they declared themselves to be. Through which devotion of the said kings, first came in the Peter-pence or Rome-scots in this realm, as by Ina first in his dominion, then by Offa in his lordship, and afterwards by Ethelwulph were brought in and ratified through the whole realm: where also is to be noted, that by the foresaid kings and queens of the said Saxons the most part of the greatest abbeys and nunneries in this realm, were first begun and builded; as partly, by the names of some, here follow to be seen.

First, the church or minster of St. Paul in London was founded by Ethelbert king of Kent, and Sebert king of Essex, about the year of our Lord 604. <sup>f1981</sup>

The first cross and altar within this realm was first set up in the north parts in Hevenfield, <sup>f1982</sup> upon the occasion of Oswald king of Northumberland fighting against Cadwalla, where he, in the same place, set up the sign of the cross, kneeling and praying there for victory. <sup>f1983</sup>

The church of Winchester was first begun and founded by Kinegils or Cynegils, king of the West-Saxons, having seven miles about it: after, finished by his son Kenwalc, where Wine of Englishmen was first bishop, A.D. 668. <sup>f1984</sup>

The church of Lincoln first founded by Paulinus bishop, A.D. 629. <sup>f1985</sup> The church of Westminster began first by a certain citizen of London, through the instigation of Ethelbert king of Kent, which before was an isle of thorns, <sup>f1986</sup> A.D. 614.

The common schools first erected at Cambridge, by Sigebert king of East-Angles, A.D. 686.

The abbey of Cnobbersburg builded by Fursey the hermit, A.D. 637. <sup>F1987</sup>

The monastery of Malmesbury by one Meydulph, a Scot, about the year of our Lord 640: afterward enlarged by Agilbert bishop of Winchester.

The monastery in Gloucester, first builded by Osric king of Mercia, <sup>f1988</sup> as Cestrensis saith; but, as William of Malmesbury writeth, <sup>f1989</sup> by Wolfer and Ethelred, brethren to Kineburga abbess of the same house. A.D. 679.

The monastery of Melrose, by the flood of Tweed, by Aidan a Scottish bishop.

The nunnery of Heortheu, by Heiu, who was the first nun in Northumberland. <sup>f1990</sup>

The monastery of Hertsey <sup>f1991</sup> by Oswy king of Northumberland; who also, with his daughter Elfrida, gave possessions for twelve monasteries in the parts of Northumberland, A.D. 656.

The monastery of St. Martin in Dover, builded by Whitred king of Kent.

The abbey of Lestinghen <sup>f1992</sup> by Ceadda (whom we call St. Ced) through the grant of Oswald, son to St. Oswald, king of Northumberland, A.D. 651.

The monastery of Whitby, called otherwise Steaneshalch, by Hilda, daughter to [Heretic] the nephew of Edwin king of Northumberland, A.D. 657. <sup>F1993</sup>

Item, another monastery called Hacanos, <sup>f1994</sup> not far from the same place, builded by the said Hilda the same year.

The abbey of Abingdon, builded by Cissa <sup>f1995</sup> king of South-Sax, A.D. 666.

Item, an abbey in the east side of Lincoln, called Icanno, <sup>f1996</sup> by St. Botulph, <sup>f1997</sup> A.D. 654.

The monastery in Ely, founded by Etheldred, or Etheldrida, daughter of Anna king of East-Angles, and the wife of Egfrid, king of Northumberland, A.D. 674.

The monastery of Chertsey in Southery, founded by Erkenwald, bishop of London, A.D. 674: thrown down by the Danes; after re — EDified by king Edgar.

Item, the nunnery of Barking, edified by the said Erkenwald, bishop of London, about the same time.

The abbey of Peterborough, called otherwise Modehamsted, founded by king Ethelred, <sup>f1998</sup> king of the Mercians, A.D. 675.

Bardney abbey, by Ethelred king of the Mercians, A.D. 700. Glastenbury, by Ira or Ina king of the West-Saxons; and after, repaired and enriched by king Edgar, A.D. 701.

Ramsey in the time of king Edward, by one Ailwin a nobleman, A.D. 975. King Edgar builded in his time forty monasteries; who reigned, A.D. 901.

The nunnery of Winburne builded by Cuthburga sister to Ingil-sus, king Ina's brother, A.D. 717. <sup>F1999</sup>

The monastery of Sealesey by the isle of Wight, by Willrid archbishop of York, A.D. 678.

The monastery of Winchcombe by Kenulph king of the Mercians, A.D. 797.

St. Alban's builded by Offa king of the Mercians, A.D. 755.

The abbey of Evesham by Egwin, bishop [of Worcester,] A.D. 691. Ripen in the north by Wilfrid, archbishop, A.D. 709.

The abbey of Ethelinge, <sup>f2000</sup> by king Alured, or Alfred, A.D. 89]. The nunnery of Shaftesbury by the same Alfred, the same year. Thus ye see what monasteries, and in what time, began to be founded by the Saxon kings, newly converted to the christian faith, within the space of two hundred years; who, as they seemed then to have a certain zeal and devotion to God-ward, according to the leading and teaching that then was, so it seemeth again to me, two things to be wished in these foresaid kings; first, that they which began to erect these monasteries and cells of monks and nuns, to live solely and singly by themselves out of the holy state of matrimony, had foreseen what danger, and what absurd enormities might, and also did, thereof ensue, both publicly to the church of Christ, and privately to their own souls: secondly, that unto this their zeal and devotion had been joined like knowledge and doctrine in Christ's gospel, especially in the article of our free justification by the faith of Jesus Christ;

because of the lack whereof, as well the builders and founders thereof, as they that were professed in the same, seem both to have run the wrong way, and to have been deceived. For albeit in them there was a devotion and zeal of mind, that thought well in this their doing, which I will not here reprehend, yet the end and cause of their deeds and buildings cannot be excused, being contrary to the rule of Christ's gospel; forsomuch as they did these things seeking thereby merits with God, and for remedy of their souls, and remission of their sins, as may appear testified in their own records, whereof one here I thought to set forth for probation of the same. Read this chart (if it please thee, gentle reader) of king Ethelbald's donation, given to churches and religious persons; which Ethelbald was the builder (as is said <sup>f2001</sup>) of Peterborough. The words of his record and instrument be these.

### **THE DONATIONS AND PRIVILEGES GRANTED AND GIVEN BY KING ETHELBALD TO RELIGIOUS MEN OF THE CHURCH.** <sup>F2002</sup>

Plerumque contingere solet, pro incerta temporum vicissitudine, ut ea quae multarum fidelium personarum testimonio consilioque roberata fuerint, fraudulenter per contumaciam plurimorum, et machinamenta simulationis, sine ulla consideratione rationis, periculose dissipentur, nisi auctoritate literarum, testamento chirographorum, aeternae memoriae committantur. Quapropter, ego Ethelbaldus rex Merciorum, pro amore coelestis patriae et remedio animae meae, studendum esse praevidi, ut eam pro bona opera liberam efficerem in omni vinculo delictorum. Quoniam enim mihi omnipotens Deus per misericordiam clementiae suae, absque ullo antecedente merito, scepra regiminis largitus est, ideo libenter ei, ex eo quod dedit, retribuo. Hujus rei gratia hanc donationem, me vivente, concedo, ut omnia monasteria et ecclesiae regni mei a publicis vectigalibus, et operibus, et oneribus absolvantur; nisi instructionibus arcium, vel pontium, quae nulli relaxari unquam possunt. Praeterea, habeant famuli Dei propriam libertatem in fructibus sylvarum et agrorum, et in captura piscium, ne munuscula praebeant vel regi, vel principibus, nisi voluntaria; sed liberi Deo serviant, etc.

By the contents hereof may well be understood (as where he saith, “Pro amore coelestis patriae, pro remedio animae, pro liberatione animae, et absolutione delictorum,” etc.) how great the ignorance and blindness of these men was, who, lacking no zeal, only lacked knowledge to rule it withal; seeking their salvation not by Christ only, but by their own deservings and meritorious deeds. Which I recite not here to any infamy or reprehension of them, but rather to put us in mind and memory, how much we, at this present, are bound to God for the true sincerity of his truth, hidden so long before to our fore-ancestors, and opened now unto us by the good will of our God, in his Son Christ Jesus. This only lamenting by the way, to see them to have such works, and to lack our faith; and us to have the right faith, and to lack their works. And this blind ignorance of that age, thus above pre-noted, was the cause not only why these kings builded so many monasteries upon zealous superstition, but also why so many of them, forsaking their orderly vocation of princely regiment, gave themselves over to monastical profession, or rather wilful superstition. Concerning the names and number of which kings that were professed monks, is sufficiently in the story before declared: the names of whom we showed to be seven or eight, within the space of these: two hundred years. Such was then the superstitious devotion of kings and princes in that age; arid no less also to be noted in queens and kings’ daughters, with other noble women of the same age and time; the names of whom it were too long here to recite: <sup>F2003</sup> as Hilda, daughter to [Hereric] the nephew of Edwin king of Northumberland, abbess of Ely: Ercongota with her sister Ermenilda, daughters of Ercombert king of Kent, which Ercongota was professed in St. Briget’s order in France: Item, Ethelberga, wife and queen to Edwin king of Northumberland, and daughter of Ethelbert king of Kent, which was also in the same house of St. Briget made a nun: Item, Etheldreda, whom we term St. Eldred [or Audrey], wife to Egfrid king of Northumberland, [and daughter of Anna, king of East-Angles]; who, being married to two husbands, could not be obtained to give her consent to either of them, during the space of twelve years, but would needs live a virgin, and was professed nun at Ely. <sup>F2004</sup> Sexburga, [another] daughter of king Anna, and wife of Ercombert king of Kent, was abbess at Ely. Werburga was the daughter of Wolfer king of Mercians, and made nun at Ely. Kinedreda, sister of king Wolfer, and Kineswida her sister were both nuns professed. Elfrida, daughter of Oswy king of Northumberland, was

abbess of Whitby: Elfleda, [another] daughter of king Oswy, and wife of Peda son of king Penda, likewise enclosed herself in the same profession and vow of Romish chastity. <sup>f2005</sup> Mildreda, Milburga, and Milguida, all three daughters of Merwald, <sup>f2006</sup> king of West-Mercians, entered the profession and vow of nunnish virginity. Kineburga wife of Alfrid king of Northumberland, and sister <sup>f2007</sup> to Osric king of Mercians, and daughter of king Penda, was professed abbess of the monastery in Gloucester.

Likewise Alfrida wife to king Edgar, and Editha daughter to the said Edgar, with Wolfride her mother, etc. All which holy nuns with divers more the Romish Catholics have canonized for saints, and put the most part of them in their Calendar, only because of the vow of their chastity solemnly professed. Concerning which chastity, whether they kept it or no, little I have to say against them, and less to swear for them. But whether they so kept it or not, if this gift of chastity. which they professed were given them of God, worthy small praise was it in them to keep it: and if it were not given them, I will not say here of them so much, as hath been said by some others, which sufficiently have painted out to the world the demeanour of these holy votaries. But this I will say, that although they kept it never so perfectly, yet it is not that which maketh saints before God, but only the blood of Christ Jesus, and a true faith in him.

Likewise remaineth that, as we have declared the devotion of these noble women, who professing monastic life, have cast off all worldly dignity and delights: so we should also entreat of such noblemen, who among the Saxon kings in like zeal of devotion, have given over themselves from the world (as they thought) unto the contemplative life of monkish profession. The names of whom as in the catalogue of the Saxon kings before is described, be these, to the number of nine.

#### **A TABLE OF SUCH SAXON KINGS AS WERE AFTER MADE MONKS.**

1. Kinigilsus, or Cynegils, king of West-Saxons.
2. Ina, king of West-Saxons.
3. Ceolulf, king of Northumberland.
4. Edbert, king of Northumberland.
5. Ethelred, king of Mercia.
6. Kenred, king of Mercia.
7. Offa, king of East-Saxons.

8. Sebbi, <sup>f2008</sup> king of East-Saxons.

9. Sigebert, king of East-Angles.

Of which kings and their doings what is to be judged, look, gentle reader, before.

By these histories it is apparent, what mutations, what perturbations, and what alterations of state have been in this realm of Britain, first from British kings, to Romans; then to British again; afterward to the Saxons. First, to seven altogether reigning; then to one, etc. And this alteration not only happened in the civil government, but also followed in the state ecclesiastical: for, as in the Britons' time, the metropolitan see was in London, so in the Saxons' time, after the coming of Augustine, it was removed to Canterbury: the catalogue and order of which metropolitans, from the time of Augustine to Egbert, is thus, as in the history of William of Malmesbury it is described. <sup>F2009</sup>

The Names and Order of the Archbishops of Canterbury from Augustine, to the time of King Egbert.

A.D	NAME	YEARS
596	Augustine	16
604	Laurentius	5
619	Mellitus	5
624	Justus	3
634	Honorius	25
654	Deusededit	9
668	Theodore	22

Hitherto from Augustine all the Archbishops of Canterbury were Italians and Foreigners.

A.D	NAME	YEARS
693	Berctuald <sup>f2010</sup> (English)	37
731	Tatwine	3

<b>735</b>	Nothelm	<b>5</b>
<b>742</b>	Cuthbert <sup>f2011</sup>	<b>17</b>
<b>759</b>	Bregowine	<b>3</b>
<b>768</b>	Lamhright or Lambert <sup>f2012</sup>	<b>27</b>
<b>793</b>	Ethelard <sup>f2013</sup>	<b>13</b>
<b>803</b>	Ulfred	<b>28</b>
<b>830</b>	Feologild <sup>f2014</sup>	<b>3 mo.</b>
<b>830</b>	Celnoth	<b>41</b>

During the course of these seventeen archbishops of Canterbury, in Rome passed in the mean time four and thirty popes, of whom partly heretofore we have declared.

And thus much touching the time of the seven kingdoms of the Saxons, ruling together in England, from the reign of Hengist unto Egbert, the first king and monarch of the whole land, after the expulsion of the Britons.

Now remaineth (by the grace of Christ) in the next book following, to prosecute the order of such kings, as, principally reigning alone, had this realm in their possession, from the time of Egbert king of West-Saxons, to the coming of William, the Norman conqueror; comprehending therein the rest of the next three hundred years, with the acts and state of religion, as in that space was in the church: wherein may appear the declining time of the church, and of true religion; preparing the way to Antichrist, which not long after followed. For here is to be noted, that during yet this mean

time, Satan (as is said) was bound up from his raging and furious violence; counting from the time of Constantine, to the next loosing out of Satan, which was foretold by the revelation of St. John abovementioned to be a thousand years; whereof in the order of the history (Christ granting) more shall be said hereafter.

**END OF BOOK THE SECOND**

## APPENDIX

**APP1** “*Digest and compile.*”]—This expression truly describes the nature of Foxe’s Work, which is—not a flowing history, the production of one man’s mind and one man’s pen, but—a “Compilation” of documents and passages from a vast variety of sources, the whole “digested” into a chronological series. Foxe himself confesses to much haste in the original construction of the Work, and he was compelled to avail himself of the assistance of other persons, some of whom were incompetent to their task. Under these circumstances, the wonder with every candid reader will be—not, that many oddities, obscurities, and errors, are to be found in so large a compilation, but—that it is so valuable as it really is. the blemishes alluded to are, indeed, chiefly confined to the earlier portion of the “Acts and Monuments,” which consists very much of translations from works of Greek and Latin writers, some of which at that period existed only in manuscript. These blemishes have till of late excited little notice or observation, owing to the circumstance that the work, valuable as it was on other accounts, was chiefly resorted to for the account of our English martyrs. Modern criticism, however, has laid bare these defects with an unsparing hand, and in a manner which might lead some persons to regard the work as altogether valueless, and to treat with undeserved neglect a most valuable treasury of documents and facts illustrative of the history and character of the Great Romish Apostasy. An attempt, therefore, has been made in this Edition to discover such blemishes, as far as possible, by having recourse to Foxe’s own alleged authorities and other authentic sources of information. The result of such an investigation has been, that many errors have been discovered which were evidently the effect of haste or incompetence on the part of translators, of whose assistance Foxe was compelled to avail himself; others (and those not a few) evidently arose from his adherence to the statement of the author whom he was following. Many of his errors are actually the errors of the writers whom he copies. It is obvious, also, that, where different writers vary in their accounts of the same matter, Foxe’s faithful adoption of each would produce an

inconsistence between different parts of his own work, which he did not always perceive, or had not leisure to rectify. It has not been deemed necessary to notice, in detail, every correction which has been made; but some reference is usually given in the Notes or in the Appendices, which may be consulted by readers desirous of seeing the grounds of any alteration made; while particular notice is taken of some of the more serious corrections, in order to give the reader an insight into the plan which has been pursued, and to satisfy him that changes have not been made wantonly.

**APP2** The author repeats this five-fold division of ecclesiastical history at the opening of the first book (p. 88), wherein he treats of the first period: this division is, however, lost sight of in the subsequent arrangement of the work, which is made chiefly with reference to the epochs of English history. It is worthy of observation, that his fourth and fifth periods partly synchronize; else they would carry us down to about A.D. 1680, long after the author's decease: the fourth reaches from A.D. 1000 to A.D. 1400, the fifth from A.D. 1270 or 1300 to Foxe's own time. It is remarkable, too, that in this place and at p. 88 he assigns A.D. 1000 as the period of Satan's "loosing out:" whereas, in every other instance (it is believed) he assigns A.D. 1300. This difference is to be traced to the change which took place in our author's views of the Apocalyptic prophecies. His first view (and, as he states *infra*, vol. 4 p. 724, the current view), reckoned the millennium, or the thousand years of Satan's restraint, from the nativity or passion of Christ. It appears from his own account (*infra*, p. 289-292), that, while engaged in writing the narrative of the ten early persecutions, he was led to adopt a different view, which supposed the thousand years to commence at the ceasing of persecution under Constantine, A.D. 324. To this last view he ever afterwards adhered. See vol. 2:724-727; vol. 4 107, 108. He probably forgot to alter or expunge these early passages which proceeded on his first view. Full information on the various interpretations of the Apocalyptic prophecies, formerly current, will be found in Bishop Hall's treatise, intituled "The Revelation Un-revealed," and in the first chapter of Archbishop Usher's work, "De Statu et Succ. Christ. Eccles."

**APP3** “*Pighius, Hosius ...*”]—Albertus Pighius was a Dutch divine of much eminence. According to Beza he sought a cardinal’s hat by writing against the Reformers. He had the misfortune, however, to have his own treatises put in the Spanish Index Expurgatorius, for their disagreement with S. Augustine: he was considered also as having had his principles corrupted by reading the writings of the Reformers.— See *Bayle, v. Pighius: also Possevini, App. Sac.*

Stanislaus Hosius, a native of Cracow, a man of great talents and accomplishments. He became bishop of Culm, and afterward of Warmia. He was a zealous advocate of the Romish Church, and was made cardinal of St. Lawrence by Pius IV., who sent him as his legate to open and preside in the Council of Trent. He died in 1579, aged 70. His writings fill two folio volumes; first published at Cologne, in 1584.— See *Bayle, v. Hosius.*—Pighius and Hosius are referred to in vol. 6 p. 505, note (4.)

**APP4** As many specimens of logical reasoning occur in the course of the “Acts and Monument,” the technicalities of which may perplex general readers, it may be well to observe that in logic arguments are framed with the help of certain contrivances termed “figures” and “moods,” and that logicians have employed certain mnemonic words, which indicate the combinations of “figure” and “mood” fitted to produce sound arguments. (See p. 46, for a specimen of a false argument.) These mnemonic words are strung together in the following hexameters:-

Fig. 1. Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferioque, prioris:

2. Cesare, Camestres, Festino, Baroco, secundae: tertia, Darapti, Disamis, Datisi, Felapton,

3. Bokardo, Feriso, habet: quarta insuper addit

4. Bramantip, Cameues, Dimaris, Felapo, Fresison.

*Encyc. Metrop.* PURE SCIENCES, vol. 1 p. 210.

**APP5** The passage in the text to which this note applies, is very obscure, as written by Foxe. It reads thus in the edition of 1570, page 3, col. 2: “Of the which two ages and states of the Romaine church, the first I cal the primitiue church of Rome The other I cal the latter church of Rome, countyng this latter church from the thousand yeares after Christ expired, from which time Satan hath been let louse accordyng to

the prophecy of the 20th chapter of S. Johns Revelation. And thus halle ye the church of Rome parted into two churches, in double respect and consideration of two sondry states and times.” It is clear that Foxe here intended the second 600 years to be reckoned from about A.D. 1000, the period at which he originally considered the millennium to close, and “Satan to be loosed out.” (See Appendix on p. 4, note (4.)) On the revision of his work for republication in 1576, he made a two-fold deviation from the above reading. First, the clauses just quoted from the edition of 1570, page 3, col. 1, are thus varied in the edition of 1576: Of the which two ages and states of the Romaine Church, the first I call the primitiue Church of Rome. The other I call the latter Church of Rome, countyng this latter Church from the thousand yeares expired after the bindyng up of Sathan, to the tyme of his lousing agayne accordyng to the Prophetie of the 20th chap. of S. Johns Revelation And thus haue ye the Church of Rome parted into two Churches, in double respect and consideration of two sondry states and tymes. Secondly, Foxe inserts in the dotted hiatus the following entirely new clause:” “countyng these. 1000. yeares from the ceasing of persecution, under Constantinus Magnus, to the begynnyng of persecution of the Church agayne under Innocentins III. and Ottomannus the first Turcian Emperor.” It is observable that Foxe, for the first time, introduces into that same edition (of 1576) the narrative of his change of views respecting the apocalyptic prophecies, which occurs *infra*, pp. 289-292. It may be supposed, therefore, that his mind was much occupied with that subject, and that he hastily introduced the above clause, containing his second view of the time of the “loosing out of Satan,” not perceiving that the effect of its introduction would be to bring down the latter church of Rome to A.D. 1800 or 1900; that is, to 200 or 300 years after his own time. For Innocent III., (who lived A.D. 1200,) Boniface VIII. (who lived A.D. 1300, and contemporaneously with Ottoman I.) has been substituted in this edition, conformably to other passages of Foxe.

**APP6** The original Latin of this passage, respecting the sources of papal revenue, is given by Illyricus from Car. Mol. in his “Cat. Test.” (edit. 1608), cols. 1952-1955.

**APP 7** “*By reason of all which ... men conjecture.*”]—It will be satisfactory to the reader to see the original text of this paragraph, and the Latin of Carolus Molinaeus, from which the new and amended text is furnished.

Foxe, Edit. 1583, p. 3.]—”Fourthently, for grauntyng out Buls and Commissions of new foundations, or for changyng of the old, for reducyng regular Monasteries, to a secular state, or for restoryng agayne into the old, and for other infinite rescriptes and writes, about matters dependyng in controversie, and otherwise might and ought by the Ordinary to be decided.

“Fiftently, for geving the palle to Archbishops newly elected, by reason of all whiche devises (besides the first of the Annates) it hath been accounted out of the kinges recordes in Fraunce, in the tyme of Ludovike the 9th. (as testifieth Molineus) to the number of two hundred thousand crownes, onely out of Fraunce payd and transported to Rome. which summe since that time hath bene doubled and tripled, besides Annates and Palles, whiche altogether are thought to make the totall summe, yearely goyng out of Fraunce to the Popes coffers, of late yeares, 10. myriades, or millions, every myriade mounting to 10. thousand crownes. Now, what hath risen besides in other Realmes and Nations, let other men coniecture.”

The following is the passage in Carolus Molinaeus, on which the amended text is grounded:—

14. “... Quae jure communi per ordinarios expediri deberent. Ex quibus, etiam non computato primo annatum articulo, tempore Ludovici undecimi inventum est, ultra ducenta millia aureorum singulis annis regno efferri. Quare idem Rex omnino vetuit Romam quicquam deferri, vel ullam bullam inde avehi. Certum est autem, hodie quantitatem illam ad minus duplicatam esse, tam propter augmentationem populi, plus media parte ab illo tempore aucti, quam propter augmentationem taxarum curiae Romanae. Postquam autem locum pragmaticae subintravit concordatum, et sic locus apertus est annatis, coepit ultra quantitatem praecedentem (quae circiter quater centum millia aureorum ascendit) alia similis quantitas annatarum nomine extrahi.

15. “Praeterea coeperunt multi curiae Romanae aulici, archiepiscopus, episcopus, abbatias, et pinguiora beneficia regni

possidere, quorum reditus singulis annis regno evehuntur: ita quod singulis annis fere decem myriades (quem milionem vocant) soleant regno Romam evehi.”

“Decem myriades” is a slip of the pen: the French edition of Carolus Molinaeus, published ten years after the Latin, reads “Dix cent mille.”

**APP8** “*Saint Louis,*” *i.e.* Louis IX.I—”S. Ludovico,” Molinaeus. Foxe, by mistake, says” Louis the Pious,” who was Louis I.

**APP9** “*Pragmatick Sanction.*”]—”The late King Charles VII., willing to follow the Council of Basil, had summoned a parliament at Bitures, where, by the full consent of all the states in France, both Spiritual and Temporal, a certain constitution was decreed and published, called the Pragmatick Sanction, wherein was comprehended briefly the pith of all the Canons and Decrees concluded in the Council of Basil, of which constitution I hinted before. The same the said King Charles commanded to be observed and ratified inviolably throughout all his Realm, for the honor and increase of Christian Religion for ever. Now King Lewis XI., successor to Charles, had promised before (being Dauphin,) unto Pope Pius the Second, called before Eneas Sylvius, that if ever he came to the crown, the aforesaid Pragmatick Sanction should be abolished. Pope Pius hearing him to be crowned, sent unto him John Balveus, a Cardinal, with his letters patent, willing him to be mindful of his former promise. The King hereupon directed the Pope’s letters patent with the said Cardinal to the Council of Paris, requiring them to consult upon the cause. The matter being proposed in the Parliament House, the King’s Attorney, named Joannes Romanus, a learned and eloquent man, proved the said sanction to be profitable, good and necessary for the wealth of the Realm, and in no case to be abolished. Unto whose sentence the University of Paris adjoining their consent, did appeal from the attempts of the Pope to the next general council. The Cardinal fretting thereat returned to the Pope, his purpose being not obtained. And the same King Lewis, Anno. 1463, to secure himself from the censures of the said Pope, with the advice of his Parliament ordained an *Arrest* that the Cardinal of Constance should be punished because he had resisted the Rights and Authorities of the King, saith Mr, John du Tillet.”—*Ecelesiastical History of France*, p. 173, by G. G. 4to. printed 1676.

**APP10** “*Constantine IV. Emperor of Constantinople.*”]—So Molinaeus; Foxe erroneously reads, “Constantine the fourth Emperor.”

**APP11** The original sentence in Foxe reads thus (edition 1583, p. 4.):—  
 “First, for that it is taken out of the Popes Bibliothe-earle, a suspected place and collected by the keeper and maister of the Popes Libratie, a suspected author, who whatsoever fayned writynges or Apocripha he could finde, etc.” Molinaeus’s words are, “Mutuatus e Bibliothecario Romano, suspecto authore.” ... At line 10 from bottom of next page Foxe correctly enough renders the expression, “the master of the Pope’s library,” which is placed here in the margin, instead of “The Pope’s bibliothecary.” The author alluded to is “Anastasius, sub., Stephano 3 pontifice Romanae Ecclesiae bibliothecarius: claruit anno 754. Cave Hist. Litt. He wrote “De vitis pontificum a Petro usque ad Nicholaum I.,” undertaken by order of the latter. This, with his “Historia Ecclesiastica,” was printed at Paris, fol. 1649. The following passages from his lives of Benedict II. and Conon will illustrate the text. “Hie (Benedictus) suscepit divales jussiones clementissimi Constan-tini Magni Principis ad venerabilem Clerum, et populum, atque felicissimum exercitum Romanae civitatis, per quas concessit, ut persona qui electus fuerit ad sedem Apostolicam e vestigio absque tarditate Pontifex ordinetur,” p. 57.—”Videns, autem, exercitus unanimtatem Cleri, populique in decreto ejus sub-scribentium, post aliquot dies, et ipsi flexi sunt, et missos pariter una cum clericis et ex populo ad excellentissimum Theodorum exarchum, ut mos est, direxerunt.” p. 5.

**APP12** In the original text of Foxe (edition 1583, p. 5, col. 2) the words, “Res Ecclesiae vota sunt fidelium, pretia peccatorum, et patrimonia pauperum,” which are here brought down into the note, form part of the text, and introduce the translation. “Pretia peccatorum” Foxe interprets as meaning, “prices to raunsome such as be in captiuitie or prison.” He was probably led to put this construction upon the words by the commentary made upon them by Jacobus Selestadiensis, in his Epistle to the Emperor Maximilian, of which a translation is given by Foxe, infra, vol. 4 pp. 14, 15. It is right to state, that in that translation there is nothing corresponding to the words “pretia peccatorum,” though they occur in the original Epistle of Selestadiensis (see the

“Fasciculus” of Orth. Grat., and Freheri Script. Germ. tom. ii.), and are cited here by Foxe himself in juxta-position with his English version of them.

**APP13** “*Like an Emperor.*”]—Boniface became Pope of Rome, A. D. 1294 or 95 (see *Pauli Langii Chron. Citizense*, p. 1193, in the *Rerum German. Scripp.* tom. 1. edit. Ratisb. 1726), a more propitious year to him than 1298, according to the *Magnum Chron. Belgicum* in the same collection, tom. 3 p. 298.

**APP14** “*Unto this Lothaire Pope Leo IV. maketh suit.*”]—The note of Boehmer, in his edition of the *Jus Canonicum*, corrects a slight mistake here made in attributing this request to Pope Leo IV:—

“Sed hoc decretum Lotharii, quod corr. Romans cum Baronio datum fuisse existimant ad postulationem *Leonis IV.*, quodque illi ex codice LL. Longobard. descripserunt, diu ante promulgatum fuisse observat Baluzius, quam idem Pontifex in sede pontificali locaretur. Conditum erim fuit a *Lothario* an. Dcccxxiv. *Eugenii II.* temporibus, ut Holstenius in collect. Romans p. II. p. 218, refert, et ipsa capitula *Lotharii* ex eodem repetit *Pagi* in Crit. ad Baron. ad an. 824. sect. 3.”—*Corpus Jur. Canon.* edit. Halae Magdeb. 1747.

**APP15** “*Ranking above the Bishop of Alexandria.*”]—Foxe here reads, “in the room of the Bishop of Antioch,” but on what authority does not appear. The canons of the council of Nice, which will be found quoted in the note following this, represent that there were at that time three chief patriarchates, those of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch, while Jerusalem (which was really under the patriarch of Antioch) enjoyed a quasi-patriarchal dignity. The third canon of the council of Constantinople subsequently assigned to the Bishop of Constantinople the second rank among the patriarchs: the canon is in Labbe ii. Col. 948, and is as follows:—*Τὸν μέντοι Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὸν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν νέαν Ῥώμην.* Labbe gives, at col. 324 of the same tome, what he intitules “*Concilii Nicaeni Canones 74, praeter 20 vulgatos, nova ex: Arabica versione Latine redditi ab Abrahamo Echellensi.* The 37th of these canons makes the four original patriarchates to be those of Rome, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Antioch; the 88th canon directs the transfer of the

patriarchal dignity from Ephesus to Constantinople; and the 41st says, “Post autem hanc sessionem tributus est patriarchatus domini Ephesi domino Constantinopolitano, et factus est secundus in gradu, Alexandrinus vero tertius.” It is clear, therefore, that when Constantinople came to be numbered among the patriarchates, it took precedence of Alexandria, as well as of Antioch.

**APP16** “*First in the Council of Nice ... other more, are forged.*”] The following is the corresponding passage in Foxe, edition 1583, p. 10. col. 1. First, in the councell of Nyce, which was the yeare of our Lord. 340. and in the. 6:Canon of the sayd Councell, we finde it so decreed: that in euery pro-uince or precinct of some one Church, and Byshop of the same, was appointed and set up to halle the inspection and regiment of other- Churches about him. *Secundum morem antiquum*, that is, after the ancient custome, as the wordes of the Councell do purporte, so that the Byshop of Alexandria shoulde haue power of Lybia, and Pentapolis in Egypt, for as much as the Byshop of the Cytie of Rome, hath the like or same manED. And in like sort also in Antioch, and in other countreyes, let euery Church haue his due honor, and consequently that the Bishop of Jerusalem haue also his due honor to him reserued, so that such order be kept:, that the Metropolitane Cities be not defrauded of their dignitie which to them is due and proper, etc. In this Councell, and in the same Canon. 6 and 7 where the Byshops of Alexandria, of Rome, and of Antioch, are ioyned together in on like maner of dignity, fyrst there appeareth to be no difference of honor to be ment therein. Secondlye forsomuch as in the sayde two Canons after mention made of them, immediately followeth, that no Byshoppes should be made without consent of their Metropolitanes, yea and that the citie also of Hierusalem should be under hys Metropolitane, and that the Metropolitane should haue the ful power to confirme euery Byshop made in his prouince: Therefore it may be well suspected that the third Epistle decretall of Pope Anacletus, and of Pope Stephanus, with other mo are forged, ....

The following are the Greek canons of the Council of Nice alluded to by Foxe, and on the authority of which his text in the above passage has been considerably altered: they are copied from Labbe, Cone. Gen. 2 cols. 30, 32.—

CAN. 4. Επίσκοπον προσήκει μάλιστα μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ καθίστασθαι. Εἰ δὲ δυσχερὲς εἶη τὸ τοιοῦτο...τὸ δὲ κύρος τῶν γινομένων δίδοσθαι καθ' ἰκάστην ἐπαρχίαν τῷ μητροπολίτῃ.

CAN. 6 Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατεῖτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν. Επεὶ δὲ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ρώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστὶν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, καθολοῦ δὲ πρόδηλον ἐκείνο.

CAN. 7 ΕΠΕΙΔὴ συνήθεια κεκράτηκε καὶ παράδοσις ἀραρχαῖα, ὥστε τὸν ἐν Αἰλίᾳ ἐπίσκοπον τιμᾶσθαι, ἐχέτω τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῆς τιμῆς, τῇ μητροπολεὶ σωζομένου τοῦ οἰκείου ἀξιώματος.

Subjoined is the Latin version of these canons furnished to the Sixth Council of Carthage, and given by Labbe, Conc. Genesis 2 cols. 1594-1599.

Capitula Nicaeni Concilii per Teilonem et Tharistum Constantinopolitanum de Graeco in Latinum conversa.

Can. 4. Episcopum oportet maxime quidem ab omnibus qui sunt intra provinciam episcopis ordinari. Si autem hoc difficile fuerit aut propter urgentem paupertatem aut propter longitudinem itineris, omnimodo tres in unum convenientes, consentientibus et his qui absentes sunt episcopis et spondentibus per scripta, tunc manus impositionem fieri. Confirmatio autem eorum quae fiunt danda est unicuique a suae provinciae metropolitano.

Can. 6. Antiquiores [? antiqui mores] obtineant qui apud AEGYPTUM sunt et Libyam et Pentapolim, ita ut Alexandrinus episcopus horum omnium habeat sollicitudinem, quia et urbis Romae. Episcopo similis mos est. Similiter. autem et circa Antiochiam et in caeteris provinciis privilegia propria reserventur metropolitanis ecclesiis.

Can. 7. Hierosolymitani consuetudo antiqua servetur ut AELIAE episcopus honoretur et habeat ordinem honoris, salva tamen metropolitana dignitate ejusdem provinciae.

Ruffinus's version of the sixth canon is here given, as containing the origin of the phrase "suburbicary cities," sometimes employed by Foxe and others.

Can. 6. “Et ut apud Alexandriam et in urbe Roma vetusta consuetudo servetur, ut vel ille Aegypti, vel hic suburbicariarum ecclesiarum sollicitudinem gerat.” Labbe, tom. 2 col. 1556.

**APP17** “*After this followed,*” etc.]—It has been necessary a little to correct Foxe’s narrative of the affair of Apiarius. Foxe says, “It continued the space of five years, wherein was great contention about the supremacy and jurisdiction. The council, however, to which Zosimus sent his legates, was not properly the Sixth council of Carthage, which did not meet till May 25th, A.D. 419, and Zosimus died December 26th, A.D. 418; but it was some African council, held toward the close of A.D. 418. While the affair was pending in that council Zosimus died; not, however, before the African bishops had written him a letter of the nature which Foxe describes. The same legates, being authorized by his successor, Boniface, renewed their former application to the African church, which produced the sixth council of Carthage, May 25th, A.D. 419. They answered Boniface in much the same strain as they had done Zosimus. See the letter to Boniface, Labbe Cone. Genesis tom. 2 col. 1670: it refers to the letter sent to his predecessor, Zosimus, “superiori anno.” The phrase “Domine frater” twice occurs in it. At length the correct copies of the canons of the council of Nice (twenty or twenty-one in number, given in Labbe, col. 1594) arrived from the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Constantinople, whose accompanying Notes are given by Labbe, col. 1673: that of Cyril states that they should keep Easter the next “indiction,” (*i. e.* year commencing September 1,) 17. Cal. Maias, *i. e.* April 15th. P. Pagi observes that 17 is a corruption of xiiii., making the date April 18th, which was the date of Easter in A.D. 420. This Note, therefore, proves that the canons were received from Alexandria before September 1st, A.D. 419. They were sent off to Boniface, 6 Cal. December, *i. e.* November 26th, A.D. 419 (Labbe, col. 1673), and seem to have operated on him as a “quietus.” The affair was revived by reason of Apiarius (who had been restored, but again excommunicated) appealing to pope Celestine, who was elected September 10th, A.D. 422, and sat till July, A.D. 432. The African bishops wrote him the letter of which Foxe gives a part, and which is given by Labbe, col. 1674; wherein they decidedly refused to allow of appeals to Rome by their ecclesiastics.

**APP18** “*It cannot, indeed, be denied,*” etc.]—It may be satisfactory to the reader to see the original faulty text of Foxe (edit. 1583, p. 12, col. 2,) which is as follows:—

“Although it cannot be denied, but certaine were in the primatiue time, which began priuately to pretende that proude and wicked title of universal Byshop, as Menna, and especially Ioannes Patriarche of Constantinople, who calling a Counsell at Constantinople, went about to stablish and rattie and to dignifie his throne by the consent of the Counsell, and the Emperour of Constantinople, and obtained the same as appeareth in the 5th generall Councell of Constantinople the second, where both *Menna* is named *Oichumenicus Patriarcharum*, and also *Ioannes* in the sayde Councell is titled *Oicumenicus Patriarcha: ex Concil. general. 5. cap. Domino.*”

**APP19** “*Namely Pelagius II. and Gregory I.*” etc.]—The same occasion led both Pelagius and Gregory to say so much against this title of “Universal bishop,” viz., the assumption of it by John, P. C., who in A.D. 588, at a general Oriental council, so styled himself in a cyclical letter. Both Pelagius, at the time, and Gregory, A.D. 595, wrote to dissuade him from using the ambitious title, but in vain. John died A.D. 596.—*L’Art de V. des Dates.*

**APP20** Foxe again alludes to this controversy infra, p. 340, where (as well as here) he attributes all Gregory’s zeal to detestation of “the ambitious pride” of the patriarch John. A sense of inferiority, however, besides his better and avowed reasons, may have given rise to Gregory’s rather unmeasured language on this occasion:—“At clamet licet Gregorius, et mare coelo confundat, controversia nihili fuit, cum nec titulus *OEcumenici* Constantinopolitanis praesulibus novus esset, nec eo caeteris Ecclesiae praesulibus suis Episcopatus eriperetur. Eo titulo Primatus honoris, non potentiae in caeteros orbis praesules Joanni ascribebatur. Et quod Gregorium fugit, pontifices Romani titulo *universalis* ornabantur. Epist. 54: Leonis ad Martianum titulus hic est: *Leo Episc. Rein. et universalis Ecclesioe Martiano Augusto.* Et in Epist. 65: *Leo Romans et universalis Ecclesioe Episc. Eudocioe Augustoe.* Similibus etiam titulis Hormisda decoratus fuit. Quid miri Regiae urbis episcopum *OEcumenici* affici titulo, quo Academiae Constantinopolitanae Praefectus fulgebat, teste Zonara, lib. 15, cap. 3.”

(*Basnagii Annales Politico-Ecclesiastes* ad an. 595, sect. 3.) The Bishop of Rome had, previously to Gregory's times, shown himself careful in keeping his brother of Constantinople in his proper place. See *Concilia studio Labbei*, tom. 4 col. 844, 849; and Bower's *Lives of the Popes*.

**APP21** The following remarks may assist the reader in making up his mind on these points:—"Mediam viam cum *Christ. Cellario Th. Ittigio, Sal. Van Til*, et *G. Caveo* insistere malim, persuasus cum W. E. TENTZELIO *distinguendas omnino esse duas quoestiones; utrum Petrus Romae fuerit? et an 25:annos ibi sederit?* Prioreau hodie plerique etiam ex Protestantibus affirmant: posterior olim pontificiis fere communis, sed non solum historiae et chronologiae repugnat, iudice *Ed. Richerio* (*Hist. Conc. Genesis* c. 1:n. 5), sed et fere jam antiquata est, ex quo *Steph. Baluzius* (in notis ad *Lact. de mort. persecut.*, p. 354) receptam apud pontificios sententiam labefactare sustinuit. Caeterum non contemnenda adversus *Schelstratum* de fictitiis xxv pontificatus Petri anni protulit *G. Caveus*, Part 2:Hist. Lit. Scripp. *Ecclesiastes* Ut vero summam quandam eorum quae dixi conficiam, omniaque sub uno aspectu ponam, malo *Camp. Vitringoe* (in *Hypotyposi Hist. et Chron. Sacrae*, p. 253) verbis quam meis ipsius uti; non sane tanti esset tam calide et acriter de eo disputare si pontificiae sectae homines in hypothesi hujus traditionis non fundarent *proerogativam sedis Romanae, tum infallibilitatis tum superioritatis et eminentioe Monarchicoe* supra omnes alias totius orbis ecclesias. Obstat tamen *universalis* totius antiquae ecclesiae *traditio* fulta autoritate *Papioe, Justini Mart., Dionysii Corinth. Episc., auctoris praedicationis Petri, Caii Ecclesiastes Romans Presbyteri, Irenoei, Clementis Alex., Tertulliani*, qui vel medio vel inclinante seculo 2 floruerunt, ne sequentium temporum doctores huc advocem; quam qui rejiciunt, videntur etiam *idem cum ratione* agere, Imo antiquior etiam auctor est *Ignatius* in *Epist. ejus ad Romanos*, quae si pro genuino illius foetu habeatur, controversiam facile dirimeret. Certe teneo cum *Pearsonio Cestriensi Episc.*, qui hoc argumentum, ut solet, docte et moderate tractat, ex historia *Lucae et Epistolis Apostolorum* nihil product posse quod traditionem subvertat, nihil etiam quod firmet. Ex *Lucae et Paulinis* id recte colligi patior, Petrum non fuisse Romae, antequam *Paulus a prioribus suis vinculis* solutus sit, in quo historia *Lucae*

terminatur, sed eundem Remain non venisse post illud tempus, et ibidem subiisse martyrium, quis affirmet, quis affirmanti credat?—P. Zornii Opuscula Sacra, tom. 2 pp. 736, 738, Altonaviae, 1731.

**APP22** On this fivefold division of church history, see note in Appendix on p. 4, note (4).

**APP23** “*Of James, the brother,*” etc.]—This title in Foxe runs thus (Edition 1583, p. 33):—“Of James, the brother of the Lord, thus we read in the story of Clement and Egesippus.” But as the following account is compiled by *Eusebius* from those two authors, *his* name is substituted here as the direct authority. The last two paragraphs (p. 99) are printed by Foxe in his larger type, as though they were a part of his own text; but they are in reality a continuation of *Eusebius*’s account, and are therefore printed as such in this edition.

**APP24** “*The persecution of the Jews*”—*i.e.* the persecution of the early church by the Jews; in like manner in pp. 152, 306, we have the expression, “the dispersion of the Jews,” for “the dispersion of the early church by the Jews.”

**APP25** “*As Jerom in his Epistle.*”]—This letter does not appear among Jerome’s Epistles; in fact it seems doubtful whether it was ever written by that Father. It will be found prefixed to “*Usuardi Martyrologium Lovanii,*” 1573; in which see the remarks of Molanus, the editor, fol. 232, who considers that even if allowed to have proceeded from Jerome, the letter has nevertheless been interpolated.

To show the extravagant estimate which Romish writers make, of the number of martyred Christians in these times, we may just add that the chronologer Genebrard assigns an average of 30,000 per day during the ten persecutions, supposing them limited to one year. *Vide* “*Ferraris Bibliotheca prompts,*” etc. tom. 5:p. 454, edit. Venetiis, 1782.

**APP26** “*Clement of Alexandria, moreover,*” etc.]—This sentence reads thus in Foxe (Edition 1583, p. 36): “*Clemens Alexandrinus moreover noteth, both the tyme of this holy apostle, and also addeth to the same a certain history of him, not unworthy to bee remembred of such which delite in things honest and profitable. Of the which historic Sozomenus also in his Commentaries maketh mention. The wordes of the author setting forth this historic, be these.*” Foxe is here translating

the Magdeburg Centuriatores (Cent. I. lib. 2 cap. 10), “Clemens inquit [Eusebius] simul et tempus significat, et historiam summe necessariam illis qui honestis et utilibus delectantur adjicit, cujus et opulentus quidam Sozomenus in suo commentario meminit.” The history of Sozomen, however, which relates to a much later period, will in vain be searched for any allusion to this matter; and in fact the Centuriators mistook the title of *Clement’s* work for the name of the historian: this will be evident to any one who reads the original sentence as it stands in Eusebius—*Ο δὲ Κλήμης ὁμοῦ τὸν χρόνον ἐπισημνόμενος καὶ ἱστορίαν ἀναγκαιοτάτην οἷς καλὰ καὶ ἐπωφελῆ φίλον ἀκούειν προστίθησιν ἐν ᾧ [τῷ] τίς ὁ σωζόμενος πλούσιος ἐπέγραψεν αὐτοῦ ἀνγγράμματι.* Foxe’s text has been corrected accordingly.

**APP27** “*Between the second,*” etc.]—This paragraph and its heading would stand, according to our author’s text, at p. 115, between the first and second paragraphs; they are brought back hither, in order to assign the martyrdoms of the bishops of Rome presently mentioned to their appropriate period.

**APP28** “*But then how can that stand with Bede and Marianus Scotus?*”]—In the opinion of a good judge, “*incerta prorsus omnia sunt, quae de annis pontificatus initioque narrantur—Qui ad veri normam annos primorum pontiffcum dirigere conantur, illi sane, ut aiunt, λέοντα κειρέιν leonem tondere videntur.*” (Basnagii *Annales Historico-polit.* an. 110, section 7.) Upon the supposed martyrdom of Alexander, and the objections to the *Acta*, see the same writer ad an. 119, sect. 4.

**APP29** For a paragraph which follows here in the original, see *supra*, p. 111, line 4.

**APP30** The Greek word in Jerome for “churches” is *παροικίας*, which Foxe renders “*parishes:*” in the next two sentences the original word *ἐκκλησία* is rendered “*congregation,*” which rendering has inadvertently been left to stand in line 17 of next page: as Foxe himself, at page 135, several times adopts the usual term church, ‘it has, for the sake of uniformity, been substituted here.

**APP31** Rather, “*Faustinus and Jouta;*” and afterwards *Calocerus.*” These martyrdoms are doubtful. “*Neque in veteri Calendario, quod adidit Rosvedus, neque apud Adonis martyrolog., ulla Faustini et Jovitae*

mentio inscribitur: At eorum martyrium non immerito revocetur in dubium.” Basnage (ut supra) ad an. 135, sect. 4.

**APP32** “*Bishop of Illyricum*”]—So says Nicephorus, the author just cited: Foxe says, “*bishop of Apulia*.” See note (8).

**APP33** “*Symphorosa and Getulius*.”]—Ruinart places their martyrdom under the year 120, Baronius under 136. See Basnage ad an. 120, sect. 5.

**APP34** “*A little before*,” etc.]—This paragraph would stand, according to Foxe’s text, at p. 187, immediately before the paragraph “Under the said Antoninus Verus,” etc.: it seems to have got accidentally misplaced.

**APP35** “*Whom the Martyrology and Chronicle of Ado declare*,” etc.]—“Acta haec Symphorosae sinceris germanisque eximimus.—Figmentum redolet praeceptum quod ascribitur Adriano, ut in *guttore* Crescens, in *pectore* Julianus, etc. vulneraretur.” Basnagii Annales, aa an. 120, sect. 5.

**APP36**—*Biothonatus* is a Graeco-Latin word for “a suicide.”

**APP37** “*Andhere occasion serveth to speak of Justin*,” etc.]—The whole passage from hence to the words “because they were called Christians,” p. 126, line 30, would stand in Foxe’s text before the paragraph “*Thus* have ye heard,” etc. at the top of p. 143: it is brought back hither, as by far the most suitable position for it. The introductory clause is the Editor’s: the words “a man in learning and philosophy excellent, and a great defender of the Christian religion,” are brought back from the last paragraph of text in p. 129, where they would stand after the words “good Justin,” but rather oddly after the abundant previous mention of him in this place.

**APP38** It should be stated; that the change in the application of the terms *first* and *second*, to Justin’s Apologies, mentioned in the note, rendered it also necessary to invert the order of Foxe’s matter in describing the two apologies.

**APP39** “*By these things*,” etc., and, “*This Justin*,” etc.]—These two paragraphs in Foxe conclude the long transposed passage (see note in this Appendix on page 122, third paragraph): but they follow the next sentence ending with “because they were called Christians.” This

minor transposition has been made, in order to make the entire transposed passage piece on the better with what follows. Foxe also says that Justin was martyred “a little *after* that Polycarpus was martyred in Asia, as witnesseth Eusebius.” For justification of the alteration here made, see note in this Appendix, on page 129, line 16 from the bottom.

**APP40** “*As well may appear,*” etc.]—These words in Foxe piece on to the paragraph ending “being moved,” p. 122. Foxe, it will be seen, does not err in bad company, in attributing the following letter to Antoninus *Pius*. “Hanc (epist.) Pio vindicavit Eusebius, quem sequuntur Baronius an 154, n. 5. Cavius, aliique eruditi. Nos potius assentimur Valesio, qui Marci rescriptum esse statuit, ut ex titulo palam est—Pius autem nunquam Marci Aurelii nomeu habuit: neque tertius ejus Consulatus, quem an. 140 gessit, cum Trib. P. 15 copulari potest. Quod maximum esse putamus argumentum, Pius *Armeniacy* titulo non est insignitus. Marcus ergo accurate pingitur.” Basnagii *Annales Historico-polit.* ad an. 165, sect. 4.

**APP41** “Προετέθη ἐν Εφέσῳ: id est *proposita Ephesi*. Sic in aliquot legibus Cod. Theodosiani additur—P. P. Romae aut Carthagine.’ Quae nota significat illam Imperatoris legem publice propositam esse in ea civitate. Solebunt enim Imperatores, quoties aliquam constitutionem ad omnium notitiam pervenire vellent, sua manu adscribere *proponatur*, ut discimus ex Novellis Valentiniani et *Majorini*.”—*Valesii not. in Eusebius* H. E. 4 13: vide etiam not. *in vit. Constant.* 2:42.

**APP42** “*Among those who sustained,*” etc.]—This paragraph is brought back from p. 137, where Foxe inserts it after the words “*as witnesseth Eusebius;*” and the succeeding paragraphs, as far as “*miracles, there may find them*” (p. 129), are brought back from the close of Justin’s martyrdom, “died cheerfully and with honor” (p. 131); it being Foxe’s custom to mention first, under each Emperor, the martyrs of Rome and Italy; and, for want of such arrangement, the account of this reign is: rather confused. These Roman martyrdoms occupy the place; of the Asiatic, which, *vice versa*, are thrown forward to p. 131, line 11.

**APP43** “*Herford,*” according to Oudin, tom. 3 p.973, is more correct than Erfurt; though it is of no great consequence. “Henricus de Hervordia ita

dictus, quia ac urbe Hervordia in Westphalia oriundus fuit, non autem in urbe Erfordia, quae in Thuringia est.”

**APP44** [*In the rage of this fourth persecution,*” etc.]—The succeeding account of Justin’s martyrdom would, according to Foxe, follow the martyrdoms of Polycarp and the other Asiatics, after the words “as witnesseth Eusebius,” p. 137; but see the respective dates of the two as settled by Foxe himself, pages 130, 131, 136: in the opening, indeed, of the ensuing translation from Eusebius he makes him say, “About the same time, or a little after, that Polycarp,” etc.; but the words “or a little after” are added by the translator. By interchanging the position of the Roman and Asiatic martyrs, as explained in the note on page 127, line 21, this chronological error has been wholly got rid of.

**APP45** For the reader’s satisfaction, the original text of Foxe (Edition 1583, p. 45) is here given:—”Hierome, in his Ecclesiasticall Catalogue, thus writeth: Justine, when in the cittie of Rome he had his disputations, and had reprov’d Crescens the Cinike, for a great blasphemour of the Christians: for a bellygod, and a man fearing death, and also a follower of lust and lechery: at the last by his indeavour and conspiracie, was accused to be a Christian, and for Christ shed his blond in the yeare of our Lord 154, under Marcus Antonius, as the Cronicles doe witness, Abb. Ursperg: and Eusebius in his Cronicle in the 13th yeare of the Emperor Antoninus.”

**APP46** [*Here is to be gathered,*” etc.]—This paragraph stands in Foxe at the tail of the long transposed passage about Justin, which was carried back from p. 143, to p. 122, and is best placed here in connection with the discussion of the date of his martyrdom.

**APP47** The following is Foxe’s very inadequate representation of the Greek (Edit. 1583, p. 42): “And whilst a great uprore and tumult began thus to be raised upon those cries: a certaine Phrigian, named Quintus, lately come out of Phrigia, who seyng and abhoruing the wilde beasts, and the fierce rage of them, of an over light mynd betrayed his own safetie. For so the same letter of him doth report, that he, not reuerently, but more malipertly then requisite, was together with others rushed into the judgement-place, and so being taken, was made a manifest example to all the beholders, that no man

ought rashly and unreuerently with such boldnesse, to thrust in himself, to entermeddle in matters, wherwith he hath not to do.”

**APP48** “*Irenoeus in his boole against heresies,*” &c.]—This paragraph, according to Foxe would stand, but not so conveniently, at the top of the page, immediately after the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna.

**APP49** “*Of Germanicus,*” etc.]—This paragraph stands in Foxe after that mentioned in the preceding note, and is reserved to this place for clearness, that the account of Polycarp might not be interrupted.

**APP50** “*Blessed saints of France Vettius, Zacharias.*”]—The name of *Zacharias* ought not to appear in this list. “*Zacharias, qui in Martyroiogiis Adonis, Usuardi, Notkeri, presbyter audit, ex prays Rufini versione numerum auxit martyrum, ut erudite observatum Valesio. ‘Qui si Graecum hujus epist. exemplar consuluissent, animadvertissent profecto Ζαχαρίαν Πρεσβύτερον hic dici—sed Patrem Johannis Bapt.’*”—*Basnagii Annal. ad. an. 177, sect. 16.*

**APP51** “*Marcus Aurelius to the senate and people of Rome.*”]—It appears from the *Lux Evangelii toti Orbi exoriens* of Fabricins, which includes the edicts of the Roman Emperors *favourable* to the Christians, that ἐν Καρνούτῳ in the original of this letter is a better reading than ἐν Κοτίνῳ. His note is (p. 229) “*Ita recte Latinus interpres et Scal. pro ἐν Κοτίνῳ: adde Eusebius Chron. et Hist. Miscellam, 10:16.*” This place is mentioned by Zozimus, lib. 2.

**APP52** Foxe’s “*Marcus Aurelius Commodus*” is altered into “*Lucius Oelius Verus,*” in compliance with the note (4.)

**APP53** “*The one Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*”]—The original Latin is, “*Date honorem trino et uni Deo, Patri, Filio, et Spiritui Sancto;*” which Foxe renders, “*believe upon the true and only God,*” and “*give honor to God alone.*”

**APP54** Foxe reads “*Superaltar,*” and infra, p. 165, line 6, “*altar, or superaltar,*”—line 7, “*superaltar;*” but Platina’s words are—“*Illis quoque poenam constituit qui negligentes sunt in attractando Christi sanguine et corpore: Poenitentiam (inquit) agant quadraginta diebus quorum negligentia in terram aliquid acciderit: si super altare tribus diebus: si super linteum quatuor: si in aliud linteum novem.*” Where it is plain that “*super*” is a preposition governing “*altare,*” as “*super*”

governs “linteum.” Platina goes on “Ubicunque deciderit, si recipi potest lambatur, sin secus, aut lavetur aut radatur: lotum et rasum nut comburatur aut in sacrarium reponatur:” the conclusion of the sentence, therefore, should be rather, “the washings and scrapings either burned or laid up in the sanctuary.”

**APP55** Bishop Pearson makes the following general inferences, after an examination into the authorship of the “*Liber Pontificalis*:”—“His perpensis, quis non videt fidem huic Libro Pontifficali minime adhibendam esse? Autor enim ejus anonymus et incertus sexti saeculi scriptor, et status primitivae Ecclesiae plane ignarus fuit. Unde pluribus et faedis erroribus scatet, fictisque narrationibus plenus est, et enormem rituum doctrinarumque antiquitatem venditat. Et quod ad Chronologiam spectat, successione ordinem non semel perturbat, annosque Pontificum nulla, certitudine, summa negligentia vel incitia tradit, et quicquid de eorum annis, qui ante Liberium sedebant, boni habet, illud ex vetustiori scriptore hausit, et male plerumque expressit. Scriptotem autem vetustiore ilium non alium fuisse censeo, quam autorem veteris Catalogi, per Cuspinianum primo editi. Hunc primum Catalogum, quod ad rem chronologicam spectat, exprimere conatus est autor secundi Catalogi sive Libri Pontificalis; quod ex certissimis conjecturis colligi posse videtur.”—*Jo. Pearsoni, Ep. Cest. Opera posthuma*; pp. 129-30.

**APP56** See note in this Appendix on page 308, note (5).

**APP57** “*Timotheus, in his story, thinketh that Eleutherius came himself.*”]—This statement is copied from the Magdeburg Centuriators (cent. 2:p. 2), who have made it under a misapprehension of the meaning of a passage in Nauclerus, who says, on the authority of the “*Legenda S. Timothei*,” “*Quod venerit*” (i.e. Timothy, not Eleutherius) “in Britanniam, et Lucium ejus gentis regem cum tota insula ad fidem Christi converterit.” Archbishop Usher points out this error of the Centuriators in his “*Ant. Brit. Eccl.*” cap. 4. — ED.

**APP58** “*And, as there is a variance among the writers for the count of years.*”]—“*Usserius lib. de Britannicarum ecclesiarum primordiis, cap. 4, quo anno Lucius Britanniae rex Legatos ad Eleutherum Papam miserit, dili-genter inquirat, et opiniones viginti tres ea de re recitat, quarum maxima pars in eo convenit cum Beda et Mariano Scoto, quod*

initio Pontificatus Eleutheri ea legatio destinata fuerit. Baronius Lucium Commodo imperante conversum scribit, quod primus tradidit Rogerus de Wendover in Chronico circa 1335 in lucem edito. Citat pro sua opinione Baronius Adonem in Chronico, qui tamen, quemadmodum et Beda, Hermannus Contractus, Marianus Scotus, aliique plures ab Usserio laudati, hanc conversionem ad M. Aurelii tempora retulerunt, quibus longe major fides habenda.” “Pagii critice annal, eccles. Baron.” ad an. 183, sect. 3.

**APP59** “Foxe’s text is (Edition 1583, p. 53), “About the same time also wrote Heraclitus, who first began to write annotations and enarrations upon the newe Testament, and Epistles of the Apostles. Also Theophilus byshop of Caesaria, Dionysius byshoppe of Corinthe a man famously learned, which wrote divers Epistles to divers churches, and among other writeth, exhorting Penitus, a certaine byshop,” etc.

**APP60** “*Over and besides these, etc.*”]—This paragraph stands in Foxe before the preceding paragraph, but is placed after it, because Clemens Alexandrinus was a pupil of Pantaenus.

**APP61** For seventy, ‘Foxe reads “threescore “but Eusebius says τὸς ἑβδομήκοντα; and line 17, for “other,’ Foxe reads “other four;” but Eusebius says καὶ τινὰς ἑτέρας.

**APP62** “*Bonifacius* Simoneta in lucem emisit commentarios in Persecutionum Christ. Pontificumque historiam a S. Petro ad Innocent VIII. Prod. Mantuae 1509.” Hallervordii Specimen de hist. Lat. in Fabricii “Supplem. ad Vossium,” p. 692, Hamb. 1709.

**APP63** “*A hundred and sixteen years.*”]—Foxe says “an hundred and threescore years and three,” but Eusebius (lib. 6 cap. 11,) says ἑκατὸν δεκαἕξ ἔτη ἡνυκως.

**APP64** Foxe reads (Edition 1583, p. 55, col. 2), “to make his journey up to Hierusalem and Palestina (for that place remained free from this persecution) to see there the congregation, and to pray;” but Eusebius says, Ταύτη δ’ οὖν ὡσπερ κατὰ τι θεοπόπιον ἐκ τῆς τῶν Καππαδοκῶν γῆς, ἔνθα τό πρῶτον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἠξίωτο, τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τὰ ἱεροσόλυμα εὐχῆς καὶ τῶν τόπων ἱστορίας ἔνεκεν πεποιημένον φιλοφρονέστατα οἱ τῆδε ὑπολαβόντες ἀδελφοί.

- APP65** “*Ado, and others,...* do hold that he was martyred.”]—It is doubtful: see Basnagii *Annales Politico-eccles. ad an. 194*, sect. 4.
- APP66** Foxe reads (Edition 1583, p. 55, col. 2), “as were before both of Origen and Irenaeus.” As Foxe has not before alluded to any “naevi” of these two fathers, a slight change has been made in the above clause. It would have been more correct, however, to say, “as are both in Irenaeus, who was before him, and likewise in Origen and others (were they never so excellent) that followed him.” See pp. 157, 158, and p. 174.
- APP67** Foxe reads, “concerning the altar or superaltar to be false; for what superaltar, etc.” See sup. p. 151, note in Appendix.
- APP68** “*Did both suffer,*” etc.]—“Non dissimulabimus tamen martyrium ejus a nobis non una de causa in falsi suspicionem adduci. Monet nos altum de eo martyrio Eusebii silentium, et in Chronico, et in historia. Monet beneficus Alex. Imp., benignusque, in Christianos animus.” Basnagii *Annal. ad an. p. 219*, sect. 6, where read more.
- APP69** “*Of this Coecilia,*” etc.]—*Similia et in Adonis et in Romano legi .Martyrologio profitemur, neque negamus virginem aliquam, Caeciliam nomine, in certamen pro fide venisse. At Romae imperante Alexandro illud inivisse, eaque ratione qua refertur in Martyrol. constantissime negamus. Adonis martyrol, passam M. Aurelii et Commodi, temporibus Caeciliam, diserte habet. Sed non conveniunt tempora cum episcopatu S. Urbani Papae, itaque ventura ad Severi actatem, quo sedebat Urbanus.—Basnagii Annal, ad an. 230. sect. 4, who proceeds to show that the Churches were enjoying rest at this time. For “Almachius,” read “Amalachius.”*
- APP70** “*Of Hippolytus,*” etc.]—This is placed here among the writers; it stands in Foxe in the next page, before the paragraph, “After the emperor Gordian,” etc.
- APP71** Foxe inadvertently says, “the *first* persecution.”
- APP72** “*Alexander*”]—Foxe reads “Gordian,” which is, perhaps, more in accordance with the authors mentioned. For Nicephorus says (lib. 5 cap. 26), *Κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχου τὸν Ἀσκληπιάδην φιλητὸς διεδέχετο Ἀλεξάνδρου διέποντος τὴν ἀρχὴν, οὗ Ζέβενος αὐτῆς διάδοχος ἦν· τὸν δ' ἐπὶ Γορδιάνου τελευτήσαντα ὁ*

ἱερομάρτυς Βαβύλας τὰς ἱεράς ἡνίας διεχειρίζετο· οὐ μετὰ τὴν ὁμολογίαν ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ τὴν ζῶν ἀμειψάμενου ἐπὶ Δεκίου, Φάβιος τῆς αὐτόθι ἐκκλησίας προίστατο: which passage seems to imply that the episcopate of Asclepiades extended into Alexander's reign. Zonaras, the other historian mentioned, seems to make the episcopate of Asclepiades extend beyond the death of Alexander, for he says, (lib. 12 of his Annals, end of cap. 15, and beginning of cap. 16.), Ἀντιοχείας δὲ ἦν τηνικαῦτα προειστηκὼς καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ τῶν πιστῶν ἐκκλησίαν ἰθύνων Ἀσκληπιάδης, καὶ Σαπδιανὸς ἱεροσολύμων . Καὶ ὁ μὲν Ἀλέξανδρος ἔτη Ρωμαίων ἡγεμονεύσας δέκα, ὃν εἴρηται τρόπον ἀνηρήτο. On the other hand, Foxe says he entered on his episcopate A.D. 214, which must have terminated (on Foxe's own showing) A.D. 221. "L' Art de Verifier des Dates" says that he died in the second year of Heliogabalus, June 7th, A.D. 219. But Alexander was made Caesar, A.D. 221, and emperor March 11th, A.D. 222, (L' Art de Ver. des D.); and as Foxe's object is to throw back Asclepiades as far as possible from Decius's reign, Alexander's name is in the text substituted for Gordian's.

**APP73** "*Nicephorus maketh mention of another Babylas besides this, that suffered under Decius, who was bishop of Nicomedia.*"—This last assertion is not correct; for the words of Nicephorus are Ἠνίκα καὶ Βαβύλας τὸν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ ἀγῶνα διένεγκεν ἐπὶ τῆς Νικομήδους. Foxe was led into the error by the Centuriators, (Cent. 3. cap. 3.)

**APP74** The following list is taken by Foxe from the Centuriators (Cent. 3, cap. 12):—"Reliquorum martyrum sub Decio catalogus, ex Bedae libro minori de Temporibus, citante Henrico de Erfordia. Sub Decio passi sunt Hippolytus et concordia, Hiereneus et Abudus, Victoria virgo, primates Antiochiae: Bellias episcopus civitatis Apolloniae; Laeus, Tyrsus, et Gallinetus, Nazanzo: Triphon in AEgypto civitate Tanais, Phileas episcopus, Philocomus cum multis allis in Perside, Philochronius Babyloniae, Thesiphon episcopus Pamphiliae, Nestor episcopus in Corduba, Parmenius presbyter, cum allis pluribus. In Circensi colonia Marianus et Jacobus. In Africa Nemesianus, Felix, Rogatianus presbyter, Felieissimus Romae Jovinus, Basileus, Ruffina et Secunda virgines, Tertullianus, Valerianus, Nemesius, Sempronianus et Olympius. In Hispania Terragone, Veronae Zeno episcopus,

Caesarae Marinus et Archemius. In vico Mitiaensi privatus episeopus, Theodorus cognomento Gregorius Ponti episcopus. Haec Beda.” This list is extremely corrupt, owing to the peculiar mode, perhaps, in which they were written in the original MS, and the ignorance or carelessness of transcribers. Thus “Nazanzo,” should stand next before “Theodorus.” It may have got out of its place owing to the names being found in some MS. written in columns, with Leacus, Tyrsus, et Gallinetus, at the top of one, and Nazanzo, Theodorus cognomento Gregorius, Ponti, etc., at the top of the next column, and the copyist did not know to which column Nazanzum belonged. “Primates,” translated by Foxe “being noble personages,” is clearly a corruption of “Miniates.” The editor transcribes Foxe’s version of this list: when compared with the amended list, in the text, it will strikingly show the difficulty of *editing* John Foxe. “Under Decius suffered Hyppolitus and Concordia, Hiereneus and Abinudus, Victoria a virgine, being noble personages of Antioche. Bellias byshoppe of the city of Appolonia. Leacus, Tyrsus, and Gallinatus, Nazanzo, Tryphon in the citie of Egypt called Tanais. Phileas bishop, Philocomus with many other in Perside. Philcronius byshop of Babylon, Thesiphon byshop of Pamphilia. Nestor byshop in Corduba. Parmenius priest with divers moe. In the province called Colonia, Arcensis, Marianus and Jacobus. In Africa, Nemesianus, Felix, Rogatianus priest. Felicessimus. At Rome Jouinus, Basileus, also Ruffina, and Secunda virgines, Tertullianus, Valerianus, Nemesius, Sempronianus, and Olympius. In Spain Teragone, at Verona Zeeno byshop. At Caesarea, Marinus, and Archemius. In the towne of Miliane Privatus byshop, Theodorus surnamed Gregorius byshop of Pontus, *Hoec Bedoe.*”

**APP75** “*Whose names,*” etc.]—Foxe says, “whose names I find not, except they be Pergentius and Laurentinus mentioned in Equilthus.” The fact is that Vincentius mentions their names; but Foxe is only copying the Centuriators, (Cent. 3, cap. 3.) “Vincentius ex Hugone martyrum puerorum meminit, apud Aretium civitatem Tusciae, libro undecimo, capite quinquagesimo secundo.” Not having Vincentius at hand, but having perhaps Equilthus, he has accordingly stated the case as if Vincentius had not given the names.

**APP2-75A** *Ibid.*—This story about Serapion is alluded to *infra*, vol. 7:p. 662.

**APP76** “*Two priests with three deacons,*” etc.—The letter alluded to by Foxe is given by Labbe (Cone. Genesis tom. 1 col. 721), with this title, “*Epistola Lucii Papae I. ad Galliae atque Hispaniae Episcopos,*” and this remark in the margin, “*Suspecta eodem jure cum allis Isidori mercibus.*” The general heading of the letter begins, “*Ut duo presbyteri et tres diaconi in omni loco episcopo adheereant propter testimonium ecclesiasticum,*” etc. etc.

Capitul. 1. Ut episcopus semper testes secum presbyteros ac diaconos habeat.

The canon itself runs thus:—

CAN. 1. Propter tales, fratres, hortamur vos, sicut et in hac sancta ecclesia constitutum habemus, ut semper testes vobiscum sacerdotes et diaconos habeatis. Et licet conscientia sufficere possit propria, tamen propter malevolos juxta apostolum, “*etiam testimonium vos oportet habere bonum ab his qui foris sunt.*” Quoniam et in hac sancta sede constitutum habemus, ut duo presbyteri vel tres diaconi in omni loco episcopum non docerant, propter testimonium ecclesiasticum.” This is quoted in *Decreti Pars III. De Consecratione, Dist. 1, “Jubemus,*” only the reading is “*duo presbyteri et tres diaconi.*” Binius says in his note on this letter (Labbe, 1:col. 726,) “*Decernitur ut ad evitanda detractionis et infamiae pericula propter testimonium ecclesiae nusquam eant nisi duorum presbyterorum et trium diaconorum comitatu stipati. Decreti hujus sancienti calumniae in Cornelium a Novatiano confictae causam dedisse videntur. Baronius anno 257, num. 5.*” Baronius (*loco citato*) reads “*et tres diaconos,*” and suggests the origin of the law mentioned by Binius. There is an evident allusion to this law *infra*, vol. 2 bottom of p. 121.

**APP77** This note is incorrect, so far at least as regards the name *Perennis*, for he is mentioned by *Eulogius*, archbishop of Alexandria, as an agent of persecution in the times of Decius and Valerian. See Photii Biblioth., cod. 182, col. 413, edit. 1612; or Dr. Routh’s *Reliquioe Sacra*, tom. 3 p. 132.

**APP2-78** *Ibid.* line 22, “*misadvised*,” παραπέισθεις.]—Fuxe, “charmed or incensed.”

**APP79** Fuxe reads “exclamations,” where he probably meant “accusations;” which has therefore been substituted.

**APP2-80** *Ibid.* line 30.—Fuxe erroneously refers to the “first” book of Cyprian’s Epistles.

**APP81** “*Curubis*,” or Corobis, in the district of Zeugitanea, now called *Gurba*, on the north side of the bay of Haman-et. See Shaw’s *Travels*, p. 90; or Dalrymple’s *Remains of Christian Antiquity*. (Edinb. 1778,) vol. 2 p. 105.

**APP82** Fuxe’s text reads (Edition 1583, p. 170, col. 1), “by which words it is apparant, that Cyprian meaneth, this deliuerance (which commeth by almose gyuing) from death and sinne, not to be expounded nor to be taken for death euerlasting, etc.”

**APP83** “*Ignatius. Epist. ad Philip. contrary to—St. Paul.*”]—“In eadem epistola totus locus de jejunio ex constitutionibus *Clementis* assutus est, ut videre est lib. 5 cap. 13, et lib. 7 c. 24, in quibus eadem totidem verbis habetur.”—*Rivet. Crit. Sac.* lib. 2 cap. 2.

**APP84** “*Albeit, here is to be noted*,” etc.]—The original text stands thus (Edition 1583, p. 71, col. 1):—“Albeit here is to be noted by the way, touching the life and story of Cyprian that this Cyprian was not he, whome the narration of Nazianzen speaketh of (as is aboue mentioned) who from Arte Magicke was conuerted to bee a Christian, which Cyprian was a Citizen of Antioche, and afterward Bishop of the same Citie, and was martyred under Diocletian. Where as this Cyprian was Byshop of Carthage, and died under Valerianus, as is sayd,” etc. What Nazianzen, however, says about Cyprian, *he* clearly intended to be understood of this Cyprian, for he calls him *Thascius*. The amended text, therefore, speaks more correctly, and probably Fuxe himself meant the same, though he has expressed himself ambiguously. See *supra*, p. 199.

**APP85** Fuxe says, “so miserably vexed that they bit off their tongues and died.”

**APP86** Fuxe omits “Claudia her mother.”

**APP87** The Martyrology of Usuard was dedicated, it seems more „probable, to Charles the *Bald*; “jussu Caroli Calvi Martyrologio operam dedit. ‘See Praef. to the Edition in 4to, Paris, 1718, p. v.

**APP88** Foxe reads this sentence thus (Edition 1583, p. 75, col. 2):—  
 ”Eutropius and Vopiscus affirme, that as the said Aurelianus was purposing to rayse persecution against us, he was sodainly terrified with lightning, and so stopped from his wicked tyranny. Not long after about the fift or sixt yeare of hys rayne, he was slaine betwene Bizance and Hieraclea, an. 278. Thus Aurelianus rather intended then moued persecution.”

Foxe is here copying the Centuriators: “Meditatum igitur cam (persec.) solum, non executum Aurelianum apparet. Facit huc quod Eutropius, Vopiscus, et Eusebius in Chronico prodiderunt, Aurelianum postquam persecutionem decerneret, fulmine subito territum paulo post interfectum esse.. Quo magis miramur, etc.” The subsequent reference to Orosius seems to be Foxe’s own, and shows that he had Orosius before him. He has not been accurate, however, as to the authors he names for the different points of his statement. Eutropius and Vopiscus do not say anything about the persecution, or death by lightning, but assert that Aurelian was murdered in his journey between Heraclea and Bezantium.” Eusebius, in his Chronicle, however, and Orosius, *do* so state the matter; their names, therefore, have been introduced into the text: the former, in his Chronicle, sub anno 278, says, “Aurelianus cum adversum nos *persecutionem movisset*, fulmen juxta eum comitesque ejus ruit, ac non multo post inter Constantinopolim et Heracleam in Cenophruno viae veteris occiditur.” Orosius, lib. 2:cap. 23, says, “Novissime, cum persecutionem adversus Christianos *agi nonus a Nerone* decerneret, fulmen ante eum magno pavore circumstantium ruit, ac non multo post in itinere occisus est.” Eusebius decidedly says the persecution was *moved*, and Orosius (as Foxe presently remarks) makes it the tenth persecution: Foxe’s “purposing” has, therefore, been changed into “beginning.”

**APP89** This and the next two pages are very inaccurate in the original text, and have been quite re-modelled from Eusebius: see the references in the notes, and Foxe, Edition 1583, pp. 77, 78.

**APP90** Foxe's text reads thus (Edit. 1583, p.77), "Thus most violent edictes and proclamations were set foorth, for the overthrowing as is saide, of the Christians temples throughout all the Romane Empire. Neyther did there want in the officers any cruell execution of the same proclamations. For their temples were defaced euen when they celebrated the feast of Easter. Eusebius lib. 8. cap. 2. And this was the first edicte giuen out by Dioclesian, the next proclamation that came forth, was for the burning of the bookes of the holy scripture, which thyng was done in the open market place as before: then next unto that were edictes giuen forth for the displacing of such as were magis-trats, and that with a great ignominie, and al other whatsoever bare any office, imprisoning such as were of the common sorte, if they would not abiure Christianitie, and subscribe to the heathen religion. Eusebius lib. 8. cap. 3. and Nicephorus lib. 8. cap. 4. Zonoras also in his second tome. And these were the beginning of the Christians euils"

**APP91** Foxe says merely, "one Tirannion;" line 7, he says the "Bishop of Sydon;" line 8, for "under the torments" he says "with bricke-bates;" line 12, he says "mettall mynes of Phenitia;" and the ensuing sentence in the original is thus:—Pamphilus the elder of Cesarea being the glory of that congregation, died a most worthy Martyr, whose both life and most commendable martyrdome, Eusebius oftentimes declareth in his 8. booke and 13. chapter, in so much that he hath written the same in a booke by itselfe." (Edition 1583, p. 78, col. 1.)

**APP92** "*Hermannus Gigas*," etc.]—The original text here reads, "Hermanus also that monster, caused Serena the wife of Dioclesian the emperour, to be martyred for the Christian Religion." (Edition 1583, p. 78, col. 2.) The following words from the Chronicle of Hermannus Gigas, will justify the correction made:—

"Hic [Diocletianus] fuit homo pessimus et maledictus; uxorem sanctissimi-mam habuit, Senecam nomine, quae pro fide Christi martyrium constanter passa est, in crastino assumptionis beatæ et gloriosæ Virginis Mariæ."—*Hermanni Gygantis Flores Temporum*, 4to. Lugduni Batavorum, 1750. f. 43.

This writer or compiler is so little known, that some notice of him seems desirable. 'Dubio procul is est *Hermannus Gigas*, qui fuit *Minorita*. Chronico veto, quod scripsit, titulum dedit *De Floribus*

*Temporum, seu Flores Temporum.* Hujus Chronici neminere Jac. Wimphelingus sub. 29 Episcopo Argent.; Flacius catal. testium veritatis; Centuriatores Magd.; Hospinian, de festis et templis; Wolfius rerum memotab, tom. 2 etc. etc. Wolfius aetatem ejus indicat, quando statuit medium inter autores, qui floruerunt inter an. 1420 et 1440.” Sandii notae ad Vossium de Hist. Lat. p. 444 in *Supplementa ad Voss, cum praef. Fabricii*; Hamb. 1709. His chronicle has since been printed under the title:—”Herm. Gygantis Flores Temporum, seu Chronicon Universale ab O. C. ad an. 1349, editum a Joh. Gerh. Meuschen, 4to. Lug. Bat. 1743.”

**APP93** The original text reads as follows (Edition 1583, pp.78, 79)—  
 ”There was in Phrigia a citie, unto which the Emperour sent his Edictes that they should doe sacrifice to the gods, and worship Idoles, all which Citizens the Major himselve, the Questor, and chiefe Caprathe confessed that they were all Christians. The Citie upon this was besieged and set on fire, and all the people, Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 11. In Melitina a region of Armenia, the bishops and Elders were cast in prison. Eusebius codera cap. 6. In Arabrace a region neare adioyning to Armenia, Eustratius was martyred, as Nicephorus declareth, Lib. 7, cap. 14. This Eustratius was that countrey man borne, and very skilfull in the Greeke tong. executyng by the Emperour’s commaundement, the shiriffes office at Licia in the East, which also did execution there upon the Christians, and was a Scribe of great estimation called Ordinis Ducalis.”

**APP94** The original sentence in Foxe (Edition 1583, p. 79) reads thus:  
 “Also in Samtatum, of whiche place Chronicon maketh mention, and Scilia, where were 79. martyrs slayne, for the profession of Christ, as writeth Henricus de Erfordia.” Foxe clearly had before him the following sentence of the Centuriators:—”Nec desunt qui in Insulis progressam eam per-secutionem prodiderunt: ut in Lesbum, quod Sabellicus indicavit Ennead. 7. lit. 8. Item in Samum, cujus loci Chronicon meminit; ac Siciliam, ubi Sep-tuaginta novem Martyres ob confessionem Christi trucidatos simul, scribit Henricus de Erfordia.”

**APP95** The following is the original text of this sentence (Edition 1583, p. 79, col. 2): “Also Henricus de Erfordia, and Reginus make mention of

great persecution to be at Colonia where Agrippina and Augusta were martyred, as also in the province of Rhetia.”

**APP96** “*Where Afra was martyred.*”]—The *place* where this martyrdom occurred is supposed to have been mistaken, inasmuch as in several Martyrologies, and in Notker’s, it is enrolled in *Augusta Euphratensi, nativitas Sti. Afri*: “So Augusta in Syria having been taken for Augusta in Germany, St. Afer was translated to Augsburg, and was there turned into a woman; and notwithstanding that city’s great distance from Jerusalem, was still said to have been converted to the faith by Narcissus, Bp. of Jerusalem, as St. Afer, of Syria, was.” Dr. Geddes’s Miscellaneous tracts, vol. it. p. 198: but see Tillemont’s remarks on the subject in his *Note sur St. Afre*. Tom. 5 pt. 2. p. 415.

**APP97** “*Honorius.*”]—A presbyter of Autun, who flourished about 1140, and acquired some celebrity by a Chronicle, an epitome of which was printed at Basle, 1544. See Supplem. ad Vossium, pp. 364, 731.

**APP98** The quotation from Baronius upon this passage will be illustrated and rectified by the following from the *Acta Sanctorum* (Octobris, tom. 5 p. 39): “Ex its quae disputata sunt consecrarium fit, ut oppidum, de quo hic sermo instituitur, primo *Vetera*, dein *Bertinum*, ac denique a *S. Victore* ejusque sociis ibidem passis ac cultis *Sancti* seu *Sanctum*, fuerit vocatum; postea interim id, cum posterioris hujus appellationis ratio haud satis haberetur comperta, nonnullis etiam ac nominatim hic Helinando [a Cistercian monk, the writer of the passage quoted from Baronius], qui Trojanam Francorum originem credebant, idemque oppidum a Trojanis conditum, praepostero nimiae antiquitatis amore abrepti volebant, *Xanthum* ac *Trojam minorem* appellantis.”

**APP99** For “Galerius” Foxe erroneously reads “Maximian.”

**APP100** “*Maximin his son.*”]—“His nephew” would be more exact.

**APP101** Foxe’s text erroneously reads “Athenians,” instead of “Antiochians.”

**APP102** “*They also did counterfeit,*” etc., and line 6 from bottom, “*And the children,*” etc.]—The following is the Greek of these two passages, Eusebius, lib. 9 cap. 5 and 7:—

Cap. 5. Πλασάμενοι δῆτα Πιλάτου καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα, πάσης ἔμπλεα κατὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ βλασφημίας,

γνώμη τοῦ Μείζονος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν διαπέμπονται τὴν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀρχὴν διὰ γραμμάτων παρακελευόμενοι, κατὰ πάντα τόπον ἀγροῦς τε καὶ πόλεις, ἐν ἑκφανεῖ ταῦτα τοῖς πᾶσιν ἐκθεῖναι, τοῖς τε παισὶ τοὺς γραμματοδιδασκάλους ἀντὶ μαθημάτων ταῦτα μελετᾶν, καὶ διὰ μνήμης κατέχειν παραδιδόναι.

Cap. 7. Οἱ τε παῖδες ἀνὰ τὰ διδασκαλεῖα Ἰησοῦν καὶ Πιλάτον καὶ τὰ ἐφ' ὕβρει πλασθέντα ὑπομνήματα, διὰ στόματος κατὰ πᾶσαν ἔφερον ἡμέραν.

The following allusion to these counterfeit “Acts” is in Eusebius lib. 1.

Cap. 9. Οὐκοῦν σαφῶς ἀπελήλεγκται τὸ πλασμὰ τῶν κατὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ὑπομνήματα χθές καὶ πρώην διαδεδώκοτων.

Foxe’s text (Edition 1583, p. 83) thus interprets these two passages: “They also did counterfet certaine practises of Pilate against our savior Christ, full of blasphemie.”—”And the children in the scholes with great noise and handes did euery day resound, the contumelious blasphemies of Pilate unto Jesus, and what other things so euer were deuised of, the magistrates, after most despitefull maner. Eusebius lib. 8, cap. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.”

**APP103** The following is the original list of martyrs as given by Foxe (Edition 1583, p. 83, col. 2.)

“To conclud many in sundry places euery where were martyred, whose name the booke intituled Fasciculus temporum declareth, as Victorianus, Symphoviianus, Castorius, with his wife, Castulus, Cesarius, Mennas, Nobilis, Dorotheus, Gorgonius, Petrus, and other innumerable martirs, Erasmus, Bonifacius, Juliana, Cosmas, Damianus, Basilinus with seuen others, Dorothea, Theophihs, Theodosia, Vitalis, Agricola, Acha, Philemon, Hireneus, Ianuarius, Festus, Desiderius, Gregorius, Spoletanus, Agapes, Chionia, Hirenea, Theodora, and 270 other martyrs, Florianus, Primus and Felicianus, Virus and Modestus, Crescentia, Albinus, Rogatianus, Donatianus, Pancratius, Catharina, Margareta, Lucia, the virgin, and Antheus the king with many thousand martirs mo. Simplicius, Faustinus, Beatrix, Panthaleon, Georgius, Iustus, Leocandia, Anthonia, and other mo to an infinite number, suffered martirdome in this persecution, whose names God hath written in the booke of life. Also Felix Victor, with his parents Lucia the widow, Gemenianus, with 79 others, Sabinus, Anastasia,

Chrisogonus, Felix, and Audactus, Adrianus, Nathalia, Eugenia, Agnes, also when she was but 13. yeare old was martyred.”

This list affords a curious instance how martyrs names may be corrupted, and martyrs made by thousands, who never existed. Foxe followed the foregoing Latin list of the Centuriators, adhering undeviatingly to it, except that, instead of literally translating “27,000 martyrum,” he substituted “many thousand martyrs mo.” The Centuriators give as their authority the “Fasciculus Temporum.” It is not improbable that, when compiling their own work, they had before them a manuscript copy of the “Fasciculus,” which it was difficult to decipher. In that work, as it appears in the printed copies, the names above quoted occur in columns, and among them the following stand thus:—

PANTALEON  
KATHARINA  
MARGARITA  
LUCIA VIRGO  
AGNES (RUS  
CHRISTOPHO—  
SIMPLICIUS

In an ill-written MS. “Agnes (rus” might have chanced to look like “Antheus rex,” and have been followed by abbreviations which might have been mistaken for “27,000 martyrum.”

**APP104** “Also of another Theodore,” etc.]—This, in the original text, stands thus: “Also of another Theodorus, being the byshop of Tyre.” The words of Nicephorus are, ἄλλος οὗτος παρὰ τὸν τήρωνα Βρίγγα τῷ ἡγεμόνι Μαξιμιανου τὴν διὰ πυρὸς ὀλοκάρπωσιν ἀνδρείως διενεγκόντα ἐν Ἀμασίῳ τῇ πόλει.

**APP105** “Prolonged life.”]—Foxe has “eternal life.”

**APP106** For “lib. viii.” read “lib. vii.”

**APP107** “Anysia.”]—This should be probably *Anastasia*, as in the Martyrologies of Usuard and Bede, Decemb. 25.

**APP108** “Urged.”]—Βιαζομένοι Theod. “brought,” Foxe.

**APP109** “Army-camels.”]—Τῆς στρατιᾶς τὰς καμήλους, Theod. “elephants,” Foxe.

**APP110** “A *thousand servants.*”]—Καὶ Σουηνὴν δὲ χιλίων οἴκετων δεσπότην, Theod. “a hundred,” Foxe.

**APP111** The expression “after the dispersion of the early church by the Jews,” is an amplification of Foxe’s “after dispersion of the Jews;” (Edition 1583, p. 106): a similar amplification is made at p. 152, line 8, where Foxe, however, reads “after the dispersion of the Jews.” See also p. 99, line 16 from the bottom of the text, for a similar instance.

**APP112** This pretended work of Gildas is alluded to before, at page 152. It is referred to by Geoffrey of Monmouth, at the end of the fourth book of his *British History*, as containing a full account of the settlement of the British Church by Lucius. Fordun, in his *Scotichronicon*, mentions Gildas as having recorded the exploits of Ambrosius in a very superior style. Foxe’s immediate authority, no doubt, was the *Magdeburg Centuriators*—”Ut Gildas Albanus in libro de victoria Aurelii Ambrosii refert.” (Cent. 2, cap. 2.) Usher says, “Patricii discipulus Gildas Albanus de Victoria, Aurelii Ambrosii librum scripsisse dicitur: quem de rebus a Josepho et sociis apud Glastonienses gestis authorem citat Foxus noster. Sed neque ille ejusmodi librum unquam vidit, neque Nicolao Sandero ulla fides adhibenda, Gildae hic auctoritatem tam confidenter venditante.” (*Britan. Ecclesiastes Antiqu.* cap. 11.) Stillingfleet says, that Leland searched in vain for the book. The best authority for it, he adds, is Geoffrey of Monmouth; but still he declares his doubt of such a work having ever existed; and both he and Usher view the story about Joseph of Arimathea as a pure fiction of the monks of Glastonbury. (See *W. Malmsb. de Antiqu. Glaston. Eccles.*) Tanner, after Bale and Pits, sets down the work to Gildas Albanus, but states that he died 4 Cal. Feb. A.D. 512, and that Gildas Badonicus was so named from being born in the year of Ambrosius’s victory, A.D. 520; if so, how could Gildas Albanus celebrate that victory?

**APP113** “*Nauclerus saith it was anno 156.*”]—Foxe makes this statement, *supra*, p. 151, and from note (6) on that page it might be inferred that he misquoted Nauclerus: this is not the case. Nauclerus (according to *Edit. Colonial, 1564*,) is inconsistent with himself: for in the left column of p. 564, he says, “Anno autem Domini 177 imperii M. Antonini XVI. Soter papa moritur et sepelitur Successit Eleutherius

natione Graecus Hic inito pontificatu mox Epistolam accepit a Lucio rege Britanniae, qua rogabatur ut se ac suos in Christianorum numerum, reciperet:" in „the right column of p. 565 (opposite to p. 564, as the book lies open) he says, Inde [regnavit] Coillus. Huic successit filius Lucius qui primus Christi fidem accepit, petitis per literas a pontifice Eleutherio pietatis doctoribus, circiter annum Domini 156, Imp. Rom. M. Antonino et Lucio Vero;" whereas, previously, at p. 562, he had made these emperors accede to the throne A.D. 162. So that 156 must be considered as a slip of Nauclerus's pen, or a corruption of his text: but Foxe does not misquote him.

**APP114** The following remarks, bearing on the genuineness of the Epistle of Eleutherius, may be found useful:—"There are all the marks of fable upon this story that can be imagined. First of all, it is very uncertain when the thing happened. For archbishop Usher reckons up no less than twenty-three opinions of several authors about the time of this royal conversion. Now this renders a thing very suspicious, when people cannot agree about it when it was done. Even Bede himself differs from himself; for in his Chronicle he sets the story down after the death of Lucius Aurelius Commodus, the brother of M. Aurelius Antoninus; and, in his history, he says the thing happened during Commodus's life, in the year 167, as appears from the 'Recapitulatio Chronica,' at the end of his Ecclesiastical History. Now Bede is the very first author that ever put it into any history or chronicle, and he is so much at a loss where to place it, that he unhappily contradicts himself. Besides that, it could not happen an. 167, because Eleutherus was not bishop of Rome till about ten years after. And pray whence had Bede this curious piece of history? Why, from the silly, ill-contrived book called the 'Liber Pontificalis,' which was patched up about the latter end of the sixth century, by Nobody-knows-who, and which has the following words: 'He (Eleutherus) received an epistle from Lucius, the British king, that by his command he might be made a Christian.' [See life of Eleutherus, in all the edit. of Councils.] These are very nearly the words of Bede, both in his History and his Chronicle. Now, every body agrees that this hook, which contains the actions of the popes, is full of notorious blunders and feigned narrations, which the learned on both sides esteem of no authority at all. Mr. Tillemont himself [Note 2 upon Eleutherus, vol. 3 p. 615]]

agrees, that this story being not founded upon ancient and original pieces, cannot pass for altogether certain. And as for those two learned men, Eluanus and Medwinus, whom king Lucius sent to Eleutherus, and those other two learned and holy bishops, SS. Fugatius and Damianus, who did many great and wonderful feats here, by authority from the apostolic see, there never were any such persons but in the fertile brains of some late Monkish writers; and the said Mr. Tillemont reckons them all as appendages of the story, that are by no means to be maintained.”—*The Britons and Saxons not converted to Popery, or the Faith of our Ancestors shown to have been corrupted by the Romish Church* (Lond. 1748); pp. 276, 277.

The text in Bede is as follows:—”CLVI: Anno ab Incarnatione Domini centesimo quinquagesimo sexto Marcus Antoninus Verus, decimus quartus ab Augusto, regnum cum Aurelio Commodo fratre suscipit: quorum temporibus cum Eleutherus vir sanctus Pontificatui Romanae Ecclesiae praeesset, misit ad eum Lucius Britanniarum Rex epistolam, obsecrans, ut per ejus mandatum Christianus efficeretur: et mox effectum piae postulationis consecutus est, susceptamque fidem Britanni usque in tempora Diocletiani Principia inviolatam integratoque quietis in pace servabant.”—*Historiae Ecclesiastes* lib. 1 cap. 4; Ed. Cantab. 1722, p. 44.

**APP115** For the satisfaction of the reader, the Latin Copy of the Letter is here subjoined, from the laws of Edward the Confessor in Wilkins’s “*Leges Anglo-Saxonicae*” p. 201. It is also in Lambard’s collection of *Ancient Laws*. Sammes, in his “*Britannia Antiqua Illustrata*, Lond. 1676, p. 262,” gives it from a bundle of Antient Records in the City of London, and remarks, that it was used by Bishop Jewel against Harding. The following is the copy from Wilkins:—”Anno 169 (Alias (dicit Lambardus) 156.) a passione Christi Dominus Eleutherius Papa Lucio Regi Brytanniae scripsit, ad petitionem Regis et procerum Regni Brytanniae. Petistis a nobis Leges Romanas et Cabsaris vobis transmitti, quibus in regno Brytanniae uti voluistis. Leges Romanas et Caesaris semper reprobate possumus, legem Dei nequaquam. Suscepistis enim nuper miseratione divina in regno Brytanniae legem et fidem Christi, habetis penes vos in regno utramque paginam, ex illis Dei gratia per consilium regni vestri sume legem: et per illam Dei patientia

vestrum Reges Brytanniae Regnum. Vicarius vero Dei eatis in regno juxta Prophetam Regem, (Psalm 24:1.) Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus orbis terrarum, et universi qui inhabitant in eo: et rursum juxta prophetam regem, (Psalm 45:7.) Dilexisti justitiam et odisti iniquitatem, propterea unxit te Deus tuus oleo laetitiae prae consortibus tuis: et rursum juxta prophetam regem, (Psalm 72:1.) Deus judicium tuum, etc. Non enim judicium neque justitiam Caesaris, filii enim Regis gentes Christianae et populi regni sunt, qui sub vestra protectione et pace et regno degant et consistant juxta Evangelium, Quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos sub alis, etc. Gentes vero Brytanniae et populi vestri sunt, et quos divisos debetis in unum ad concordiam et pacem et ad fidem et ad legem Christi, et Sanctam Ecclesiam, congregare, revocare, fovere, manutenere, protegere, regere, et ab injuriosis et malitiosis et ab inimicis semper defendere. Vae regno ejus Rex puer est, et cujus principes mane comedunt. (Ecclesiastes 10:16.) Non voco Regem propter parvam et nimiam aetatem, sed propter stultitiam et iniquitatem et insanitatem, juxta prophetam Regem. (Psalm 55:25.) Viri sanguinum et dolosi non dimidicabunt dies suos, etc.: per comestionem intelligimus gulam, per gulam luxuriam, per luxuriam omnia turpia et mala juxta Salamonem regem. (Wisdom 1:4.) In malevolam animam non introibit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis. Rex dicitur a regendo non a regno: Rex eris dum bene regis, quod nisi feceris, nomen Regis non in te constabit, et nomen Regis perdes, quod absit. Det vobis Omnipotens Deus regnum Brytanniae sic regere, ut possitis cum eo regnare in aeternum cujus vicarius estis in regno praedicto, qui cum Patre, et Filio,” etc.

Sammes gives a translation of this Epistle, and then remarks:—

“There are several reasons that induce us to believe that this is not the true and genuine Epistle of Eleutherius. And the first is the date it bears, which in the text is dated 169, in the margin 156, yet neither agree with the time of Eleutherius his Popedom, if we will follow the most approved authors; for although Bede says he was made Bishop of Rome A.D. 167, yet Eusebius in his Chronicle places the beginning of his Popedom in the sixteenth year of the Emperor Antoninus, i.e. A.D. 179; but in his history, and indeed truer, to the following year of Antoninus, which is of our Lord 180. Baronius is of the same opinion

also, and confirms it by the letters of the martyrs at Lyons, which were presented to Eleutherius himself.

“2. Besides, if this epistle be true, it makes K. Lucius to take a very preposterous course in sending so far as Rome to Eleutherius for the Roman Laws, when he might sooner, and with less trouble, have procured them at home from the Roman governor; for from the time of the Emperor Claudius (who subdued most part of Britain) the Roman laws were in force here, nay, very well known to the further parts of Yorkshire. And Tacitus says he had erected here Roman courts and tribunals, which was about 100 years before Lucius came to the Government.

“3. This epistle makes no mention of any power or authority the Romans had in these parts; but makes Lucius an absolute monarch, as in nothing subject to the Roman governor,—‘For you be God’s Vicar (or Vicegerent) in your own kingdom—not Claudius Caesar’s, or any other emperor’s,—contrary to the customs of those times,’ etc. etc.

“4. The word ‘manutenere’ (in the original), which we translate ‘maintain,’ was not in use in Eleutherius his time, but savors rather of the Norman-Latin, from which it crept into our country laws, etc.

“5. Those places which are quoted out of the Holy Scripture are taken out of the translation of St. Hierom, who lived two hundred years after Eleutherius.

“6. This epistle never came out into the world till almost a thousand years after the death of Eleutherius, but out of what monk’s cell it came is uncertain; but that which ought to be most observed is, that it is nowhere to be found in Gaufridus Monumetensis, contemporary with Hoveden, who was always diligent in the collection of the British Antiquities.”

Collier copies the substance of these objections, and gives another translation of the letter.

**APP115A** “*Who with Ursula.*”]—A similar account is given by Baronius in his notes to the Martyrol. Romans (Oct. 21) from a MS. in the Vatican library, by Geoffry, Bishop of St. Asaph. It may, now not unseasonably, be added, that part of the skull of St. Maurice, and the heads of two of St. *Ursula*’s companions, were considered as

acquisitions in the 17th century by the college at Augsburg; and that the ladies of the family of the *Fuggers* spent upwards of 600 golden crowns in decking out the aforesaid relics for their temple. See *Hist. provincioe soc. Jesu Germanioe Super. ab Ign. Agricola; pars 3*, (Aug. Vind. 1734,) p. 109.

If any one is desirous of looking further into the subject, Archbishop Usher's *Brit Eccles. Antiq.* pp. 324-30, edit. 1687, may be consulted. "Ejus (Ursulae) historia multa fabulosa continet, nec legitima sunt Acta, quae a Surio ad 21 Oct. ex Auct. Anonymo referuntur; sicut nec quae citantur a Baronio in notis ad Martyrol. Rom., quaeque in Breviariis plerisque leguntur. Hermannus quidem Crombak soc. Jesu theologus tomum integrum *de Ursula vindicata* composuit Colon. 1647.) Sed uam causam tuendam susceperit magis incredibilem reddit. Martyrium itaque S. Ursulae et sociarum certum; sed harum humerus incertus, pluraque ad eam Historiam pertinentia prorsus fabulosa." Pagii critice in Baronii *Annal.* ad an. 383, sect. 3. See also Basnage upon the same year, sect. 13, who doubts the truth of the *whole*. The story, however, is still countenanced in Rome. In the "Lives of the saints canonized on Trinity Sunday, 1839," we read of St. Veronion Giuliani, that "she received in baptism the name of *Ursula*, for God destined her, like our own holy martyr, to be a virgin, and the leader of many other virgins to the kingdom of heaven." p. 224.

**APP116** Foxe says, erroneously, "Eleven hundred."

**APP117** "Canterbury" is substituted for Foxe's "Dorobernia;" the same has been done twice in p. 342.

**APP118** Guido de Columna, a native of Messina, in Sicily, is most celebrated for a grand prose Romance in Latin, containing fifteen books "on the Trojan War:" it was written at the request of Mattheo de Ports, archbishop of Salerno. Bale says, that Edward the First, having met with Guido in Sicily on his return from Asia, A.D. 1270, invited him into England. Among his works is recited "Historia de Regibus Rebusque Angliae;" it is quoted by many writers under the title of "Chronicon Britannorum." A full account of him will be found in Mongitori's *Bibliotheca Sicula*, 1:265, and Isaiah Vossius *de Script. Lat.*, and the Notes of Sandins thereon. See also the New Edit. of Warton's *History of English Poetry*, Loud. 1824, vol. 1:pp. 12.9, 130.

**APP119** “*The various Sigeberts create confusion.*”]—Sigebert or Sigbercht, king of the E. Angles, was converted and baptized in France, when an exile; and, on his return, founded the East Anglian Church, of which Felix was the first bishop. (See Bede, 3 18.) Sigebert, or Sigbercht (the Good), being converted by means of his friend Oswy, king of Northumberland, was baptized by bishop Finian. Cedd was first bishop. This was the revival of Christianity after it had been oppressed by the expellers of Mellitus. (*Ib.* 22.) Wulfere, hearing that Sighere, brother of Sebbi, king of Essex, had revolted from the faith about A.D. 664 in consequence of a pestilence, sent Jaruman bishop of Mercia, to reclaim the province, who was successful. (*Ib.* 30.) The following passages, also, in Polychronicon were probably before Foxe—” A.D. 650. Circa hoc tempus, Est-Saxones fidem quam olim abjecerunt mediante Oswy Rege Northumbrorum receperunt; Nam Rex eorum Sigebertus baptizatus est a Finano Episcopo Northumbrorum juxta murum illum prolixum, qui quondam Britannos distinxit a Scotis.” “A.D. 657. Beda. Wulferus qui primus omnium Regum Merciorum Christianus factus Ermenildam filiam Erconberti Regis Cantiae in conjugem accepit ..... Regem Westsaxonum Kenwalcum spud Ashednum gloriose devicit: Vectam Insulam subjugavit quam postmodum Regi Estanglorum ut Christianus fieret dedit, cujus et ipse in Baptismo Patrinus extitit.”

**APP120** A Roman priest, named Stephen, was chosen to the papal chair immediately after Zachary, but died of paralysis the third day after, without being consecrated; hence he is sometimes omitted (as here) from the list of popes.

**APP121** “*Then cometh Adrian the first holding, moreover, a synod at Rome against Felix.*”]—Felix, Bishop of Urgella, is intended; but his heresy had no connection, apparently, with images. (See Mosheim, cent. 8, pt. 2, ch. 5, sect. 3.) “*Damnata jam pridem fuerat haeresis Felicianiana, quae Christum non verum ac proprium Dei filium, quod fides docet Catholica, sed adoptivum esse contendebat, in Synodo Ratisbonensi an. 792, ubi et auctor ipse agnitum, ut prae se ferebat, errorem detestans ejurarat; neque ibi solum, sed Romae item apud Hadrianum Papam, ad quem directus a Carolo rege fuerat.*’ *Labbei*

*Concill. General.* (Lutet. Paris. 1671), tom. 7 col 1149; *Forbesii Instruct. Historico-theol.* lib. 6 cap. 1.

**APP2-122** *Thus Charlemagne being proclaimed Emperor ... the empire was translated.*”]—The fact, thus briefly alluded to, deserves to be brought more distinctly under the notice of the reader, as the bishops of Rome have frequently referred to the circumstance, as being *aspiritual* proceeding. “*Palmate est Innocentii III. P.M. testimonium in c. ‘Venerabilem’ de electione [Decret. Greg. IX. lib. 1:tit. 6, sect. 34]. APOSTOLICA SEDES, inquit, imperium in persona magnifici Caroli a Groecis transtulit ad Germanos. Idem asserit Clemens V. in Clementina [lib. 2, tit. ix.] ‘Romani principes,’ de Jurejurando: ECCLESIA Romana, inquit, a Groecis imperium transtulit ad Germanos, sc., ad Carolum M., cui Germania parebat universa.*

“*Causam cur Leo III. imperatoris titulum ac dignitatem cum Carolo M. communicarit, paucis verbis exponit Sigonius, lib. 4., ad an. 801. Hunc, inquit.. dignitatis imperatorie titulum, quum in Momyllo Augustulo, ultimo Occidentis imperatore, ante trecentos ferme annos, sub regnum Gothorum in Italia defecisset, in eodem Occidente Pontifex renovavit, ut haberet Ecclesia Romana adversus infideles, hoereticos, ac seditiosos tutorem, ejus officium repudiasse jampridem imperator Orientis videretur.*” *Alex. Natalis Hist. Ecclesiastes tom. 12 p. 196, edit. 1788.* Cardinal Allen, in his notorious, and now most rare, tractate, *An Admonition to the Nobility and People of England and Ireland*, printed in 1588, declares plainly, among other instances quoted by him to animate the Papists against queen Elizabeth, that “for heresy and schisme were the Greek emperours discharged, and the Empire thereby translated to the Germans, by Pope Leo the Third.” p. 45. See Mosheim for some good remarks and references upon the subject.

# FOOTNOTES

## SECTION 1

- <sup>ft1</sup> “Quivis archiepiscopus et episcopus habebit domi suae sacra Biblia in amplissimo volumine, uti nuperrime Londini excusa sunt, et plenam illam historiam, quae inscribitur ‘Monumenta Martyrum,’ et alios quosdam similes libros ad religionem appositos. Locentur autem isti libri vel in aula, val in grandi coenaculo, ut et ipsorum famulis et advenis usui esse *possint*.” — *Cardwell's Synodalia*, p. 115.
- <sup>ft2</sup> Quorum importunitate consensi in opus emittendum, initio non alio destinatum, quam ut imaginem pateruae consuetudinis apud me servarem, et nunc in tanta hominis farna, aliorum magis opinione, quam iudicio meo necessarium. — *Ad Lectorem*.
- <sup>ft3</sup> The Revelation S. R. Maitland, who has apparently occupied a large portion of the last six years of his life in the vain endeavor to write down Foxe, — having indited within that period some seven or eight separate pamphlets, besides letters and newspaper and magazine articles innumerable, — Mr. Maitland, in his general “dislike” and distrust of everything connected with the Martyrologist, cannot help suspecting even this Memoir. He has devoted a separate pamphlet to the task of showing that it is certainly spurious, and not written by either of Foxe's sons. His reasons for so concluding are trivial to the last degree. For instance: 1. The Martyrologist was accustomed to write his name *Foxus*: — the memoir-writer latinizes it *Foxius*. (Had Mr. M. forgotten *Shakespear*; *Shahspete*; *Shakesper*, etc.?) 2. The memoir-writer says little of Mrs. Foxe, or of his brother. 3. “He tells us that Foxe began his Martyrology at Basil, and was eleven years writing it, — a statement so monstrous,” etc. But it is quite true, nevertheless, that as a Martyrology it was first produced at Basil, and that for eleven years, and more than eleven years, afterwards, Foxe was constantly engaged in augmenting and completing it. 4. He falls into an error as to the title of one of Foxe's tracts. A mistake which might easily happen; seeing that the said tract was printed many years before he, the memoir-writer, was born, and that it is quite possible that he

had never even seen a copy. 5. Besides which, the way in which Foxe is spoken of, (*Foxtius noster*, etc.) is very unlike the filial style. A similar objection would prove Caesar's Commentaries not to have been written by Caesar.

By such reasonings as these does Mr. Maitland persuade himself that this memoir of Foxe, prefixed to the edition of A. n. 1641, is a fraud and a forgery. A more striking proof of the credulity of resolved scepticism was perhaps never seen. While hunting, with more zeal than discretion, for the slightest token of deception or inconsistency, he overlooks certain broad and palpable proofs of authenticity, which are abundantly sufficient to decide the whole question.

The Memoir in question first appeared under the sanction of a public, privileged, and responsible body. It was given to the world by the *Stationers' Company*, at a time when that incorporation occupied nearly the same ground which the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* does now.

The *Stationers' Company*, in 1641, was, under LETTERS PATENT, jointly with the University of Oxford, the authorized printer of Primers, Psalm Books, and other books for Churches and Schools. Its affairs were conducted by a large and respectable court; and under its sanction appeared this Memoir of Foxe, professing to be the work of one of his sons.

No records, I am informed, can now be found of the production of the edition of 1641; their absence being partly accounted for by the loss of many of the Company's books in the Fire of London. But a copy of an entry of a later date has been handed to me, which shows the sense of responsibility under which the Company acted. In 1682 they gave authority to captain Samuel Rycroft to print an edition in their name, paying to them the sum of 100l. But, at the same time, they required him to enter into articles, "to make *no alteration or addition* in the said book, *or in any part thereof.*"

Under the sanction, then, of this public body, appeared the edition of 1641, having prefixed to it a Life of Foxe, professing to be written by one of his sons. But were those sons both deceased at that moment; or absent, and unable to protest against a fraud? No; on the contrary, Dr. Simeon Foxe, the younger of the two, was then alive, and occupied the

honorable post of President of the College of Physicians, having an official residence in *Amen Corner*, within sight of *Stationers' Hall*.

Mr. Maitland, therefore, requires us to believe, on the ground of some things in the Memoir which, appear to him strange or inconsistent, that the Stationers' Company, possessing a character and functions confided to them by Letters Patent, and acting, not in individual secrecy, but by a public board, perpetrated a fraud on the Church; and that not in some trivial matter, but in the great Church History of the time, published in three folio volumes. And further, that the Company did not thus fraudulently personate any deceased or obscure person, but actually endorsed a document purporting to come from the hand of the President of the College of Physicians, then living, and dwelling within sight of their own premises; and that neither by means of any member of the Court of that Company, nor yet by the complaint of the eminent person so practiced upon, did one word of the fraudulent nature of this transaction ever transpire. Certainly, he who can believe all this, had better leave off troubling himself in future, with external or historical evidence as to any fact or document whatsoever.

Mr. Maitland has examined, as he says, the original documents; yet he seems to have been unable to discern what, to others, would constitute the strongest proofs of authenticity.

A person fabricating a Life of Foxe, to be passed off as the work of his son, would naturally have shunned the light as much as possible. He would have found some private adventurer, of unscrupulous character, among the booksellers, to aid in putting forth the forgery. He would have never thought of writing his fiction first in Latin, and then taking the trouble to translate it into English. He would have waited until the death of the party whose name he meant to assume. Above all, his MS., when printed, would have been carefully concealed, and speedily destroyed.

Instead of which, what do we find, in the present case? The Memoir of Foxe is placed in the hands of a public body, the last that can be thought likely to be concerned in a fraud. It is published during the life-time, and within sight of the very dwelling, of the party whose work it professes to be. The original Latin is printed with great pomp, and followed by an English translation. And the document itself, in its

native condition, is carefully preserved, is treasured up by Strype, among other undoubted relics of the Foxe family; and after passing through the Lansdowne Collection, is deposited at last in the British Museum. There it rests, side by side with private letters of both the sons of the Martyrologist. And on comparison with their unquestionable correspondence, it appears to be quite evident, by similitude of hand, that the body of the narrative is in the writing of Samuel, the elder brother, — the corrections and additions in the hand of Simeon, the younger, who doubtless adopted it as his own, and transferred it, before his death, to some acting members of the Stationers' Company.

It may be as well to add, though the case is sufficiently strong without it, that not only Simeon Foxe, the younger son of the Martyrologist, but also Thomas Foxe, the son of Samuel and nephew of Simeon, was living at the College of Physicians in Amen Corner, at the very time of the publication of this Memoir; and the latter for many years after. It would, doubtless, be from his descendants that Strype obtained the unquestionable relics of the Martyrologist which are now in the British Museum; and it must have been from the same source that both he and Anthony Wood gained their impression that the Memoir in question was the work of Samuel Foxe, the eldest of the two sons.

<sup>ft4</sup> See Churton's *Life of Nowell*, 1809. Nowell taught logic from the work of Rodolphus Agricola, one of the most learned men of the fifteenth century. Erasmus greatly exalts his character, learning, and abilities. — Watt's *Bibliotheca Britannica*, Art. Agricola Rodolphus

<sup>ft5</sup> See Townley's *Biblical Literature*, vol. 2:p. 470.

<sup>ft6</sup> Townley, vol. 2:p. 393.

<sup>ft7</sup> February 4th, 1555

<sup>ft8</sup> Townley, vol. 2:p. 400.

<sup>ft9</sup> Strype's *Memorials of Cranmer*, vol. 1:b. 1:chap. 18.

<sup>ft10</sup> May, 1540.

<sup>ft11</sup> May, 1541.

<sup>ft12</sup> Successit tandem postrema *scholasticorum* aetas, quae modum nullum servavit sophisticæ barbariæ, impudentiæ in erroribus tum receptis

statuminandis, otiosis et inutilibus, quin etiam impiis, determinandis, aut versandis in utramque pattern; atque adeo inducenda in scholas quaestionum, terminorum, distinctionurn, monstrosa novitate, perdendis ingeniis, literis, sacra disciplina. Cumprimis in materiis de Deo, de Trinitate, de Incarnatione, de persona Christi, de potestate papae, de transubstantiatione, de pnrgratorio, de novissimis. Et hi doctores, vocandi *acuti, subtiles, singulares, facundi, resolutissimi ordinatissimi, et si quibus aliis elogiis et epithetis veniunt. Ab his quodlibet mojora, minora, determi-nationes, fornalitates, specuta, quaestiones solemnes, ordinariae, questiones, super questiones, praedicamen-forum, acroamaticorum, metaphysicalium: subtilitatum, mysteria; praeer Legendas, Marlalia, et id genus librorum pestes.*

Partes hujus postremae scholasticae praecipui fuere: *Joannes Duns Scotus*, sub initia hujus seculi 14:Cotoniae (ut ferunt) apoptexia percussus, vel letargo correptus, ac virus in sepulchrum illatus, ex quo frustra egredi annexus est, devoratis manibus. Hinc celebres fuere, *Durandus as. Porciano, Petrus Aureolus, Herveus Natalis, Fr. de Mayronis Gallus*, et ejus farinae reliqui. Nec minus lstorum ferax fuit seculum 15:ad tempora usque *Thomae Cajetani*, id est, Lutheri et Zwinglii, ubi desinit scholasticorum aetas. De quibus tacere praestat, quam de ils multa dicere, et adeantur noti de *Scriptoribus. Ecclesiastes Commentarii.*

Frid. Spanhemii F. L Optrum. fol. tom. 1:secul, 14:cap. 11, p. 1796. — Lugd. Batav. 1701.

<sup>ft13</sup> Wakefield, the successor of Reuchlin at Tübingen, was the first Hebrew professor

## SECTION 2

<sup>ft14</sup> Henry conceived that he had not only the right, but was placed in the duty of guiding and ruling the faith, and doctrines, and religious reasonings of his people. He believed he was to act in these as the vicar of the divine legislator, as the pontiff he had dethroned had arrogated a right dictatorially to be. It was on this principle that he so personally insisted on the Act for suppressing diversity of opinions. { Henry VIII. c. xiv. } He saw his people in a fluctuating sea of mind and discussion from the influx of the new sentiments and views that now rushed in

from all parts of society; and he thought that he was the proper Neptune to pacify and to govern the disordering commotion into quiet and uniformity. We see this misconceiving idea in full operation in his last speech in parliament, in which he urges the clergy to terminate the reigning discord, “or else I, whom God has appointed his vicar, and high minister here, will see these divisions extinct, and these enormities corrected, according to my very duty; or else I am an unprofitable servant and untrue officer.” { Hall, p. 866. ap. Turner's Hist. of England, ut sup. p. 533. See also, for further enactments in Confirmation of this king's power, 24 Henry VIII. cap. xii., 25 Henry VIII. cap. 19:and 35 Henry VIII. cap. 16:Pulton's Statutes, fol. 1670.} A wide career of evil was opened by this strange assumption, in which the most energetic mind, without any bad motives, and even from the very best purposes, especially if unchecked by the kind sensibilities, was sure to be the most tyrannical; and, from principle, unrelenting. — Hist. of Eng. by Sharon Turner, vol. 7:chap. 31:p. 533.

**Ft15** Thou ruthless, jealous tyrant, — Heaven repay  
 On thee and on thy children's latest line,  
 The wild caprice of thy tyrannic sway —  
 The gory bridal bed — the plunder'd shrine —  
 The murder'd Surrey's blood — the tears of Geraldine.  
 Scott's “Lay of the Last Minstrel,” Canto VI.

**Ft16** See Gardiner's Treatise “De Vera Obedientia,” in the Fasciculus Rerum Expetendarum, 2:800; and Sampson's “De Obedientia Regi Praestanda;” “ibid. 820; also, Strype, 1:111. Thus we are told, in a Sermon by Archbishop Cranmer, — “Though the magistrates be evil, and very tyrants against the commonwealth, and enemies to Christ's religion, yet ye subjects must obey in all worldly things, as the Christians do under the truth; and ought so to do as long as he commandeth them not to do against God.” — Strype's Cranmer, Rec. 114. See also the King's Books — the Articles — the Institution — and *the Erudition of a Christian Man*. — Lingard's History of England, vol. 6:pp.481,482. Second Edition.

**Ft16** Day assures us that he was sent for from Oxford to Reigate in Surrey, in the troublesome and dangerous times of the Six Articles, to be tutor to the duke of Norfolk. This could not have been, however, till after his

marriage. — Day's Epistle-Dedicatory to Foxe's "Christus Triumphans." Lond. 1579.

**Ft18** Foxe, vol. 2:p. 479, Edit. 1684, folio.

**Ft19** The name Thomas was common for many generations to the head of the Lucy family, who were at this period the owners of Charlecote. The employer of Foxe, one of the pupils of Foxe, and the son of the pupil of Foxe, who prosecuted, as it is said, Shakspeare for deer-stealing, were all so named. A doubt has been started, whether the honor of knighthood was borne by the head of the family at the period named in the life of Foxe; but the inaccuracy, if it be one, is very trifling. Foxe might very naturally tell his son that he was, at such a time, tutor in Sir Thomas Lucy's family; meaning thereby, in the family of the gentleman who was Sir Thomas Lucy at the time when he so spake. — See the pedigree of this ancient gentleman's family in Dugdale's Warwickshire. The Lueys were patrons of the living of Charlecote. I find the following abstract in Dugdale which confirms my account.

1 Rich. Verney. Ar. etc. D. Eliz. Lucy, ux. ejus, D. Andreas Warburton, nuper ux. Th. Lucy, mil. defuncti Phr. 24 Mail 1534.

2 Thom. Lucy, Arm. D. Nich. Smith, Clef. 23 Julii 1562. John Davies, Cler. 21 Aug. 1577.

3 Tho. Lucy, Miles Ric. Southam, Cler. 25 Mail 1582.

4 Thomas Lucy, Miles Mich. Wood, Cler. 10 Aug. 1619.

A descendant of sir Thomas entered Trinity College, Oxford, in 1610, but afterwards proceeded to Caius, Cambridge; and, in 1660, was consecrated bishop of St. David's. He died in 1677, and was buried in the collegiate church of Brecknock; on a monument to whose memory was an inscription in letters of gold on black marble. Bishop Lucy wrote a Criticism on Hobbes's Leviathan, in which he exposed many errors; 8vo. 1657. Also, On the Nature of a Minister in all his Offices, 4to. 1670; and An Apology for the Church of England in point of Separation from it, 8vo. 1676. — See Ant. Wood, vol. 2:p. 596, Ed. 1721. Also, Watts's Bibliotheca.

In the reign of Elizabeth, a grammar-school was founded at Hampton Lucy, near Stratford-on-Avon, by a branch of the family, with six

scholarships to Magdalen Hall, Oxford, endowed out of the Lucy estates in Warwickshire.

The most memorable circumstance, however, which has made this ancient name familiar in every part of England, is the tradition that Shakspeare absconded from his native town to seek a precarious livelihood, to avoid a prosecution for stealing the venison in Lucy's park.

**Ft20** Quoad pueris adultior jam aetas praesceptoris neessitatem exuerat.

**Ft21** In qua domo uxorem posted duxit.

**Ft22** Porerat tamen ea, ut ferebat lama, ex illo emergere periculo: nisi schedula forte quaedam a ductore per manicata brachii redimicula, quae orationem Dominicam vernaculo idiomate contineret, perspecta, in odium primum episcopi et theologorum, deinde in condemnationem earn retraxisset. — Rerum in Ecclesia gestarum, etc. etc. autore Joanne Foxo Anglo. Baslieae, per Nicolaum Brylingerum et Joannem Oporinum. Folio. 1559, p. 117.

**Ft23** Atque utinam ii, qui, in historiis scribendis versati, ceteras res in externa republicae gestas, bella, tumultus, seditiones domesticas, victorias, regumque facta tam diligenter mandarunt monumentis, parem quoque in his, quae ad ecclesiae pertinebant negocia, consignantibus diligentiam adhibuissent, quo plenior simul et certior harum rerum memoriam teneret posteritas. — Rerum in Ecclesiastes Gest. ut sup.

**Ft24** As when a hunted deer, chased with the hounds, takes sanctuary by flying to the rest of the herd, they, out of a principle of self-preservation, drive him away for fear lest the hounds in pursuit of him fall on them; so Foxe's father-in law was loath to receive him, and forbade him the protection of his family, lest persecution, in quest of his son, should bring him and his whole household into trouble. — Lansdowne MSS. No. 388.

**Ft25** Born March 10, 1536.

**Ft26** Born February 25, 1539.

**Ft27** Born 1537-8.

<sup>ft28</sup> The name of the first duke of Norfolk is given by Hume as Thomas; but this appears to be an error. Dr. Nott, in his *Memoirs of the Earl of Surrey*, states, “that on the accession of Richard III. sir John Howard was created the first duke of Norfolk, of the name of Howard, his son Thomas being at the same time, June, 1483, made earl of Surrey.” This is corroborated by the “*Memorials of the Howard Family.*” *Baker's Chronicle*, p. 325. London, 1653. The title had been in the Mowbray family. Margaret, daughter of Thomas Mowbray, duke of Norfolk, married sir Robert Howard, whose son John, born about 1420, was raised to the dukedom of Norfolk in 1483. The above Thomas Mowbray was the last duke of Norfolk of that name. I subjoin a specimen of the correspondence of the duchess of Norfolk to the earl of Essex:—

“My ffary gode lord her I sand you in tokyn hoff the new eyer a glasse of setyl set in sellfer gyld I pra you take hit wort and hy wer habel het showlde be hater I woll hit war wort a M. crone.”

Which, in modern English spelling, runs thus:—”My very good lord, here I send you, in token of the new year, a glass of setyl set in silver gilt. I pray you take it worthy, an I were able it should be better. I would it were worth a thousand crowns.” This lady was daughter of the great duke of Buckingham, and mother of lord Surrey, one of the most accomplished persons of her time; the friend of scholars, and the patroness of literature.

<sup>ft29</sup> Lord Thomas Howard. — *Nott's Life of Lord Surrey*, Preface, p. 13

<sup>ft30</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.

<sup>ft31</sup> Rapin and Tindale, vol. 1:p. 847. *Herbert's Henry VIII.* p. 624. *Sharon Turner's History of England*, vol. 2:p. 515. *Nott's Surrey*, p. 9. Hume says they were committed December 12, 1547; and Tytler, in his *Henry VIII.* p. 457, also, says 1547. This is evidently a careless error, as the latter (p. 461) mentions proceedings as having taken place January 27th foliowhig; and Hume, vol. 5: notices the assembling of parliament on January 14th, after the arrest of Norfolk and Surrey. All historians agree that Henry VIII. died January 20, 1547; before which event Surrey had been beheaded on the 19th of January; and. at the time of the king's death the duke of Norfolk was left in prison.

- <sup>Ft32</sup> This opinion would be strengthened, as the duke of Norfolk was one of the enemies of Cranmer. — Burnet's Reformation, vol. 1:p. 531.
- <sup>Ft33</sup> His name has been rendered familiar to us by Dr. Nott's publication of his Life; and by the beautiful lines of Sir Walter Scott, in his "Lay of the Last Minstrel."
- <sup>Ft34</sup> This may, perhaps, have been the real cause why the duchess appeared as the accuser of her brother. — Memorials of the Howard Family.' Oldmixon, p. 141. Tytler's "Henry the Eighth," p. 458.
- Herbert, "Henry the Eighth," says, "The duchess said that her brother also urged her to marry Sir Thomas, wishing her to endear herself so into the king's favor, that she might the better bear rule, as others had done." This does not appear at all compatible with Surrey's character.
- <sup>Ft35</sup> Burnet's History of the Reformation," pp. 533, 534: London, 1820. Oldmixon, p. 147.
- <sup>Ft36</sup> The countess of Surrey afterwards married Thomas Steyning, Esq. of Woodford, Suffolk. She had a daughter by this marriage, named Maria, married to Charles Seekford, Esq. of Woodford. The countess died in June 1577, at Sobare Earl, and was interred at Framlingham, where her second son, Henry, Earl of Northampton, erected a monument to her and his father. The register of Soham Earl, contains the following: "Anno Dmi. 1577. Item, the Ladye Francis Countys of SurrYE dyed the last of June, in the year aforesaid, and was buried at Framlyngham."
- <sup>Ft37</sup> Camden, pp. 440. 441,448, who states that he was present, and heard all, and saw all, that he here alleges. Apud Collins's Peerage, Vol. I. Part 1. p. 131.
- <sup>Ft38</sup> There were two other daughters, whom Foxe's son has not mentioned: Catharine, who was married to Henry Lord Berkely, and Margaret, to Henry Lord Scrope of Bolton. They probably continued under the care of their mother.
- <sup>Ft39</sup> "Exceedingly did his free and voluntary labors fructify among them, for many were there converted from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God; witness thereof the old superstitious and idolatrous Lady of Ouldsworth, an image or idol-saint, who was worshipped at

Reigate, in place of God, for her miraculous power of saving health," etc. — Daye's Preface.

<sup>Ft40</sup> Godwin, de Praesulibus, p. 236.

<sup>Ft41</sup> See Heylyn's *Ecclesia Restaurata*, pt. 2:p. 59, Ed. 1570, who affirms that Whittingham, Williams, and Goodman were Zwinglians: and Bossuet boasts of the fact, that Zwinglianism triumphed at Oxford in the time of Edward VI. — *Variations*, book 8:c. 9.

<sup>Ft42</sup> Bingham, book 14:c. 4. see. 4.

<sup>Ft43</sup> Burnet's *Reformation*, Collection of Records to Book I. pt. 2:No. 2. Leslie's *Case of the Regale and Pontificale*, pp. 39, 41.

<sup>Ft44</sup> *Ecclesiastes Hist.* vol. 2:p. 222.

<sup>Ft45</sup> This date is according to the Book of Ordination of 1550, now in St. Paul's. "Deacon, June 23d, 1550. (Foxus) Master John Foxe, Master of Arts, residing in the House of the Duke of Norfolk, born at Boston. in the Diocese of Lincoln, by Letters Commendatory in that behalf (in cal. parte)laudably bestowed." Copy from Ordination Book.

"1550, 25 Junii, Mag. Joh. Fox, A.M. moram trahens cure Domina Ducissa Suffolc. oriundus apud Boston, Linc. Disc. ordinatus Diaconus per Nichum. Lond. Epum. Reg. Ridley." — Lansdowne MSS. 982, p. 103.

<sup>Ft46</sup> Southey's *Book of the Church*, p. 301, Edit. 1837.

<sup>Ft47</sup> Southey, pp. 311, 312; Carte, vol. in. p. 234; Mackintosh, vol. 2:p. 259; Turner's *Mcd. Hist. of Eng.* vol. ill. p. 251. Also Tytler, Walter, Burnet, and others. "The Six Articles, and the statutes that made words treason, and other such severe laws, ye seem to require again; the which all our whole parliament, almost on their knees, required us to abolish and put away; and, when we condescended thereto, with a whole voice gave us most humble thanks, for they thought before that no man was sure of his life, lands, or goods. And would you have these laws again? Will you that we shall resume the *scourge* again, and *hard snaffle* for your mouths? If all the realm consent, and ye require to have our sword again awake, and more nearer your heads, ye may soon have it by us and by parliament restored to his old power. But, we fear us, they that most desire it will soonest and sorest repent it. When we are

content to rule like a father, with all mercy and clemency, ye do call for the bridle and whip. Ah! our loving subjects, who be they that put this into your heads? Do ye know what ye demand, and what the end will be of that request? “ — Tytler's Edward VI. and Mary. vol. 1:pp. 180, 181. This is a different answer from that given in the text, which may also be correct; as Tytler says, (p. 182,) there are in the State Paper Office three contemporary *drafts* of this answer.

Fi48 **“Frequens hic per omniurn era ac aures jactatur non suspicio modo,<sup>L1</sup>** sed coilstans certissimaque prsedicatio, id vos, summi sanetissimique patres, moliri, ut sanguinaries leges illes *Sex Artieulorum* titulo inscriptes, quondam bene sopites, nunc demure, velut ex orco, revocentur ad superos. Quod si verum sit, quam vobis plausibile, ac quibusdam sit gratum, ignoro; certe, quam reip. fanesturn at ominosum sit futurum, satis jam pridem declarat publicus moeror, tristissima rerum fere humanarum ac luctuosa facies, optimi cujusque gemitus; nec tacita solurn suspiria, sed abetrim ex doloris acerbitate prorumpentes lachrymae, quotidiana bonorum fuga, totius denique reip. (si tamen resp. aliqua sit) squalor: ut interim taceam conscientiarum occulta judicia ac vulnera, in omnibus fere horror, in nonnullis etiam funera, ae mortes ex rerum perturbatione contractae. Quae si calamitates (tot tantaeque quidera illae, quantas vix in ulla unquam rep. conspeximus) ex concepta rerum imagine atque recordatione duntaxat ipsa, cives adeo perstringunt vestros, quid vos futurum tandem existimatis, suspiciendi domini, exhibitis jam rebus ipsis, ubi in exhibendis tanta sit trepidatio; ubi intolerabilis ipse legum rigor, et acutissima acies cervicibus jam incumbit civium; ubi tot millia hominum non vitae libertatem, quam jam amiserunt, sed vitam ipsam cogentur deserere? Nec jam vita, sed et conscientia etiam erepta hominibus; — nec Deo quidera supplicate licebit pro arbitrato suo, sed ad libidinem paucorum.

“Quae quum ita sint, vel deteriora etiam, quam a me referri queant, considerabit prudentia vestra, quae documentis nostris non eget, sed pro communi salute rerum, consilia vestra potissimum flectenda sunt. Haec etiam jam ipsa aguntur tempora, quibus vobis jam in manu siturn est, felices nos velitis, ae perditos? Si tam vilem babearis civium vestrorum sanguinem; — si nihil vos moveant tot hominum gemitus, querelae, lacrymae, bonorum miseriae, — si parum sit vobis una ab

iisdem legibus accepta clades;—age denuo! revocetur Trojanus equus in urbem, quo soli, vel cum pancis, regnum hoc possideatis! Sin vero ulla subit animos vestros reip. charitas; — si quod patriae studium maneat; — siquid denique reip. siquid ecclesies christianae (quam advolutam genibus vestris existimetis) flebilis querela valeat; — efficite modo, pii proceres, pro summa pietate, ut pluris sit apud vos salutis publica conservatio, quam privata quorundam sollicitatio; nec quid possit pro imperlo autoritas, sed quid aequitas potius civibus debeat vestra, velitis considerate.

“Nihil enim in omni officiorum genere fieri aequus arbitror, quam ut quorum vos patria patres conscripsit ipsa, eos in filiorum loco ascitos tueamiai; quique suam ad vos omenm reverentiam, ac dignitatis autoritatem transferunt, ilidem a vobis salutis ac tranquillitatis vicissim accipiant suae incolumitatem. Quod si communis patriae respectus vos minus attingat, at quod vobis ipsis dignum, quod generosa ac heroica sanguinis vestri nobilitas tacito quodam sensu vobis suggerat, attendite. Nam quum inter humanos omnes affectus, nil sit tam hominis proprium, quam clementia, qua divinae naturae imaginem maxime referre vel infimi etiam videntur homines; quid tum a vobis expectari convenit, illustrissimi heroes, qui quo sublimiorem honoris in his terris gradum sortiti estis, hoc expressius supremo huic imaginis divinae archetypo respondere omnibus modis decet?”

“Porro, habetis ad hoc reginam, ut nobilissimam, ita ad sand et salubria quaque obsequacem principem. Habetis et eancellorium, ut doctrina praestabilem, ita natura non improbum si quorum absint consilia. Verum ut inter animantium genera, qumdam noxia, alia act hominis usum, creata existunt: rursus sunt, quae in hoc tanturn dicas nata, ut reliquis molestiara ac perniciem moliantur: sic, in humanis reibus, nulla resp. nec vitae genus est, quod suas non habet vomicas, et [κακοβούλους](#). Atque hi suni potissimum, qui religione praeposteri, naturae saevi, alteri ecclesiae, alteri reip. exitiales existunt. Quibus cum bene esse non possit, nisi perturbatis rebus, turbam, quantum queant, intendunt ad saevitiam. Mitissimos principum animos, hoc est, reip. fontes, vitiant; consilia instillant, non quae honesto, sed quae ventri suo, ac quaestui serviant: simile quiddam exercentes in humanis rebus, quale Ate tribuit Homerica narratio. Deinde quum tutius laedunt sub

umbra nobilitatis, ac... se occul-tant, quo si quid adveniat adversi, illos postremo feriat: si quid boni sit, ipsi primi sint ad carpendam messera. Et quoniam juxta imperitorum legera, nihil his recte fieri videtur, nisi quod ipsi faciunt, ad arbitratum suum universam religionem, cum ipsa Scriptura, corrigendam putant. Quicquid ipsis non placet haereticum est. Nil sibi placere potest, quod non illico alba amussis sit quantum libet a scopo alienum.” — Strype, in his *Memoirs of Cranmer*, vol. 2:pp. 937 — 939, I subjoin it here, that the reader may appreciate the latinity and eloquence of Foxe.

**Ft49** It contains about forty pages, without any number to them. Its title is, “De Non Plectendis Morte Adulteris Consultatio, Joannis Foxi.” Impressum Londini per Hugonem Syngletonum, sub intersignio D. Augustini. Anno Domini. M.D. 1548. Some account of it will be given in the Appendix.

**Ft50** Troubles at Frankfort.

**Ft51** “Chronicon Ecclesia, continens historiam rerum gestarum maximarumque per totam Europam Persecutionum a Vviclevi temporibus usque ad nostram aetatum. Authoro Joanne Foxo.”

**Ft52** Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona, etc. Hor. Od. lib. 4:Od. 9:5:25 — 29.

**Ft53** Milton.

### SECTION 3

**ft54** July 6th, 1553.

**Ft55** Judge Hales. August, 1553

**ft56** August 18th, 1553.

**Ft57** August 22d

**ft58** October 5th of the same year.

**Ft59** November 8th.

**Ft60** August 22d.

**ft61** See Sharon Turner's *Reign of Mary*.

**Ft62** Mr. Samuel Foxe informs us that his mother was pregnant at the time of their emigration. As we do not read of the birth of a child, we may

conclude that either a miscarriage, or the premature birth of a child, who died soon after, took place at this time.

<sup>Ft63</sup> November 12th, 1554.

<sup>Ft64</sup> For an account of the Interim, see Sharon Turner's *Edward VI.* p. 294.

<sup>Ft65</sup> *German Reformation*, vol. 2:p. 322. The following letter from Tytler's *Edward VI. and Mary*, vol. 1:pp. 84, 85, agrees with the above.  
 “Bishop of Westminster to sir William Petre. Orig. State Paper Office, Germany, April 3d, 1548, Augsburg. After my most hearty commendations to you: where, heretofore, I advertised you, that I heard say how the emperor had committed to Malvenda, and others his learned men here, to devise in the matter of *Interim* some order, which, peradventure, the commissaries in the said *Interim* might be persuaded to accept. I hear say now, that the said learned men's device is perfected, and delivered to the electors to view, but kept so secret, that by no means yet I can get no copy thereof, nor certainly learn the effect thereof.

“It hath been told to Mr. Mount, that it should reduce religion to the old state where it was before twenty years, except that *communieatio sub ntraque specie* should be permitted to all those that would ask it; and that such priests as be already married should be tolerated, *ne ecclesiae destituantur ministris*, and this only until the council should determine these matters.”

<sup>Ft66</sup> *German Reform.* ut supra (Naumberg).

<sup>Ft67</sup> Book 10:c. 17, Gerdesii, *Hist. Reform.* vol. ill. p.203.

<sup>ft68</sup> Among whom were Sutton, Williams, Whittingham, afterwards Dean of Durham, who married Calvin's sister, and others.

<sup>Ft69</sup> His name is variously called — Valeranus, Valerandus, Valeren, Valeran — Polanus, Pollanus, Pullen, Pullan.

<sup>Ft70</sup> Cowper's *Expostulation*.

<sup>Ft71</sup> Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*, vol. 8:p. 379, Ed. 1839. John Hullier; he was curate of Babraham, but afterwards went to Lynn, where he was residing when taken by Dr. Thirleby.

<sup>Ft72</sup> There is but one authentic account, and even that is tinged with the prejudices of its puritan author, of the circumstances to which I here

allude — the well-known pamphlet in the Phoenix, entitled, “the Troubles at Frankfort.” The original was published by a nonconformist in 1575; reprinted in 1662; and afterwards in the Phoenix in 1707.

Strype and others relate the history; but that pamphlet is the source of their narrative. — See Strype's Grindal, pp. 13 — 15. Mr. Lathbury, in his History of the Episcopacy of England, has given a very good abstract of the history, p.24, etc. See especially Fuller's Church History, folio edit. 1655, b. 8:p. 26, etc.

<sup>ft73</sup> Strype, vol. 1:p. 508.

<sup>Ft74</sup> So I understand the expressiou — “ A rehearsal of the articles of our belief;” which seems to be taken from our Church Catechism — Rehearse the articles of thy belief.

<sup>Ft75</sup> Lathbury's Episcopacy, p.29.

<sup>ft76</sup> Lathbury, ut supra.

<sup>Ft77</sup> This expression is in the letter, which seems to be a circular sent from Frankfort to Strasburg, Zurich, and some other places, dated August 2d, 1554. the principal signer is Whittingham. Foxe was not at Frankfort at this time. — Phoenix, vol. 2:p. 49.

<sup>Ft78</sup> L'esprit est toujours la dupe du coeur. — Reflexions Morales de la Rochefoueaald, No. 102.

<sup>Ft79</sup> The well-known *tolerabiles inepias*. Calvin's letter is dated January 22d, 1555. The words have been translated “bearable or tolerable fooleries, or fitnesses “ — “ tolerable foolish things.” Bishop Williams, says Puller, was accustomed to speak of Calvin's *tolerabiles morositates*. — *Church History*, b. 7:p. 375.

<sup>Ft80</sup> It was called the *Order of Geneva*, because first used by the English church at Geneva: but it is not the same as that used by the church of Geneva in which Calvin ministered. It was afterwards used in the Presbyterian church in Scotland, under the name of *the. Book of Common Order*, and is sometimes called Knox's Liturgy. M'Crie's Life of Knox, Vol. i.p. 148.

<sup>Ft81</sup> He arrived at Frankfort, March 13, 1555.

<sup>Ft82</sup> M'Crie's Life of Knox, vol. i.p. 153. It is called, in the “Troubles at Frankfort,” p. 76, “An Admonition to Christians.”

<sup>Ft83</sup> “Knox, who was minister of this congregation at Frankfort, and invited by them the last year from Geneva, September 24th, now (May 26th) returned in some haste thither (to Geneva) again; for he was the chief opposer of the use of the English Liturgy, averring, that it was a superstitious model, borrowed from the papists; and refused to celebrate the communion, according as it was there prescribed to be done. And besides, Knox held and published some dangerous principles about government; which were so disliked by the chief of the English divines there, as Cox, Bale, Turner of Windsor, Jewel, and others, that they thought it fit, and that for their own security, to disown him publicly, not only by discharging him of his ministry, but also by making an open complaint against him to the magistrates of the town.

“The magistrates, upon this information, sent for Mr. Williams and Mr. Whittingham, willing them to advise Knox to depart; otherwise they should be constrained to deliver him unto the Emperor's council, which was then at Ausburge; that, upon this information, Knox makes a sermon in his lodging, to about fifty persons, of the death and resurrection of Christ, and of the unspeakable joys prepared for God's elect, and then departed; and was conveyed by some, three or four miles out of the town.” — Eccl. Mem. vol. 5:pp. 406, 407.

<sup>Ft84</sup> The following extract of a letter from Grindal, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury, to Ridley, who was now in prison, or in confinement at Oxford, confirms the above account of the exiles abroad.

*Grindal to Bishop Ridley.*

Gratiam et consolationem a Domino, et servatore nostro, Jesu Christo.

SIR — I have often been desirous to have written to you and to have heard from you; but the iniquity of the times have hitherto always put me forth of all hope and comfort. Now at this present God seemeth to offer some likelihood that these might come to your hands, which I thought to use, referring the rest to God's disposition. Your present state, not I only, (who of all others am most bound,) but also all other our brethren here, do most heartily lament, as joined with the most miserable captivity that ever any church of Christ hath suffered. Notwithstanding, we give God most humble thanks, for that he hath so strengthened you and others, your concaptives, to profess a good

profession before so many witnesses. And I doubt nothing, but that He that hath called you and them not only to believe upon hym, but also to suffer for hym, doth not leave you destitute of that unspeakable comfort which He useth to minister abundantly to his in the schole of the cross. He graunte that his name may be glorified in you, whether it be by life or death, as may be most to his honor, and your everlasting consolation.

Sir, I thought it good to advertise you partely of our state in these partes. We be here dispersed in divers and several places. Certayne be at Tigurye (Zurich) good students of either University, a number; very well entreated of Maister Bullinger, of the other ministers, and of the whole eitye. Another number of us remayne at Argentine (Strasburg), and take the commodity of Maister Martyr's lessons, who is a very notable father. Maister Scory, and certayne other with hym be in Frysland, and have an English church there, but not very frequent. The greatest number is at Frankfort, where I was at this present by occasion; a very fayre city, the magistrates favorable to our people, with so many other commodities as exiles can well look for. Here is also a church; and now (God be thanked) well quieted by the prudency of Maister Coxe, and other which met here for that purpose. So that now we trust God hath provided for such as will fiye forth of Babylon, a resting place, where they may truly serve hym, and hear the voice of their true pastor. I suppose in one place and other dispersed, there be well nigh an hundredth students and ministers on this side the seas. Such a Lord is God to work dyversly in his, according to his unsearchable wisdom, who knoweth best what is in man.

God comfort you, ayd you, and assist you with his spirit and grace to continue his unto the end, to the glory of his name, the edification of his church, and the subversion of Antichrist's kingdom. Amen.

From Frankfort, the 6th of July 1555. — Strype's *Life of Grindal*, pp. 16 — 18. *Ecclesiastes Mere.* vol. 5:pp. 410, 411.

<sup>Ft85</sup> See the testimonials to its correspondence with the ancient liturgies, the case of the reformers, the adaptation to the wants of the people, the conformity to the services of the reformed churches, etc. in Durell, Comber, Nicholls, the *Oxford Tracts*, and in many other works.

It is, however, capable of improvement. Some of the alterations by the Episcopal Church of America must be so called. See Mr. Caswal's work on America. We might do well to omit the stories of Bel and the Dragon, Susanna and the two Elders, with some other portions of the Apocrypha. Another Collect also might be advantageously inserted in the Burial Service, over those who were not regular communicants, and of whom their best friends hesitate to speak as worthy of the stronger language of faith and hope.

<sup>Ft86</sup> The title was "Liturgia Sacra, seu Ritus Ministerii in Ecclesia Peregrinorum propter Evangelium Christi Argentini, 1551. Cum apologia pro hac Liturgia. Per Valerandum Pollanum Flandrum."

<sup>Ft87</sup> His Institutes had been published at Basil in 1535. The work gave him a high place among his contemporaries. They idolized his name; and adopted his gloomy system.

<sup>Ft88</sup> Calvin is said to have suggested alterations in the second prayer-book of king Edward; and to have offered his assistance to Cranmer; which the archbishop declined. Fuller gives as the reason of this, that he knew the man. Collier, vol. 2:p. 253.

When the manner in which he spoke of the progress of the reformation both to the king and Cranmer is considered, and the mode in which he expressed his disregard for antiquity, we cannot be surprised at the hesitation of the archbishop to receive his services. { Heylyn's History of the Reformation, p. 65; and History of Presbyterianism, p. 15. } The news, says Heylyn (of order being given to Cranmer, and some other prelates, to draw up a form for the administration of the sacrament) no sooner came unto Geneva, but Calvin must put in for a share; and forthwith writes his letter to archbishop Cranmer, in which he offereth his assistance to promote the service, if he thought it necessary. But neither Cranmer, Ridley, nor any of the rest of the English bishops, could see any such necessity of it, but that they might be able to do well without him. They knew the temper of the man, how busy and pragmatical he had been in all those places in which he had been suffered to intermeddle; that in some points of christian doctrine he different from the general current of the ancient fathers and had devised such a way of ecclesiastical polity, as was destructive in itself of the sacred hierarchy, and never had been heard of in all antiquity.

In his letters unto the king and council, as he writes to Bullinger, he had excited them to proceed in the good work which they had begun; that is to say, that they should so proceed as he had directed. Heylyn's *Hist. of Presbyt.* pp. 236 — 238.

Cardwell, in his “Two Prayer Books of Edward VI.” Oxford, 1838, preface, p. 31, note W. says,

“This statement” — of Heylyn and Collier — “seems to be overcharged.” The words of the epistle, although not containing the direct offer, certainly seem to hint that he was ready to do whatever Cranmer chose in the business. He spoke slightly of the reformation in England. *Epist.* p. 136. “Quantum ad me attinet, si quis mei usus fore videbitur, ne decem quidem maria, si opus sit, ob earn rem trajicere pigeat.” He expresses his joy at the prospect of the reformation principles being forwarded by Cranmer; and he rejoices to think that unity of doctrine and discipline will be established under his care. He greatly wishes that learned and pious men from the chief churches (reformed) could meet at a convenient place to discuss diligently each article of faith, and by the common decision of all, hand down to posterity the sure doctrine of Scripture. “Atque utinam impetrari posset, ut in locum aliquem docti et graves viri ex praecipuis ecclesiis coirent, ac singulis fidei capitibus diligenter excussis, de communi omnium sententia certam posteris traderent Scripturae doctrinam.” See *Instit. Christ. Relig. Genev.* 1607. *Epist.* at the end, 1617, p. 135. Bene habet, quod non eundem modo animum Deus nobis contulit, ut Regem Angliae et ejus consiliarios incitarem ad pergendum; sed fecit etiam ut consilia nostra tam apte inter se congruerent. Hoc certe ad eorum confirmationem nonnihilo, ut spero, valebit. — Calvin's *Epist.* pp. 131, 132.

<sup>Ft89</sup> “Strype's Cranmer,” vol. 1:p. 296.

<sup>Ft90</sup> The sentence, the exhortation, and confession, are the same which are at this day used in the French congregations, and prescribed in their liturgy.

<sup>Ft91</sup> This is the Sunday service now general among the independent dissenters.

**Ft92** The work of Pollanus, which was published, as we have seen, at the time that the Second Book of king Edward was being compiled, contained a slight form of absolution, embodying only a sentence of Scripture relating to the remission of sins. — “Hic pastor ex scriptura sacra sententiam aliquam remissionis peccatorum populo recitat, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.” — but Calvin's Liturgy, published in 1545, for the church at Geneva, and originally drawn up, and used at Strasburg, contains no absolution of any kind, although he at first intended to have added one, but was overruled by others. {Lawrence, Bump. Lect. p. 207. Cardwell, Preface, p. 30. Durell, p. 35.} Durell, p. 34, says, that most of the reformed liturgies have confessions of sins, and also absolution, but this is wanting in the liturgy of the French reformed churches (p. 35). Whether the English absolution was taken from that of Pollanus, as Lawrence says, or from that of John-a-Lasco, as Cardwell writes, is not probably easy to decide. May not each form have contributed a portion, both having been published in the interval between the publication of the two Prayer Books?

John-a-Lasco's confession and absolution, bear a strong resemblance to those adopted in the Second Book of king Edward the Sixth.

Vide Forma ac Ratio tota Ecclesiastes Min. in Pereg. Ecclesiastes anno 1550.

**Ft93** Nothing perhaps can demonstrate the weight and authority of John Calvin at this time more than the remarkable fact, that even Cox apologized to him for restoring the English Liturgy to the church at Frankfort without previously requesting his sanction to the undertaking. — Troubles at Frankfort, ap. Phoenix, p. 82.

**Ft94** He was born in France in 1509, and originally intended for the church, but afterwards for the law.

**Ft95** “Quo loco,” says Beza, “(Ponte-episcopi) constat Joannem ipsum Calvinum antequam Gallia excederet (nullis alioqui pontificis ordinibus initiatum) aliquot ad populum conclones habuisse.”

**Ft96** He was succeeded by Peter Brulius, who was followed by Valerandus Pollanus.

<sup>Ft97</sup> “Calvin thought himself,” says Collier, “wiser than the ancient church, and fit to dictate religion to all countries in Christendom.” Vol. 2:p. 309. “Calvin had no sooner conceived and brought forth his discipline,” says Heylin, “than he caused it to be nourished and brought up at the charge of Geneva. When: he found it strong enough to go abroad of itself, he afterwards commended it to the entertainment of all other churches in which he had credit. He finally proceeded so far as to impose it upon the world as a matter not to be refused on pain of God's displeasure.” — Heylin's History of Presbyterianism, p. 10.

<sup>Ft98</sup> On the sentiments of Calvin concerning this deplorable transaction, I collect the following additional passages. In the introduction to his “Refutation of the Errors of Servetus,” which was published the year following, and subscribed by fourteen other ministers of the Genevese church, he says, “Whatever was done by our senate is everywhere attributed to me. I do not deny that by my advice and exertions he was, in due course (*jure*) committed to prison; for by the established law of this city, it was fit that he should be charged as a criminal. So far, I confess that I prosecuted this cause. But that, after his conviction, I uttered not a word concerning his punishment, not only will all good men bear me witness, but I challenge even bad men to produce the proof of the contrary, if they can.” — *Scott's Continuation of Milner*, vol. 5:p. 429.

To Farel he writes, August 20, 1553, “I hope at least that a capital sentence will be passed; but I wish the severity of the punishment to be remitted.” “Spero eapitale saltem fore judicium: poenae veto atrocitatem remitti cupio.” (Ep. p. 154.) In the same letter he adds, “One thing more I will add, that the treasurer of the city, who bears this to you, is right-minded in this business, that he (Servetus) may not escape the punishment or death (*exiturn*) we desire. “Tanturn unius rei to admonitum rolo, quaestorem urbis, qui tibi has literas redder, in hac causa recto esse animo, ut saltera exiturn quem optamus non fugiat.”

And again, 26th October, “To-morrow he will be led out to punishment; the kind of death we have vainly endeavored to change.” “Cras ad supplicium ducetur. Genus morris conati sumus mutare, sed frustra.” — Epist. p. 156.

“Servetus, in 1553, published at Vienne in Dauphine, a new treatise called “Christianismi Restitutio;” and escaping from thence, as he vainly hoped, to the protestant city of Geneva, became a victim to the bigotry of the magistrates, instigated by Calvin, who had acquired an immense ascendancy over that republic.” (Hallam's Introduction to the Literature of Europe, vol. 2:p. 107.) In the note he says (p. 109), Servetus in fact was burned, not so much for his heresies, as for some personal offense he had several years before given to Calvin. The latter wrote to Bolsec, in 1546, 'Servetus cupit hue venire, sed a me aecersitus. Ego autem nunquam committam, ut fidem meam eatenus obstrictam habeat. Jam enim constitutum habeo, si veniat, nunquam pati ut salvus exeat.' A similar letter to Farel differs in some phrases, and especially by the word *virus* for *salvus*. He had, in some printed letters, charged Calvin with many errors, which seems to have exasperated the great reformer's temper so as to make him resolve on what he afterwards executed.”

Jacques George de Chauffie published the Life of Servetus, and endeavors to palliate the conduct of Calvin. He is, however, compelled to acknowledge and to condemn the giving of information to the magistrates to procure the seizure of the heresiarch, and the advising, as Calvin seems to have done, all the subsequent proceedings. It is impossible to acquit the reformer of being the cause of Servetus' death, and his conduct appears to be indefensible. Taking into consideration the strong feelings of the reformers towards every dreg of popery, and giving the utmost latitude to their desires for rooting out all blasphemy and idolatry, the process by civil proceedings in a court of law was not concurrent with the profession of religious toleration which they made. The following extracts will, in some degree, explain the animus with which Calvin entered upon the prosecution of Servetus; and he appears to have had some compunctions of conscience as to the propriety of his conduct, however he might deceive himself that he was seeking God's glory.

“Quum Michael Servetus jam ante annos viginti christianum orbem virulentis suis ac pestiferis dogmatibus infecerit, nomen tibi non ignotum esse arbitror. Quod si librum non legisti, fieri tamen vix potest, quirt de ipso genere doctrinae aliquid audieris. Is est de quo fidelis

Christi minister et sanctae memoriae D. Bucerus, cum alioqui mansuetus esset ingenio, pro suggestu pronuntiavit dignum esse, qui avulsis visceribus discerperetur. Sicuti ab eo tempore non desiit venenum suum spargere, nuper Viennae majus volumen, sed ex iisdem erroribus consarcinatum, excudi clanculum curavit. Re veto patefacta, in carcerem est coniectus. Unde nescio quomodo elapsus, per Italiam erravit fere quatuor menses. Tandem huc malis auspiciis appulsum unus ex syndicis, me auctore, in carcefera duci jussit. Neque enim dissimulo, quin officii mei duxerim hominem plusquam obstinatum et indomitum, quoad in me erat, compescere, ne longius manaret contagio.” — Calvinus Suitzero, Epist. p. 154.

**Fi99** “It is undeniable,” says M’Crie (Life of John Knox, vol. i. p. 346, note E), “that Knox was so ordained in that church.” Some have hesitated to admit that Knox was in priest’s orders in the church of Rome: I think it unquestionable. The fact is attested both by protestant and popish writers. Beza says, “Cnoxus, igitur (ut manifeste appareat totum hoc admirabile Domini opus esse) ad *Johannis illius Majoris*, celeberrimi inter sophistas nominis, veluti pedes in Sancti Andrees oppido educatus, atque adeo sacerdos factus, apertaque celebri schola, quum jam videretur illo suo praeceptore nihil inferior sophista futurus, lucem tamen in tenebris et sibi et aliis accendit.” (Icones Illust. Viror. epist, iii. Comp. Spottiswood’s Hist. p. 265: London, 1677.) *Ninian Winzet*, in certain letters sent by him to Knox in the year 1561, says, “Ye renunce and estemis that ordination null or erar wikit, be the quhilk sumtyme ye war callit Schir Johne.” And again: “We can persave, by your awin allegiance, na power that ever ye had, except it quhilk was gevin to you in the sacrament of ordination, be auctoritie of priesthed. Quhilk auctoritie give ye esteme as nochtis, be reasoun it was gevin to you (as ye speik) by ane papist bishope,” etc. (Winzeti Letteris et Tractatis, apud Keith, Append. pp. 212, 213.) Winzet’s drift was to prove, that Knox had no lawful call to the ministry; consequently, he would never have mentioned his popish ordination, if the fact had not been notorious and undeniable. *Nichol Burne*, arguing on the same point, allows that he had received the *order of priesthood* from the Romish church. (Disputation concerning the Controversit Headdis of Religion, p. 128: Paris, 1581.) And in a scurrilous poem against the ministers of Scotland, printed at the end of that book, he calls him,

*“That fals apostat priest,  
Enemie to Christ, and mannis salvation,  
Your maister Knox.”*

The objection of the Roman catholics to the legality of our reformer's vocation, was, that although he had received the power of *order*, he wanted that of *jurisdiction*; these two being distinct, according to the canon law. “The power of ordere is not sufficient to ane man to preache, bot he man have also jurisdiction over thame to whom he preaches. Johann Knox resavit never sic jurisdictione fra the Roman kirk to preache in the realme of Scotland; thairfoir suppoise he receavit from it the ordere of priestheade, yet he had na pouar to preache, nor to lauchfullie administrat the sacramentes.” — Nichol Burhe's Disputation, ut supra, p. 128.

<sup>Ft100</sup> Strype's Annals, vol. 1:Appendix No. 22.

<sup>Ft101</sup> John Foxe to Peter Martyr, urging him to accept the invitation of the English at Frankfort, to read divinity to them.

“Suspiciende Domine, salutem et gratiam in Christo. Elmeri nomine et subscriptione nostra ad te veniunt literae, in quibus graves et necessariae causae ad persuadendum continentur. Caeterum ne omnino occultis tuis cogitationibus satisfaciant, vereor. Scio enim quam difficilis sit *τρόπος ἢ μετάθεσις*, locique mutatio, praesertim in ea urbe, ubi et diu assueveris, et plausibiliter victitas. Quin nec scio an occultiora adhuc avocamenta in hac re subsint, abs te perspecta, quae nos non advertimus. Verum quaecunque incerta sunt Deo permittentes, interim ut simpliciter tecum agamus *καὶ-κατηγορικῶς*, pri-murn, cogitet modo eximia prudentia tua, sic te producturn esse, ut multo maximas utilitates vitae et reip. Christianae pro singulari excellentia tua afferre queas; nec minus certe parem virtutibus industriam in te defuturam arbitror. Jam etsi nullus locus te vindicare poterit, attamen si indigentiam spectet excellentia tua, nulla certe Germaniae pars impensius eget opera tua; si voluntatem ac vota hominum, nulla impotentius desiderat, quam Anglia nostra Francfordiana. Cui genti quoniam te peculiariter esse apostolum suspicamur (suspicamur enim omnes) idcirco audacius te literis sollicitare atque arabire ausi sumus.

“Quod si vero ita res pateretur, ut per conjuges nostras et conscientiam aliquo pacto abesse ab ecclesia liceret, facile isthuc momento

traheremur. Nunc quum nobis non perinde licet ecclesiam deserere, ut caeteris ad vos accedere: deinde quum in te uno situm sit, ut Anglos omnes ubicunque dispersos intra unas caulas eardemque septa compellere; magnopere obtestamur, ne quibusdam e nostris ita gratificeris, ut reliqua Anglorum multitudo inopia tui destituatur. Ut hic de Argentinensium studiis ac favoribus nihil dicam, ut quotidianos temporum ac vitae humanae casus praeteream, certe si senectam hanc, etsi satis adhuc florentem ac vividam, consideres, quid tam consultius, quam ut illic quod superest aetatis exigas, ubi quam plurimis esse queas utilis.

“Postremo, vel illud reputa, ad fovendam interim senectam tuam quam non mediocri solario fuerit, postquam tot tam diversis locis dispalantes Anglos tua unius causa coire in unum coetum, te amplecti, ex te (imo ex Christo potius per to) pendere, tuis consiliis regi, te in illo observare, videas.

“De salario, de propensione magistratus, quid cum illis, quid inter mercatores nostros conventum sit, fidelis hic Tychicus noster, frater in Dno. charissimus, abunde significabit; qui communem hanc causam multo facilius dicendo, quam ego scribendo, perorare poterit. Attamen haec apud to seorsim pro audacia mea commentare libuit.

“In versione libri Dni Cantuariensis maturabimus, quantum Dominus dederit. Audio Crawlaeum quendam esse, qui priores libros illius habeat ex versione D. Chyclaei (*Chycheei Cheke*), quos si per Whittinghamum nostrum ad te mittendum cures, gratum feceris. Dns. Jesus to quam diutissime incolumem ecclesiae suae servet, ac tueatur in omnibus. Francfordiae, 12 Octob.

“Tuus Jo. Foxus.”

“Incomparabili ac summo viro Dno. Doctori Petro Martyri.”

Harl. MS. 417. art. 67, fol. 116. Strype's *Ecclesiastes Mem.* vol. 6:pp. 311 — 313, Oxford edition.

<sup>Ft102</sup> “Clarissimis viris D. Brynksio, D. Alcosto, D. Kelko, cumque his universo Christianae pietati faventium sodalitie, Joannes Foxus, salus.”

<sup>Ft103</sup> This precariousness seems to have been implied in an expression in Foxe's letter. He makes his own supplies depend on the mutual agreement of the merchants — “quod inter mercatores nostros

conventum sit.” Endowments, not casual subscriptions, are the proper rewards, and the right dependence of learned men. These alone produce the ease of mind which is essential to quiet study.

**Ft104** The first of Foxe's works published after he settled at Basil, was “Christus Triumphans,” in 1556; and which, it is presumed, he had just come to an agreement with Froschoverus to publish, as alluded to in his letter to Grindal; or it may have been a portion of his Acts and Monuments, which was published and circulated in parts, on the continent, before it came out entire.

**Ft105** *Ad Edmundurn Grindallum.*

Salutem in Christo. Recepi cum litteris tuis historiam Bradfordianam, cum variis illius alio atque alio missis epistolis. Qua in re video (mi Edmunde) quam bonae fidei sponsor sis, citraque noxam (quod aiunt). Utinam ad eandem diligentiam caetera omnia **μαρτυρικά** congesta habeamus. Atque ut non dubito, quin magnam harum rerum faraginem (ut scribis) jam etiamnum habeatis, ita nec diffido in caeteris conquirendis vigilantiam vestram fidemque non defuturam. Jam ante, te absente, binas ad te misi litteras, quas an receperis ideo subdubito, quod nullam video in litteris tuis de libris Cantuariensis mentionem. Jamdudum transactum est cum Froschovero, jamque meuse Octob. primum librum meo magno taedio iterum descriptum illis in gustum miseram interim autem dum expecto ab illis responsum, delatum mihi est negotium a Frobenio et Episcopo Chrisostomi exemplaria cognoscendi et conferendi: eramque tum omnibus plane exutus pecuniis, adeoque poene ad extremum assem redactus. Itaque in ea movenda farina perierunt mihi duo menses. Interea temporis venit ad me Froschoverus cum litteris D. Elmeri et Bullingeri, pasciscens mecum inducias ob certa negotia in proximas nundinas, quas nec minus libenter ipse accipi; scis enim in hieme ubique fere conquiescere **τα πολεμικά**, ducibus se in hyberna recipientibus. Habes itaque integrum hujus negotii statum. Quum haec ad te scripsissem, alteras ad Jacobum Haddonum literas eodem simul tempore destinabam, jamque charta ad eam rem parata erat, quum subito affertur, eum istic Argentinae defunctum esse, ad quem si vixisset libenter scripsissem, partim illi acturus gratias de *coronato*, quem ad me nuper te absente miserat, partim etiam submoniturus, quod his diebus mihi in mentem venerit.

Eram enim Francofordiae tum in aedibus Ant. Gilbij, quum Jo. Knoxius satis indigne eo tempore accusatus a quibusdam et ejectus ea urbe: post colloquium nescio quid initum cum Jac. Haddon, tandem me cum aliquot mecum praesentibus palam illi denunciarunt futurum, si sic pergeret, ut evidenter sentiret divinum in se supplicium in hac ipsa quoque vita, erant enim haec illius verba, aut non multo profecto diversa. Dominus meae ignoscat tarditati. Nunc verb quoniam sero ad eum scripturus sum, votis (quod solum superest) opto illi faelicem in Domino requiem. — Harl. MS. 417, art. 59, fo. 113 b.

<sup>ft106</sup> Salutem in Christo Servatore. Accepi literas tuas quas 4 Maii ad me dedisti (frater amantissime), in quibus meam operam in vita et obitu D. Cantuariensis describendo postulas. — Harl. MS. 417. Art. 57, fol. 113.

<sup>ft107</sup> “A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Savior Christ; with a Confutation of sundry Errors concerning the same, grounded and established upon God's Holy Word; and approved by the consent of the most ancient Doctors of the Church.”

<sup>ft108</sup> An Explication and Assertion of the True Catholic church. touching the most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, with the Confutation of a Book written against the same.

<sup>ft109</sup> “After my veray hertie commendations. Thies be to signify unto you, that Rayner Wolf, at my desire, hath fully fynysht the printing of my book, for answer to the late Bishop of Winchesters, written against myn of the doctrine of the sacrament. And forasmuche as both printing and selling of any matiers in thenglishe tounge is prohibited by a proclamation set furthe, onles the same matier be first allowed by the king's majestie, or 6:of his majestie's privey counsail, as you shai more plainly perceyve by the proclamation, which herewith I send unto you; therfor I hertily pray you to be a sutor to the king's majestie, or to the privye counsail, that Mr. Rayher may have licence for the printing and selling of my said book accordingly. And the same so obtained to send me with convenient spede. For in the begynning of the terme I think it wer veray necessary to be set furthe, for the contentation of many, which have had long expectation of the same. Assone as I shal receyve advertisement, whan the king's majestie will

be at Hampton Courte, I wil come thither to see his grace, and do my duty towards the same. Thus fare ye hertily wel. — From my mannour at Croydon the xxix of September, 1551.

“Your lovyng frende, T. CANT.”

“To myveray Iovyng freendes Mr. Cecill one of the King's Majestie's two principal Secretaries. Or to Mr. Cheeke.”

Strype's Cranmer, vol. 2:pp. 901,902. Oxford, 1812, App. No. lxii.

Ft110 A priest of Lorraine.

Ft111 The title of his book was — *Confutatio Cavillonum, quibus saerosanctum Eucharistiae Sacramentum ab impiis Capernaitis impeti solet.* — Paris, 1552.

Ft112 Strype's Cranmer, p. 571.

Ft113 It was on this occasion that Grindal wrote the following admirable letter. It has ever been since. as archbishop Orindal declares it to have been then — that while various opinions were formed respecting Foxe, the friends of the Reformation spoke well, its enemies spoke ill of him — *Boni de te bene loquentur, mali, male. Satis est laudari a laudaris viris; omnibus placere nemini unquam datum est.*

*Grindal to Foxe.*

“*Quod ad judiciorum varietatem attinet, non est cur multum labores. Boni de te bene loquentur, mali male. Satis est laudari a laudaris viris; omnibus placere nemini unquam datum est. De ratione vertendi nemo melius judicabit quam tuipse, cui non est incognita fidi interpretis libertas. Verbum verbo reddi qui exigent, seipsos statim proderent, quam nullius esse judicii. Sensus sensu redidisse semper in laude fuit, modo scriptoris mentern non suam explicuisse appreat. In his omnibus mediam quandam viam tenuisse, ut fere etiam in caeteris, tutissimum erit. Idemque etiam judico de stylo. Nam neque eeelesiasticus stylus cure fastidio rejiciendus est (quod faciunt quidam), praesertim quum capita controversiarum sine eo nonnunquam perspicue explicari non possunt: neque e diverso tam superstitiose consecrandus est, ut orationis lumen aliquando aspergere non possimus. Hujus rei egregium nobis exemplum ob oculos posuit D. Calvinus, quem honoris causa nomino, qui et styli ornatum non*

neglexit, et ecclesiasticas loquendi formulas, tanquam civitate donatas, saepenumero usurpat. De librorum inversione qua utitur Wintoniensis, meum quidem hoc est iudicium; ut omnino permittatur ille suo arbitratu uti atque ordine, neque moveas quicquam. Duo sunt quae me praecipue movent. Primum, vociferabuntur adversarii, fraude et dolo malo mota esse argumenta loco suo. Nam ut in praeliis non semper eodem ordine pugnam ineunt imperatores, sed aliquando primam aciem invadunt, aliquando in cornua impressionem faciunt, nonnunquam equestri pugna, saepius etiam tenui armaturae velitatione hostes primum aggrediuntur (iniquissimum enim esset, de ordine pugnae ineundae ab hostibus leges accipere), ita et de vobis quiritabuntur, si Wintonienses copiae alia ratione, quam ipsemet instruit, in aciem producantur. Deinde et hoc mihi videtur ad auctoris ingenium patefaciendum pertinere: nam qui in tota vita praeposterissimus (ut ita dicam) fuit omnium rerum humanarum et divinarum inversor, consentaneum est, ut in scribendo etiam praeposterum sese ostendet, et (ut vulgo dici solet,) *Joannem ad Oppositum*.

“Haec mea est sententia, tu pro tuo candore aliter consulas. Quod ad titulum libri, nemo melius adaptabit quam interpret, qui non modo singulas sententias, sed et verba etiam et apices pene excussit.

“Mihi impraesentiarum libri copia non fuit: itaque nunc nihil habeo quod in medium proferam. Si posthac aliquid occurrerit quod acuminis aut gratiae aliquid in se habeat, non illibenter communicabo. Verum quiddam est quod nunc scribenti mihi in mentem venit, cujus tuam prudentiam admonere non inutile fore existimavi. Audivi hoc mussitatum aliquando in Anglia, Cantuariensem aliquando Papisticam affingere, quod ipsi non profitentur. Et si bene memini, habet quasdam antitheses inter Papisticam et doctrinam nostram hac formula, *Illi dicunt, Nos dicimus*. Ibidem (credo) habet, *Papistas corpus Christi ubique esse* asseverate; quod illi nusquam docent, sed in omni altari pertinaciter essa contendunt. Siqua similia inter vertendum repereris (nam illud exempli causa tantum affero) aut sicubi tuo ipsius iudicio non plene satisfiat, faceres meo quidem iudicio non male, si ad D. Petrum Martyrera catalogum huiusmodi locorum mitteres; et illius consilium in amantissimi sui patroni opera requireres. Communicaret

sat scio libentissime, et fortasse, siqua ipsc praeterea annotaverit similia, subindicaret.

“Haec ita a me scripta sunt, ut tuo tamen iudicio omnia geri vellem; tantum meae mentis sensa apud amicum et fratrem, candidius fortasse quam prudentius, in medium profero. Saluta D. Balaeum, et caeteros amicos. Opto to in Domino quam optime valere.

“EDMUNDUS GRINDALLUS tuus.”

“Argentina V. calend. Jan. 1557.”

**Ft114** Strype's Grindal, pp. 22, 23.

**Ft115** “The original manuscript,” says Strype, “under Foxe's own hand, is in very elegant Latin. I have it lying by me. It bears this title: — 'De tota sacramenti Eucharistiae causa institutionum Libri V. autore D. Thoma Cranmero Archiepiseopo Cantuariensi. Quibus et Stephani Gardneri Episeopi Wintoniensis, et Smythi Doctoris Theologi impugnationibus, respondetur.' “ — Strype's Cranmer, vol. 1:p. 375. Strype must be wrong in saying it was never published; or the translation in Latin published at Embden under the care of Sir John Cheke, in 1557, was different from that of Foxe. “In that translation,” says Mr. Jenkyns, “some supplementary authorities were inserted, which were collected by Cranmer during his imprisonment, but were not published till after his death.” — Could these supplementary authorities be the pages to which Strype refers as having perished?

**Ft116** See Notes to the First Sermon in Laurence's Bampton Lectures, p. 200.

**Ft117** Ecclesiastes Mere. vol. 5:pp. 408, 409.

**Ft118** Spelling of the MS.

**Ft119** Ecclesiastes Mem. vol. 6:pp. 313 — 315.

**Ft120** This is an error as to the name. The duchess married for her second husband Richard Berrie, esq. (not the Hon. Robert Berrie, as is generally written), son of Thomas Berrie, captain of Hurst Castle, Hampshire. He took his degree of bachelor of arts, as member of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, May 3d, 1537, one year before Foxe. In the first year of Mary, Gardiner, who knew that the duchess favored the Reformation, was determined to persecute her; and he

issued an attachment to the sheriff of Lincolnshire, commanding him to bring Richard Bertie to London without bail. He, however, accepted his bail, in two sureties of one thousand pounds each, to appear before Gardiner, which he did on Good Friday following. The day after, a conversation took place between them, when Gardiner asked him whether the lady, his wife, was now “as readie to set up the masse, as she was latelie to pull it downe, when she caused, in hir progresse, a dog in a rochet to be caried and called by my name; or dooth she thinks hir lambs now safe inough, which said to me, when I varied my bonnet to hit out of my chamber window in the tower, that it was merle with the lambs now the woolfe was shut up? “{Holinshed, p. 1143.} The one she did not, said her husband: and the words were not intended to be offensive. And although Gardiner dismissed him with apparent friendship, yet was it known that he only waited an opportunity to summon the duchess before him. Mr. Bertie obtained leave from the queen to go abroad, under color of looking after some debts due from the emperor to the late duke. He departed in June, 1554, leaving the duchess behind. In January following she made her escape, and joined her husband, and proceeded to Santon, in the duke of Cleve's dominions. About five miles from this place is a free town, Wesel, where they took up their abode. They obtained protection from the magistrates by means of Francis Perusal, then called Francis de Rivers, minister of the Walloon congregation, who had been in London, and had formerly received kindness at the hands of the duchess. Here their only son was born; and they named him Peregrine, from the circumstance that he was born in a foreign land, but given to them as a consolation in their exile. {“Eo quod in terra Peregrina pro consolatione exilii sui piis parentibus a Domino donatus sit.” — Camden's Britannia.}

<sup>ft121</sup> Harl. MS. 416, art. 89, fol. 144.

<sup>ft122</sup> Thus it happened that there were two contemporary duchesses of Suffolk — Frances Brandon, married to Henry Grey, marquis of Dorset; and Catherine, baroness Willoughby de Eresby, relict of Charles Brandon, married to Richard Bertie, esq. Nare's Life of Lord Burghicy, vol. in. p. 145. Also, Echard's History of England, vol. i.p. 308, and Burke's Peerage.

**Ft123** November 24th, 1556.

**Ft124** November 29th, 1556.

**Ft125** Mention is made of this circumstance by Bullinger, in a letter to Calvin, bearing date January 18th, 1555, from Zurich. — “Angliam recepisse papam et papatum non nescis. Usus est diabolus in illa recuperanda duobus eximiis organis: in regno quidem Vintoniensi episcopo, extra regnum Reginaldo Polo cardinali, qui jam et primas regni et archiepiscopus Cantuariensis creatus est. Receptus est solenni pompa Londini ad S. Crucem in aede Paulina. Projecerunt se ad ejus pedes magnates, et absolutionem benedictionemque apostolicam supplices postularunt a bestia, confitentes se 15 annis a catholica Romanaque ecclesia abscissos, per vepreta haereticorum aberravisse. Orationem habuit in caeco illo coetu Vintoniensis, qui et ipsam revocavit orationem, quam olim sub rege Henrico de obedientia edidit. Cardinalis cum venisset ad reginam Mariam destituereturque salutandi formula tanta reparatione digna, placuit uti verbis Angeli, “Ave Maria gratia plena, Dominus tecum.” O caecas hominum mentes, o pectora caeca! Veni, veni, D. Jesu, et vindica contumeliam tuam, et assere gloriam tuam. Fratres nostri episcopi et nobties adhuc incarcerati tenentur, brevi forte tradendi judicio spirituali quod jam reparatur, mox brachio saeculari. In vincula conjiciuntur quotidie innumeri. Inhibetur sub poena capiris ne cui exuli feratur auxilium. Jactat Vintoniensis effecturum se, ut exules omnibus ejecti locis cogantur tandem fame perire, adeoque proprios ungues rodere. Qui apud nos versantur Angli, valde tristantur, sed consolamur ipsos. Orandus est sedulo Dominus, ut afflictæ suae ecclesiae dexter et propitius adesset.” — Hollinshed, vol. i.c. 2, p. 1123. Cal. Ep. p. 233.

**Ft126** I am sorry to observe that Dr. Lingard expresses no grief at the folly — no sorrow at the wickedness of our ancestors in re-enacting these odious laws. (Lingard, vol. 7:p. 190.) I may observe here, too, that Dr. Lingard, in a note in the same page, impugns the accuracy of Hume respecting the different conduct of Pole and Gardiner, on the best mode of enforcing the laws against heretics. That Dr. Lingard has either misrepresented or mistaken Hume, may be seen by referring to Collier, vol. 2:p. 371; Andrews's Continuation of Henry, vol. 1:p. 184; Warner's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2:p. 363; Carte, vol. ill. p. 319.

Ft127 Feb. 4, 1555.

Ft128 Warner's Eccl. History of England, vol. 2:pp. 369, 370.

Ft129 See Strype's Life of Cranmer, vol. 2:pp. 961 — 963. Appendix 135.

Ft130 February 8, 1555.

Ft131 *“Ad Lectorem.*

“Quum primum hunc historiae Martyrologicae librum, ante annos complures a nobis in Anglia descriptum, jam ante sexennium Argentinae impressum in lucem dedimus, satis perfuncti officio nostro videbamur, si turn Wiclevianam persecutionem, resque illorum temporum gestas, a seculi nostri memoria remotiores, qualicunque industria nostra a tenebris ac oblivione vindicarem; aut si allis saltem hac occasione calamos expergefacerem, ut per ecclesias alias, suaque quisque in patria idem facerent, quod nos in Brytannia nostra fecimus. Id quod evenisse secundum votum nostrum, tum in Germania, turn Genevae, tum etiam alibi, in Gallicis, Germanicis, et Italicis martyribus conquirendis, gaudeo. Neque putavi posthac fore, quod vehementer mihi in hoc argumenti genere necesse deinceps foret nervos intendere, maxime post exactam Henrici octavi Illustriss. principis tempestatem. Atque utinam tempora ipsa ocium mihi et dimissionem ad reliqua studia mea permetterent, quo in laetiori aliqua scribendi materia versari liceret. Sed incidit rursus, nescio quo faro Angliae nostrae infelici et calamitoso, longe praeter expectationem nostram Mariana persecutio quinquennalis, ita per se scriptorem necessario flagitans, ut vix sciam an unquam exoriturus sit, qui tot tantasque res exiguo gestas tempore, tam gravitate insignes, varietate innumeras, atrocitate plusquam tragicas, non dico oratione et stylo, pro rerum dignitate explicare, sed enumerando complecti omnia, aut singula pervestigando indagare atque eruere, poterit, quae tam varie dispersa persecutionis hujusce tempestas atque ruina suppeditat. Nos etsi Anglia procul abfuimus, ubi res certissime cognosci potuit; usi tamen Anglorum quorundam adminiculis, quum praestare omnia non dabatur, nihil tamen conari in historia tam necessaria non potuimus. Itaque priorem hunc Wiclevianae historiae librum, jam ante diu Argentinae, ut dixi, impressum, cum posteriorurn temporum perturbationibus conjungentes, seriem rerum gestarum ducentis annis perpetuatam per continuas aetares ad hunc usque diem deduximus, ita distinctis historiae partibus, ut Prior aetas

Wiclevicas et Hussianas res, ad exortum D. Martini Lutheri, complectatur; Secunda Lutheri perturbatissima tempora ad exitum regis Henrici 8 confineat; Tertiam deinde sectionem Mariana haec persecutio possideat. Illud doluit, in recognoscendis istis et perpoliendis justam nobis operam curamque defuisse. Sic enim urgebant cum temporum ratio, tum duo pariter typographi, alter Basiliensis, qui Latine imprimeret, alter Genevensis, qui Gallicam etiam hujus Listoriae editionem efilagitabat, Oporinus.” Basil. edit. 1559.”

Ft132 Life of Grindal, pp. 25, 26.

Ft133 1555.

Ft134 1556.

Ft135 He once sent Foxe two dollars in a letter. It was thought to have been money conveyed to him from England for the benefit of those abroad.

Ft136 “*Grindal to Foxe*. “Sal. in Christo. Mutationes temporum meum etiam institutum mutarunt, doctissime et charissime Foxe; ego jam cogor urgentibus amicis in Angliam iter instituere, qui alioqui Basileam ad vos transvolassem. Jam quod ad Historiam Martyrum attinet, Sampsonus et ego existimamus optimum fore, ut ad aliquod tempus premeretur; donec ex Anglia et certiora et plura comparemus. Dubium enim non est, quin multa tum in lucem prodibunt, quae antea in tenebris delitescebant. Si tibi etiam idem videatur, bene est. Nos quaecunque possumus ibi corrademus, et ad to transmittenda curabimus. Levis erit jactura temporis, si rerum copia et certitudine compensetur. Vale in Christo, quam optime. “EDMUNDUS GRINDALLUS, tuus. {Life of Grindal, p. 31.} Argentinae, raptim 19 Decemb. 1553.”

Ft137 Hallam's Literature of Europe, vol. 2:p.509, London, 1839.

Ft138 Harleian MSS. No. 416, Art. 34, p. 70.

Ft139 There is mentioned in a parenthesis by his son after this, that his family was increased with two children: and as Samuel, who wrote his life, is called his eldest son, we may conclude they were both daughters. It appears probable that one was born at Basil.

Ft140 Strype's Annals, vol. i.p. 151. Fuller, lib. 8:p. 36.

Ft141 It was printed at Basil by Oporinus.

**Ft142** The title of this edition was “*Rerum in Ecclesia Gestarum, quae postremis et periculosis his temporibus evenerunt, maximarumque per Europam persecutionum, ac sanctorum Dei Martyrum, caeterarumque rerum si quae insignioris exempli sint, digesti per Regna et Nationes Commentarii. Pars Prima, in qua primum de Rebus per Angliam et Scottam Gestis, atque inprimis de horrenda sub Maria nuper Regina persecutione, narratio continetur. Auctore Joanne Foxo Anglo. Basiliae, per Nicolaum Brylingerum et Joannem Oporinum.*” The dedication was “*Praepotenti ac pietate non minus quam generis claritudine ornatis. Principi. D. Thomae Duci Norfolkiae, supremo Regni Ang. Archi-Marschallo, etc., Mecaenati suo, Joan. Foxus perennem in Christo cum salute felicitatem.*” <sup>L4</sup>

**Ft143** “Volebam praeterea de iis apud to multo plura: sed vix dieculae pars mihi ad compellendam sublimitatem suam dabatur: ita festinabant typographi et urgebant nundinae.

“Dominus Jesus, principum omnis quae celsitudinis princeps, celsitudinem tuam diu nobis velit incolumem servare; teque cum martyribus et sanctis suis sanctificet in regnum gloriae suae simulque ad publicam Reginae patriaeque tuae utilitatem.

“Basileae Anno 1559. Septembris I. Tuae Cels. multis nominibus devinctus addictusque in Christo.

“JOAN. FOXUS.

## SECTION 4

**ft144** This must refer to the fact, that Foxe had inscribed nothing to the Duke since he had returned to England. Or the allusion may mean that he had dedicated nothing to him of a merely political nature; or, in the estimation of the tutor and supplicant, which he esteemed worthy of the attention of so good and great a friend. Foxe had, as we have seen, dedicated to the Duke the Basil edition of his work, published in 1559.

**Ft145** The original is in Harl. MSS. No. 416, Art. 65, p. 115. b.

“Cur nihil nomini tuo inscribere adhuc austin, obstat pericult tui metus, potius quam voluntas accincta, id quod celsitudo tua (Christo aspirante) posthac rectius intelliget. Quod ad religionem attinet, non

arbitror opus te admonere, ubi stet veritas: Dominus det ut tu cum veritate stare queas viriliter. Illud interim imprimis vide, nequis eo te adducat mortalium, si Christum laborantem juvare non queas, attamen ut illi te adversarium ulla in re praebeas. Vincet enim ille tandem invitis omnibus. Tempus quod alii pompis aulicis et aleis impendent si tu literarum sacrarum lectioni impertias, prudenter ac in rem tuam ageres.”

Ft146 “Accepi litteras tuas, optime preceptor, quibus mihi quod animi haberes significasti, quodque mihi valde charum est. Et nisi famulorum meorum redditus literas meas praevenisset, multo antehac tu hic mecum fuisses. Scripsi enim ad illos, ut ita tibi de rebus omnibus providerent, ut ad me subito venires: quod et ita factum fuisset, nisi citius quam credideram, rediissent. Nunc quoniam ipse brevi to Londini videbo, velim ut ibi me expectes, quando tibi (sicut et debeo et volo) prospiciam. Interea jubeo te valere. Ex aedibus meis Reningatae, tricesimo die Octobr. 1559.

To my right loving schoolemaster John Foxe. “Tuus alumnus, “THOMAS NORFOLC.” Harl. MSS. No. 417, Art. 66.

Ft147 Harl. MSS. No. 416, Art. 81, fol. 134.

Ft148 We have here the earliest date under Foxe's hand, after his return from exile.

Ft149 Strype writes this “Bull,” Annals, vol. 1:p. 310. It is, by some, written Bruel, Bruil, Brule.

Ft150 “Forman,” Strype.

Ft151 Harl. 318.416, art. 61, fol. 106.

Ft152 “*Dux Norfolclensis ad D. Joh. Foxum.*

“Incredibili gaudio obruor, mi Foxe, cum tuum adventum jam appropinquare conspicio; et tamen computans unumquemque diem annum, donec tuam personam intueor. Tuum amorem atque laborem, in juventute et paupertate mea in me impensum, non obliviscor, et, Deo volente, in memorem hominem collocatum invenies. Pudet me meam dissuetudinem in literis tibi his scriptis indicare, sed amor cogit me tibi id facere quod nemini alii volui; nam nunquam scripsi epistolam Latinam istis jam quinque praeteritis annis, sic allis negotiis me tempus appellavit, et ne longotempore his barbaris litteris te in rebus tuis

impedire possim, sperans te hic videre infra paucos dies, opto tibi in Christo felicissimam vitam atque adventure. Die Martii5.

“Tuus scholasticus amantissimus, “THO. NORFOL.”

Harl. MSS. 417. art. 23, fol. 102.

ft153 Harl. MSS. 416, art. 79, fol. 131.

ft154 Harl. MSS. 416. art. 72, fol. 120.

Ft155 Harl. MSS. 416, art. 92, fol. 147.

ft156 Ibid. art. 98, fol. 157.

ft157 Harl. MSS. 416, art. 82, fol. 135.

ft158 Harl. MSS. 416, art. 88, fol. 143.

ft159 Ibid. art. 69, fol. 116.

ft160 Strype. Annals, vol. 1:cap. 17:ad fin.

ft161 The duchess of Norfolk was, at this time, expecting her confinement. She was the second wife of the duke. His first duchess was the lady Mary Fitzalan, who died in August, 1557, about two months after the birth of Philip, earl of Arundel, the eldest son. In 1560 the duke married the lady Margaret Audley, by whom he had three children — Thomas, created earl of Suffolk, the lady Margaret, and the lord William Howard, who settled at Naworth, and became Warden of the Marshes. He is the ancestor of the present possessors of Castle Howard. His birth took place at Framlingham, in December 1563 and his mother survived the event scarcely a month.

ft162 Harl. MSS. No. 416, art. 109, p. 175.

Ft163 Strype's Annals, vol 2:p. 44. Oxford Edit.

ft164 “Anno Domini Millesimo quingentesimo sexagesimo tertio. Shipton prebendae institutio. “Ultimo die mensis Maii anno Domini praedicto, praenarratus Reverendus pater dominum Johannem Foxum clericum ad canonicatum in ecclesia sua cathedralis Sarum, et prebendam de Shipton in eadem per mortem naturalem Petri Vannes clerici ultimi incumbentis ibidem vacantem, juxta praesentationem Serenissimae in Christo principis et dominae, dominae Elizabeth, Dei gratia Angliae Francia et Hiberniae Reginae, fidei defensoris, etc., veri et indubitati ejusdem prebendae patroni, admisit; ipsumque canonicum et

prebendarium, et de eisdem in persona Johannis Randall procuratoris sui legitime constituti instituit, et investivit cum suis juribus et pertinentibus universis, prestitis primitiis per eundem procuratorem in, antejam dicti Johannis Fox prebendarii sic instituti-juramento corporali juxta formam statuti in ea parte editi, etc. Necnon de legitima obedientia dicto Domino Episcopo et successoribus suis commisitque sibi cura sire onusque vel quod dicto canonicatui et prebendae incumbit. Et scripture fuit Decano et Capitulo pro ipsius installatione et inductione.” — Register of Bishop Jewel in *anno supra*.

In addition to this the following entry appears in the Chapter Register of Salisbury: —

“Die lunae vij. ultimo die mensis Maii Anno Domini 1563 in domo capitulari ecclesiae Cathedralis Sarum Magistris Parry, Presidente, Lancaster, Chandler, Proctor, et Bradbrydge, Canonicis residentibus, ac Stephano Cheston, Roberto Ryve, Ric. Reade, Johnne Fawley, et Roberto Mody Canonicis prebendaribus, et capitularibus congregatis et capitulum facientibus, dictus Magister Jacobus Pctor (Proctor) procurator Magistri Johannis Fox prebendarii prebendae de Shipton exhibuit procuracionera suum literatoriam pro dicto magistro Johanne Fox, et fecit se procuraterem pro eodem, ac literas mandatorias Reverendi in Christo principis et Domini, Domini Johannis Sarum Episcopi, Decano et Capitulo Saturn directas pro sua admissione, installatione et inductione nomine domini sui in canonicatu et prebenda de Shipton praedicta, realiter obtulit et presentavit.” — Blacher. Register in Cath.

The following from the Harl. MS. 419, art. 60, fol. 171, is also inaccurate: “Mr. John Fox was Prebend of Shipton in the sixte yeare of Queen Eliz. which is above a hundred years since.”

“In the beginning of the reign of Queen Elizabeth John Fox Clarke Professor of Devinity; was by the particular favor and bounty of her Majty. made Parson and Prebendary of the Parsonage of Shipton under Whichwood in the County of Oxd. In requitall of his paines in writing the Booke of Martyrs.”

Elizabeth came to the throne November 17, 1558, consequently May 1563 would fall in the fifth year of her reign.

Foxe took his corporal oath that he would observe the statutes of the foundation of the cathedral at Salisbury, and the laudable customs of the Church: he gave the usual security of fifty pounds that he would perform all the duties and support all the burdens attached to his office. — Register, *ut supra*.

From the same Register it appears that Foxe was not present at the Pentecostal synods held in 1564 and 1565, nor probably at the ensuing ones. He was not present at Bishop Jewell's visitation in June 1568. An hour was allowed for his appearance after his name was called, but he was not present. In December he was proclaimed contumacious, but his penalty reserved until the octave of the next Epiphany. Foxe refused to agree to the payment of the tenth of his income for the repairs of the cathedral, and process was ordered against him with others for its recovery. He was neither present at the election of bishops nor yet of deans.

**Ft165** Ad Decanum et Capitulum Sarisburiensem: — Ornatissime D. Decane, caeteriq, charissimi mihi in Christo fratres ac Domini, in Domino salutem. Nisi aequa vobis videatur petitio, non postulo ut annuatim. Sin nihil a vobis postulaturus sum, quod vel a justissima ratione vel a communi vestro jure et consuetudine sit alienum; peto ut quod illustriss. D. Episcopus, aequissima sua voluntate, passus est a se impetrari, idem a vobis exorare liceat, ut syngrapham hanc nostrae cum Tho. Randallo trans-actionis publica sigilli vestri approbatione, ac benigno suffragio confirmare ne denegetis. In quo ut mihi rem non ingratham, tum nec incommodam his qui mihi successuri sunt, in hanc praebendam, vos pro solira vestra benignitate facturos confido. Harl. MSS. 417, art. 24, fol. 102.

**Ft166** The following is an extract from the letter which is still extant: — Divina largiente providentia contigit, non ita pridere, mihi dono majestatis tuae prebendiola in ecclesia sarisber. Quo nomine quantum debeam munificentissimae tuae sublimitati, alias dabitur (Christo volante) explicandi opportunitas (*sic*). Nunc vero ita habet res. Ad prebendam hanc, quam dixi, spectat parochia, in qua vicarium designavi Guliel. Masterum, vinum optimum, et tuae forsitan majestati non incognitum. Jam utrique haeremus in solutione illius pecuniae, quae tibi pro primi anni fructibus debetur, quum neuter tamen teruncium habet ad

persolvendum. Ejus pecuniolae ut remissam nobis faciat Reginea tua pietas, rogare vix audet verecundia, at necessitate tamen impulsus rogare vel invitatus cogimur, freti deinde mansuetissima tua benignitate etsi non sine timore aliquo, audaciores tamen ad supplicandum reddimur; nihil diffisi, quin et huic audaciae tua facile condonabit pietas, si sciat, quanto nobis detrimento quart-toque obstaculo ad studia nostra sit infelix hujus aeris remora. Quamquam nihil esse in studiis aut laboribus nostris haud ignoramus, quod favoris tui lenissimam partem promereatur, cui etiamnum plusquam facultates nos debere agnoscimus; attamen si serenissima tua facilitas, in remittenda hac nobis solutiuncula, gratias nostras maluerit, quam pecuniam nostram deberi tibi maluerit, in altero quid riscus tuus!... (unfinished). — Harl. MS. 416, art. 46, fol. 83.

<sup>Ft167</sup> Strype's Life of Parker, vol. 1:pp. 375, 376. Oxfi Edit. Strype's Annals, vol. 2:p. 108. Oxf. Ed.

<sup>Ft168</sup> See Tanher's Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica, art. Foxe. London, 1748.

<sup>Ft169</sup> June 14, 1547.

<sup>Ft170</sup> Hugo Whitehead creatus fuit Prior Dunelmensis an. 1524, ex fide Wilhelmi de Chambre. Ultimus prior constitutus per foundationem *Primus, Originalis, et Modernus Decanus* Ecclesiae Cathedralis Dunelm. Maii 12. Obiit Londini, inusitatis molestiis agitatus, 1548. Stetit in Prioratu 18 annis. In Decanatu 6. His character is summed up in few words. Totus erat deditus amori divino. Magnam familiam domesticorum semper secum aluit. In domo sua generosos atque plebeios complurimos habuit, a quibus honorifice inserviebatur. Liberalem et copiosam mensam habebat. In eleemosynis erat abundans, in puritate vitae laudabilis. See also Wood, Ath. Ox. vol. 1:pp. 20, 21, where the chapter of foundation is placed in 1541, it ought to be 1542. The names of the first prebendaries were — 1st stall, Edward Hymers, a Benedictine monk; 2d, Roger Watson, ditto; 3d, Thomas Sparke, ditto; 4th, William Bennett, ditto; 5th, William Todd, ditto; 6th, Stephen Marley. ditto; 7th, Robert Dalton; 8th, John Towton; 9th, Nicholas Marley; 10th, Ralph Blabiston; hth, Robert Bennett, Benedictine monk; 12th, William Watson, ditto. Those of the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th stalls are thought, most probably, to have been monks,

although it is not specifically so stated. Two reasons are assigned in support of this opinion: — one arising from the fact of the prebendaries in the stalls above, and also those in the stalls beneath them, having manifestly been monks; the other, from their having been severally deprived in 1560, which leads to the supposition that they were true papists, and, at heart, against a thorough reformation.

The archdeacons were — for Durham, William Franklin; for Northumberland, Robert Dobell. See Cosin's MSS., Cosin's Library, Durham.

By the act of 2d of queen Victoria, lately passed, the holders of stalls in the cathedrals of England are to be called canons, and not prebendaries. Their appointments must be consequently called canonries. For the distinction between canonries and prebendaries, and prebends and canons, see writers on the Canon Law, Selvagio, vol. 2:p. 172, lib. 2:tit. 18:Section 12, de Praebendis. Barbosa.

**Ft171** “John Foxe, M.A. (the martyrologist, if I mistake not, intitled Verbi Sacri Professor, was promoted to the prebend; but resigned the preferment the next year, 1573.” (Strype's Annals, vol. 2:p. 237.) The stall is the third — now held by Mr. Jenkyns, the professor of divinity in our newly-founded university of Durham.

**Ft172** Hutchinson's Durham, vol. 2:p. 231, and references there.

**Ft173** See the whole memorial in Peck's *Desiderata Curiosa*, lib. 9:No. 7, folio edition.

**Ft174** “1572. Johannes Foxe, A.M. the martyrologist, installed October 14. He resigned it within a year, being (as is supposed) quite averse to the habits of the church of England, which were here kept up with great strictness. He succeeded Sparke in the 3d stall. Sparke died in 1571.” — Cosin's MSS. in Cosin's library.

**Ft175** Soames' Elizabethan History, chap. 1

**ft176** Strype's Grindal, p. 175. Soames, p. 76.

**Ft177** The consequences of each clergyman assuming to himself the power of deciding to what extent he would conform externally, because he was a strict conformist to the essential truths and doctrines of the church, appears from the following statement: — “Some clergymen read

prayers in the chancel; others in the nave; some from a reading-desk; others from the pulpit; some adhered strictly to the prescribed service; others interspersed metrical psalms. Communion tables, variously formed and furnished, were transferred to the nave in some churches; in others, though still in the chancel, they stood not against a wall, but centrally. In administering, some clergymen used a chalice; others, a communion cup; others, a common cup; some, leavened bread; others, unleavened. In receiving, some knelt; others stood; others sate. For baptism, the font was used by some; a bason by others; the sign of a cross was made in some cases; in others omitted. In this, and all other of their ministrations, there were clergymen who never wore a surplice; others conformed so far as this, but did not wear the cap. Nor was this always of the customary form even among such as retained it: some wearing it round; others, a button cap: others would hear of no compromise, and wore a hat. It was these, perhaps, who had renounced academics altogether, and were to be seen only in common clothes." Soames, *Eliz. Hist.* p. 39.

**Ft178** Mr. Soames, in his *Elizabethan History*, p. 159, has made a mistake respecting the resignation of the fifth stall at Durham. Lever was appointed in 1567, and was made archdeacon of Northumberland in 1566. He resigned this appointment in 1573, the same year in which Foxe is said to have vacated the third stall; but he died prebendary of Durham, 1585, and was succeeded by Dr. Barnes. Mr. Soames thinks that he resigned this stall in 1571.

**Ft179** "Salutem. Literae tuae, mi D. Foxe, fuerant mihi longe gratissimae unarum libello de papistarum tyrannide, quam tamen obiter tantum inspicere hic licuit: domum reversus diligentius percurram, suspicor enim, te, licet nomen non adjeceris, operis ejus autorem. Pro utroque ingentes tibi gratias ago, et quam suavissimas litteras animi tui erga me testes notissimas et elegantissimum libellum ad me miseris. Quod si etiam libellum de statu Belgico misisses, rem adhuc mihi gratiorem fecisses, non quod illo carere diutius nequeam, sed quod verear ne omnino aliquando pereat, non indignus alioqui quin legatur et in lucem etiam aliquando prodeat. Libenter aliquid librorum ad te misissem, hoc tempore a me excusorum, si recipere eorum curam quisquam voluisset; vix effeci ut literas reciperent. Sed proximis nundinis, citius fortasse

curabo. Bene vale, doctissime Foxe, et de recognoscendis aliquibus martyribus tuis quaeso serio etiam cogita. Franckofordiae, Sept. 1, 1562. — Harl. MSS. No. 417, Art. 43, fol. 108. b. “JOAN. OPORINUS tuus ex animo.”

**Ft180** Richard Day, minister of Ryegate, and son of the printer. — British Reformers, p. 130.

**Ft181** Harl. MSS. No. 416, Art. III, p. 175. b.

**ft182** This title-page corrects the mistake that Oldmixon and Burnet have fallen into when they state that the first edition appeared in the year 1561.

**Ft183** Dated, Zurich, March 10, 1563.

**Ft184** Thomas Byng of Peterhouse, afterwards of Clare Hall, kept a philosophy act, and gave these two political questions:

*Monarchia est optimus status reipublicae?  
Frequens legum mutatio est periculosa?*

Thomas Cartwright, afterwards the opponent of Whitgift, who bore no share in the day's solemnity, when the Divinity Act was held, he not having then proceeded to the degree of Doctor in Divinity, took part in the disputation. The questions proposed for the disputants in theology were —

*Major est scripturae quam ecclesiae auctoritas?  
Civilis magistratus habet auctoritatem in rebus ecclesiasticis?*

Dr. Cox, whose name I have had occasion to mention in connection with the disastrous contentions among the exiles of Frankfort, was now bishop of Ely, and determined on these two questions.

**Ft185** **Strype's Annals, vol. 2:pp. 110 — 112. Nares's Memoirs of Lord Burghley, vol. 1:p. 341. Collier, vol. 2:p. 492. Rapin and Tindal, vol. 2:p. 68. Neal's Puritans, vol. 1:p. 195. Echard, Hist. of Eng. vol. 2:p. 420, who states the arrival of the queen at Cambridge, August 15.**<sup>L7</sup>

**Ft186** Annals, vol. 1:chap. 39, p. 407, folio edit.

**Ft187** In Christo mi Foxi. Quum Londini vix uno verbo affari potueram, tu nunc prae temporis angustiae vix una litera vacat salutarer. Quod aut... licet, ut volui, diligenter, id certe faciam, quod possum, libenter. Summa

haec est, commendo tibi hunc meum Ludimagistrum Magdalenensem, pium, eruditum, tuorum monumentorum studiosum lectorem. Commendo precibus tuis et curae tuae propagationem religionis, reformationemque Eae. (Ecclesiae) in his comitiis, ut agas et peragas ope, opera, gratia, et modis omnibus, ut principes regni et proceres cleri moveant aliquid salutare et promoveant. Commendo ad extremum me tibi, et te Deo tuorumque omnes. Cura ut valeas. Vale Xo. Oxo. Tuus Lau. Humfred.

Mitee, si potes, per hunc Balgaium Legum Ecclesiasticarum exemplar. — Harl. MSS. 416, art. 114, fol. 179. See also, Strype's Life of Parker, vol. 1:p. 439, where the date is given March 28, 1566.

Ft<sup>188</sup> Carte's England, vol. in. p. 439.

Ft<sup>189</sup> Nares's Life of Burghley, vol. 2:p. 404, note.

Ft<sup>190</sup> Ergo tuam celsitudinem, non dicam ut numen, dicam certe ut numam veneramur. — Andrews' Continuation of Henry, vol. i.p. 66, note 43.

Ft<sup>191</sup> Harleian MSS. 416, art. 74, fol. 123.

Ft<sup>192</sup> **See the original letter in the Appendix. It is taken from the Lansdowne MSS, No. 10, art. 70. Day, in 1566, had printed the edition of the Psalms referred to in this letter.** <sup>L8</sup>

Ft<sup>193</sup> Harl. MS. 417, art. 108, fol. 131 h.

ft<sup>194</sup> Harl. MSS. 416, art. 70, fol. 118.

Ft<sup>195</sup> Harleian MSS. 416, art. 67, fol. 113, etc. etc.

ft<sup>196</sup> Ornatissime vir, salutem in Christo multam. Primum, quod ad ignotum scribam ignotus, id putes velim non aliunde proficisci, quam ex animo tui studioso tuaeque notitiae percupido. Quanquam subest et alia causa quare to compellandum existimavi hoc tempore; Alani Copi Dialogos ante triennium editos jamdudum vidisse to non ignorare ac etiam perlegisse suspicor. Horum quinque priores dialogi ad te et Magdeburgenses vestros (ut scis) partim etiam ad Apologeticos nostros spectant. Sextus vero dialogorum liber me peculiariter et nominatim impetit. De istis dialogis quid vos istic statuatis an sycophantem illum sine responsione omnino negligendum putetis, sive responsionem brevi exituram paretis, scire laboro. Quod ubi constiterit,

ex ratione vestra ipsemet capiam rebus meis consilium. Hac de re si dignaberis vel tribus verbis me certiozem reddere, gratum feceris.

Ad Flacium Illyricum. forsan.

Harl. MS. No. 417, Art. 36, fol. 105

<sup>ft197</sup> Acts and Mon. vol. iii. p. 709, edit. 1837.

<sup>ft198</sup> The observance of Lent was a well-known rigid fast. In 1564 an order was issued to observe Wednesdays as fast days, when fish was eaten. In 1568 a royal proclamation appeared, supposed to have been dictated by Burghley, to enforce the observance of all the old fasts, and a more rigid one of every Wednesday. (Life of Burghley by Nares, vol. 2:pp. 483, 484.) Foxe, as appears from the above letter, was in an ill state of health, and I think this the likely period when he obtained from archbishop Parker a dispensation to eat flesh in Lent. For this kindness, Strype says, Foxe addressed him in a handsome Latin letter. Life of Parker, vol. 1:p. 354.

Erasmus could not endure even the smell of fish; and Roger Aseham obtained a dispensation from archbishop Cranmer. Jortin's Life of Erasmus, Works, vol. 5:p. 80.

<sup>ft199</sup> *George Norton to Mr. Foxe, asking for the Preface to his Martyrology:*

—  
 “For that I doe rather write than come myselfe, impute I pray you to this: for that I think it pleaseth far better: and becauss it hath so fallen out, it lykethe the no lesse,” etc. etc. etc. After many observations, he adds — “ But to the cause of my writinge, etc. Syr, Mr. Daie willed me when he ridde forth, as this dale to come to you for the preface. The parliamente draweth nere, which yf you pleas to send by this messenger with your mynd, I will doe thereafter. Vale in Christo.

“Yours to commande, “GEORGE NORTON.”

“To the worshipful Mr. Foxe, these.”

Harl. MSS. 416, Art. 71, fol. 119.

It would appear from this letter, that Foxe was not living at this time in the house of Day: but was probably at the duke of Norfolk's; whence he afterwards removed to Grub-street.

<sup>Ft200</sup> See on this subject the Accusations of History against the Church of Rome — Soames's Elizabethan History, the last work in which these topics are considered — the usual references to the Canon Law of Rome — and Bishop Taylor's Notes to his Sermon on the 5th of November, where the numerous authorities of the learned papal writers who defended these doctrines are collected. The members of the church of Rome in the present day shrink from these opinions. They are sincere in their disavowal; but they are required by all their hopes of the reunion of Christians, and by all their hopes of credit to their professions of loyalty to a sovereign whom the laws denominate Protestant, to demand the expungement of the canons which former controversies have placed in the canon law of Rome, from the Coneilia, and pontifical codes by which their church is governed. Those laws are unrepealed, though they are disavowed, as obsolete. They slumber with the weakness — they wake with the power, of Rome; if the security, the indifference, the irreligion, or the party politics of the objectors to the revival of the papal supremacy, permit the resumption of its power.

Michael Ghislieri, the commissary-general of the Inquisition, a man of high reputation as a scholar, and of blameless character, but still more highly esteemed for his “hatred to those revivals of primitive Christianity, which his church called heresy, and for his consequent severity to the upholders of every error which the church had so long sanctioned,” was elected pope, on the 7th of January, 1566. He had scarcely assumed the tiara before he put forth a bull against heretics. “In the name of the Holy Trinity, of the Blessed Mother of God, of St. Peter and St. Paul, of the holy host of heaven, of the archangels and angels, of the holy apostles, saints, and martyrs,” willing and authorizing all the wise and learned of his clergy, to labor, endeavor, and contrive all manner of devices, to abate, assuage, and confound them; anathematizing all heretics, living, trading, or travelling in arty colonies, princi- palities, realms, and countries, subject to the see of St. Peter, his predecessor; that thereby they might either be reclaimed, or a total infamy be brought upon them, by their discord and divisions; by which means they might either speedily perish by God's wrath, or continue in eternal difference.” {Nares's Life of Lord Burghley, vol. 2. p. 363.}

In the Bull of Canonization of Pius V. 1712, among his high virtues entitling him to such honors, this is one: — his “unhesitating zeal in striking with his dread anathema the impious *heretic, Queen Elizabeth, the pretended queen of England.*”

**Ft201** The title to this Second Edition was — “ The first volume of Ecclesiastical History, contayning the Acres and Monumentes of thinges passed in every kynge's tyme in this realm, especially in the Church of England, principally to be noted. With a full discourse of such persecutions, horrible troubles, the sufferyng of Martyrs, and other things incident, touchyng as wel the said Church of England, as also Scotland, and all other foreine nations, from the primitive tyme, till the reigne of King Henry VIII. Newly recognized, and enlarged by the author John Foxe. Also the second volume, from the tyme of King Henry VIII. to Queene Elizabeth, our gracious Lady now reigning. Printed by John Day, 1570, etc.”

Both the first and second volumes had many more engravings than the edition in 1563.

**Ft202** Audiendi quae fecerint pudor est: nullus faciendi quae audire erubescunt.

**ft203** It is written in Latin. The commencement is an imitation, apparently, of Cicero's introduction to his “De Oratore: “ — “ Cogitanti mihi, versantique mecum in animo,” etc.

**ft204** That it has not been deemed an objectionable custom to commemorate the memory of religious persons by assigning especial days to that purpose, and even offering up suitable prayers when we recal them to our remembrance, see the Oxford Tracts on the honor due to the memory of Bishop Ken, etc.

**ft205** It has, I perceive, become the fashion among those of our clerical brethren who would place the happiness, peace, purity, and triumph of the true catholic church in retrogradation, and not in progression, to deny the accuracy of this, the usual interpretation among protestants. I refer them to the late Mr. Davison's work on Prophecy. He, too, was of Oriel, and had peculiarities, but not heretodoxies.

**Ft206** See a Treatise, proving the Church of England to be the Holy Catholic Church, by P. Berault, 1682.

Ft207 He wrote, among other things, *Epistola de Graecis Literis, et Homeri Lectione et Imitatione. De Religionis Conservatione et Reformatione, deque Primatu Regum, etc.*

ft208

*“Auctorem specta! pius est, et tersus, et ampius,  
Judicio clarus, dexteritate, fide.”*

Ft209 See the Treatise of Archbishop Wake on the State of the Church and Clergy, folio, 1703, pp. 502, 503.

Ft210 *Uti nuperrime excusa sunt Londini.*

Ft211 This book of Canons is reprinted in Sparrow's Collection; 4to. London, 1684. It is entitled *Liber Quorundam Canonurn Disciplinae Ecclesiae Anglicanae, Anno 1571.*

The decrees of the synod were — *De Episcopis, De Decanis Ecclesiarum, De Archidiaconis, De Cancellariis, De Aedituis Ecclesiarum, De Concionatoribus, De Residentia, De Pluralitatibus, De Ludimagistris, De Patronis, etc.*, to which was prefixed this preamble:

—

*Sequuntur in hoc libello certi quidam articuli de sacro ministerio, et procuracione ecclesiarum, in quos plene consensum est in synodo a domino Matthaeo, archiepis. Cantuar. et totius Angliae primate et metropolitano, et reliquis omnibus ejus provinciae episcopis, partim personaliter praesentibus, partim procuratoria manu subscribentibus, in synodo inchoata Londini in aede divi Pauli, tertio die Aprilis, 1571.*

The decrees to which I refer are these —

*De Episcopis, p. 227.* — *Quivis archiepiscopus et episcopus habebit domi suae sacra Biblia in amplissimo volumine, uti nuperrime Londini excusa sunt, et plenam illam historiam quae inscribitur Monumenta Martyrum, et alios quosdam similes libros ad religionem appositos. Locentur autem isti libri, vel in aula, vel in grandi coenaculo, ut et ipsorum famulis et advenis usui esse possint.*

*Decani Ecclesiarum Cathedralium, p. 227.* — *Eosdem illos libros, quos proxime diximus, decanus quisque curabit emi et locari in ecclesia sua cathedrali, ejusmodi in loco, ut a vicariis et minoribus canonicis et*

ministris ecclesiae, et ab advenis et peregrinis, commode audiri et legi possint.

Eosdem libros illos decanus et primarius quisque residentiarius, quos appellant ecclesiae dignitates, ement, suo quisque famulatio, eosque opportuno aliquo in loco, vel in aula vel in coenaculo, locabunt.

*Archidiaconi*, p. 229.-Quivis archidiaconus habebit domi sum et alios libros, et nominatim eos qui inscribuntur *Monumenta Martyrum*.

**Fi212** Theonas the last bishop of London, before the arrival of Augustine the monk, fled to Wales only eleven years before that event. This flight was the most disastrous and fatal circumstance, without any exception, that ever happened to the episcopacy of Britain. If Theonas had remained, and died at his post, the pretensions of Rome to rule in Britain would never have rested, as they now do, on the mission and consecration of Augustine.

**Fi213** The preface of John Foxe to the *Reformatio Legum* commences with this very sentiment:—"Quum nihil sit, quod vel ad communem omnium naturam vel ad privatam cujusque salutem proprius pertineat, quam ut in quaque reipub, societate recta religionis doctrina retineatur, tum ad hanc ipsam optima religionis institutionem non parum retulerit, optimarum pariter legum accedere disciplinam: Quarum altera nos ad pietatem infotract, altera externam hominum inter ipsos vitam moresque componat." etc.

The seventh of the canons, also, to which the puritans so vehemently objected, proposed by archbishop Laud in 1640, begins thus: — "Because it is generally to be wished that unity of faith were accompanied with uniformity of practice in the outward worship and service of God," etc. It then proceeds to command that the communion table be called an altar, not that it is to be esteemed a true and proper altar, whereon Christ is again really sacrificed; but in that sense in which the primitive church called it an altar, and in no other sense. The unfortunate archbishop was right in the principle that one discipline should be the bond of union to the upholders of one faith; but he made the same blunder, and committed the same great crime which his imitators, eulogizers, admirers, and followers in the university of Oxford, and in many parts of the church of England, are committing in the present day. He imagined that the union and improvement of the

churches of Christ can be effected by retrogradation instead of progression. In these two words lies the whole secret of the Tractarian controversy. May God prevent our differences from terminating in an open schism!

**Ft<sup>214</sup>** See Lawrence's Bampton Lectures.

**Ft<sup>215</sup>** See the whole controversy respecting the origin, rights, powers, etc., of the English convocations, in archbishop Wake's State of the Church and Clergy, etc. folio, 1703.

**Ft<sup>216</sup>** See for a brief account of these laws, Short's Sketch, vol. 1:pp. 140-2.

**Ft<sup>217</sup>** Harl. MSS. 426, and Cranmer's Works, by Jenkyns, vol. 1.p. 108.

**Ft<sup>218</sup>** Documentary Annals, by Cardwell, vol. 1:pp. 95, 96, note, 1839.

**Ft<sup>219</sup>** Strype's Annals, vol. 2:p. 66, folio edition.

**Ft<sup>220</sup>** Strype's Cranmer, book 2. c. 26.

**Ft<sup>221</sup>** "God grant," he exclaims, "that a day may come, in which that noted design, so near being perfected in king Edward's days, may be revived and established." — History of His Own Time, ap. fin.

**Ft<sup>222</sup>** See Dr. Winchester's Dissertation on the Seventeenth Article, Oxford edit. 1773, p. 47.

**Ft<sup>223</sup>** Ex Officina Joh. Daii, 1571, Mense Aprilis. Dr. Winchester cites an edition of 1641, which he calls the *second*. Dissert. on the 17th Art. ut supra p. 52. The real second edition, which I possess, is dated 1640, "typis T. H. et R. H., impensis Laurentii Sadler habitantis in Parva Britannia, etc." But there are certainly copies which bear another notification, with the date 1641, viz. "impensis Societatis Stationariorum." One of these is in the Lambeth Library. It is the same book with a different title-page. Todd's Declaration of our Reformers on Free-will, Original Sin, Grace, etc.. London, 1818. Preface, pp. 15 — 18. See also Neal's Puritans, vol. i.p. 57; Oldmixon, pp. 185 — 418; Biog. Brit. vol. 4:p. 420, art. Cranmer; Short's Sketch, vol. 1:p. 406; Le Bas' Jewel, p. 187; Collier, vol. 2:pp. 326 — 333, where he gives an epitome of the work; Nares' Life of Burghley, vol. 1:p. 338, vol. 2:p. 572; Lingard, vol. 4:p. 462; Burner, Ref. vol. in. p. 226; Strype's Annals, vol. in. p. 97, Oxf. ed.; Strype's Parker, vol. 2:p. 62; Soames' Elizabethan Rel. Hist. p. 148. Among the commissioners for drawing

up the code in Edward's time, John Alasco was numbered. Krasinski's Ref. in Poland, vol. 1:p. 264.

- Ft224** Hallam's Constitutional History of England, vol. i.p. 109. 4to edit.
- Ft225** Warburton's Letters to Hurd, letter lxxxi, p. 192.
- Ft226** Hurd's Dialogues, vol. ii. p. 309, 310. 5th edit. 1776. Burnet, Reform. Part I, p. 330, ap. Hurd.
- Ft227** lxxxii, p. 194.
- Ft228** See Hallam's Note. Hallam also refers both to Warburton and Hurd.
- Ft229** c. 10. De judiciis contra Haereses. — Hallam.
- Ft230** The following is the disputed passage: — “ Cum sic penitus insederit error, et tam alte radices egerit, ut nec sententia quidem excommunicationis ad veritatem reus inflecti possit, tam consumptis omnibus aliis remediis, ut extremum ad civiles magistratus atlegetur puniendus.”
- Ft231** History of England, vol. 2:p. 318, note.
- Ft232** Soames' Reformation, vol. 3. pp. 722, 723.
- Ft233** Mr. Hallam is incorrect in representing the origin of the new code of ecclesiastical law from the two curious entries in the Lords' Journals of the 14th and 18th of November, 1549. Const. Hist. of Eng. vol. 1.p. 109, 4to. edit. and note.
- Ft234** It was said of bishop Pearson, that the dust of his writings was gold. The remark may be applied to bishop Warburton. I extract from his letters, to which I have above alluded, his brief theory of the causes of the prevalence of the notion, that non-resistance to the sovereign was the duty of all christian people. Factious and rebellious opposition to any government, even the most cruel and tyrannical, is certainly expressly forbidden to all Christians; but the bold, yet courteous, submission, by expostulation or petition, or by any other legal mode, of desiring a change of the principles or enactments of unchristian or oppressive laws, is at once a christian privilege, and a bounden duty. Liberty, secured by wise laws, is the uniform result of true religion: the following is the extract to which I allude. “After the Reformation the protestant *divines*, as appears by the homilies, composed by the wisest and most disinterested men, such as Cranmer and Latimer,

preached up non-resistance very strongly; but it was only to oppose popery. The case was this. The pope threatened to excommunicate and depose Edward. He did put his threats in execution against Elizabeth. This was esteemed such a stretch of power, and so odious, that the Jesuits contrived all means to soften it. One was, by searching into the origin of civil power, which they brought rightly (though for wicked purposes) from the people; as Mariana, and others. To combat this, and to save the person of the sovereign, the protestant divines preached up divine right. Hooker, superior in every thing, followed the truth. But it is remarkable, that this non-resistance, which, at the Reformation, was employed to keep out popery, was, at the Revolution, employed to bring it in. So eternally is truth sacrificed to politics! “ — Warburton's Letters. Letter LXXXIV. p. 200. *Second edition.*

**Ft235** On Tower-hill, June 2d, 1572.

**Ft236** “It was misliked that she should bestowe herself in marriage with the duke, for that he was coumpted to be a protestant.” See the Confession of the Duke of Northumberland in the very interesting Memorials of the Rebellion in 1569, by sir Cuthbert Sharp. 1840. Appendix, p. 192. See, also, 192, 201, 208, 210.

**Ft237** Thomas Howard, fourth duke of Norfolk, was three times married; first, to Mary, second daughter of Henry Fitz Allen, earl of Arundel, by whom he had issue, Philip, earl of Arundel. She died 25th August, 1557, being then but sixteen years of age. (Walpole's Royal and Noble Authors, vol. 1.p. 324.) She was of a highly cultivated mind, and translated from Greek 44 Certain Ingenious Sentences, collected from various Authors.” It was dedicated to her father. He married again, in 1560, Margaret, daughter and co-heir of Thomas, lord Audley, of Walden, widow of Henry, youngest son of John, duke of Northumberland. She died in 1563-4, in child-birth of William Howard, afterwards of Naworth, in Cumberland, and ancestor of the present family of the Carlises, of Castle-Howard. There were two other children alive at her death. He married, for his third wife, Elizabeth Leyburne, daughter of sir James Leyburne, widow of Thomas, lord Dacre, of Gillesland, March, 1566. She also died in child-birth, having been married to him but one year.

**Ft238** The letters are given in Le Plat. “Profiteor,” she says to the cardinal of Lorraine, “et affirmo, me victuram e: morituram etiam in obedientia antiqua catholicae et Romanae ecclesiae, quam ego reputo esse caput,” etc. Le Plat, vol. 5:p. 660. The letter is dated Edinburgh, 30th January, 1563.

The next is to pope Pitts IV., and is dated Edinburgh, in the same year. She says, “Ut tandem dignis modis sanctam agnoscant catholicam ecclesiam Romanam in ea obedientia, in qua nos mori atque vivere ut devotissima filia possumus, nullis certe facultatibus, quae sunt in nostra potestate, et ne vitae quidem propriae parcemus.” Ibid. p. 661.

**Ft239** See the Confession of the Duke of Norfolk, Strype's Annals, fol. edit. vol. 2:Appendix 12:p. 28.

**ft240** Harl. MSS. 416, art. 97, fol. 154. See also Wright's Elizabeth and her Times, vol. 1:pp. 324 — 326.

**Ft241** Orig. — State Paper Office.

**Ft242** See Strype, ut supra.

**Ft243** Wright's Elizabeth, vol. i.p. 402, note. The entire letter is given pp. 402 — 412. It is the Harl. MS. 787, art 104, folio 112.

**Ft244** Harl. MS. 416. art. 83, folio 136.

**Ft245** Harl. MS. 416, Art. 121, folio 189. Dean Cooper was consecrated bishop of Lincoln in Feb. 1570, and translated, in 1583, to Winchester. — Godwin, pp. 302, 239. Wood. Ath. Ox. — There is no mention made of Dr. Pierce in Wood; but he must have been successor to Dr. Cooper, as Torporley's letter directs Foxe to make application to him.

**Ft246** Harl. MS. 416, art. 122, fol. 191.

**Ft247** Acts and Mon. vol. 8:pp. 201 — 219.

**Ft248** Strype's Ecc. Mere. vol 5:p. 585.

**Ft249** Strype writes “cannot.”

**Ft250** Harl. MS. 416, art 57, fol. 100.

**Ft251** Acts and Mon. vol. 8:pp. 721,722.

**Ft252** Ecclesiastical Memorials, vol. 5:pp. 574 — 585, and vol. 6:pp. 430 — 434.

**Ft253** “Quo majore desiderio animus mihi illustrissimam pietatem tuam caeterosque istic amicos mihi jam non diu visos revisere, Antistes imprimis observande ac in Christo reverende, hoc molestius mihi accidit, hoc tempore non licere quod libeat tantopere. Nam alioqui mentiar si quisquam sit hodie Episcoporum omniurn, cui vel impensius debere me pro acceptis beneficiis profiteor, vel quem lubentius eram aditurus. Sed praeter caeteras remoras et difficultates accedit insuper valetudinis ea debilitas quae vix permittit tam longinquae profectioni me committere. Consimilem etiam legationem misit ad me nuper clarissimus episcopus Lincolniensis, per famulum et equum ultro oblatum ad aedes suas accersens amantissime; cui tamen et famulum et equum rursus vacuum remittere coactus sum. Et tamen, si ferat ita voluntas Domini, experiar atque etiam annitar sedulo, fraetus Christi domini nostri gracia ac patrocinio, temporis aliquid ociosi posthac dispescere, in quo et reverendam tuam celsitudinem cupidissime salutaturus simul et meipsum, si volet Dominus, refocillaturus adveniam. Interea Dominus Jesus pro [in]exhausta sua misericordia te cum grege universo multa pace laetum et florentem custodiat. Ad DD. episcopum Norwicensem, ut videtur.” — Harl. MS. 417, art 34, fol. 105.

This bishop of Lincoln was Thomas Cooper, who had been fellow of Magdalen. He was elected probationer in 1539, and perpetual fellow in 1540. He was made dean of Christ Church in 1566, dean of Gloucester in 1569, and consecrated bishop of Lincoln in 1570, February 24. — Anth. Wood, vol, 1:p. 265. Godwin de Pres. p. 302.

**Ft254** **Vide Appendix for the letter.** <sup>L10</sup> “A reprieve,” says Collier, “being granted, and Foxe's expedient being tried without success, the forfeiture of their lives was taken.” (Eccl. Hist. vol. 2:p. 549.) The same is mentioned by Fuller, who adds “that though queen Elizabeth constantly called him her *Father Fox*, yet herein was she no dutiful daughter, giving him a fiat denial.” (Ch. Hist. b. 9:p. 105. Heylin's Hist. of Presb. p. 280.) Both Collier and Fuller notice the letter; the former saying it was “written in a very handsome christian strain “ — the latter pointing to it as an answer to the charge brought against Foxe that he was not a Latin scholar, and therefore nick-named him John Lack Latine: this will prove that they were so many Lack Truths, as it

shows his fluent and familiar language. (Ch. Hist. b. 9:p. 106.) He refers to another which will be found in another place under the year 1581.

**Fl255** See Appendix. L13

**Fl256** It is in Rymer, vol. 15:p. 741. “Vobis praecipimus” is the ending, quod dictos Johannem Peters, et Henricure Turwest — apud West Smithfield, in loco aperto et publico — coram populo igni committi — ac in eodem igne realiter comburi faciatis, etc. etc. Dean Nowel, and the bishops of London and Rochester, I grieve to say, were on the commission which condemned them.

**Fl257** Libellum tuum de Christo crucifixo accepi (clarissime Foxe), tibi que propter honorificam nostri existimationem tuam gratias ago, quod me eum esse arbitratus sis, cujus fidei et diligentiae illius publicationem mandare et tradere volueris. Siquam talem superioribus annis expectationem et famam concitavimus, est quod Deo gratias agamus, qui opellam nostram sua benedictione secundare non recusavit: tum etiam tam praeclara bonorum de nobis sententia calcar non leve jam currentibus in posterum addet ut eodem pede porro pergamus. Haec habui quae nunc tibi significanda (ut te quoque velle ostendisti) existimavi. Nam ipsum quidera Libellum vix inspicere, per eas quae nunc pene nos obruant occupationes adhuc licuit. Faciam autem libentissime quod mones, et consilium, quale et ecclesiae utilitas postulat et temporis hodierni ratio permittere videbitur, cum amicis capiemus. Tabulas enim quas ex gravissimo naufragio, servare et colligere licuit, ad eum usum adhiberi decrevi, quem Dei glorie promovendae et ecclesiae Christi aedificandae profuturum sentiam. Bene ac fideliter vale. Francoforti, xj. Sept. 1575.

Harl. MSS. 417, art. 33, fol. 105. Tuus ex animo, ANDR. WECHELUS.

**Fl258** Salutem. Fretus divina ope, tum secundum Deum pietate tua provocatus, mitto ad vos Foxulum meum, ut fiat Academicus, atque ut istic mercaturam faciat in nobilissimo hoc emporio vestro, non ut opibus ditescat, sed ut ingenuis artibus animum pascat, et ingenium excolat. Qua in re quo magis mihi opus est praesidio tuo (praeses celeberrime), hoc impensius Laurentianam hanc tuam, hoc est, vere fraternam, charitatem appello, ut qui ea facultate a Deo donatus sis ut

possis, ea deinde praeditus natura ut velis, quam plurimis prodesse, inter caeteros illos tam multos, quos juvisti hactenus, nostri quoque cura partem aliquam tuae charitatis occupet; si non pro meritis nostris (quae nulla sunt) aut muneribus (quae nusquam sunt), at pro ingenita saltera illa candidissimi pectotis tui, quae nullis deesse solet, pietate. Nimium forte impudens videri possim, qui amicum tot tantisque tum publicis tum privatis actionum turbis satagentem sic gravo officiiis. Sed huc necessitas, acre telum, adegit, ut necessario hoc abs te postulem. Quod enim postulo ejusmodi est, ut opera et beneficio tuo liceat istie apud vos filium meum sedem aliquam et tutorem (ut tibi commodissimum videbitur) adipisci. Caetera quae desunt ex aere meo et demenso ipsemet sufficiam, quoad potero.

Ad Laur. Humfridum Praesidem Collegii Magdalenensis.

Harl. MSS.417, art. 55, fol. 112 b.

ft259 It is in the Harl. MSS. 417, art. 69, fol. 116 b. **See Appendix.** <sup>L14</sup>

Ft260 Strype's Annals, vol. 6:p. 515. Oxford Edit.

Ft261 Harl. MSS. 417, art. 19, fol. 99b.

ft262 **See the Appendix.** <sup>L15</sup>

Ft263 Harl. MSS. 416, art. 136, fol. 208.

Ft264 See the letter of Foxe to Lord Burghley in Strype, Annals, vol. 6:p. 350, Oxford edition, and Life of Whitgift, vol.1.p. 485.

Ft265 Harl. MS. 419, art. 60.

Ft266 Harl. MS. 419, art. 60, fol. 171.

Ft267 Harl. MS. 416, art. 91, fol. 146.

Ft268 British Reformers. Printed for the Religious Tract Society, 1831.

Ft269 Harl. MS. 416, art. 123, fol. 192.

Ft270 Harl. MS. 416, art. 126, fol. 196.

Ft271 Harl. MS. 417, art. 84, fol. 120 b. Oct. 1578.

Ft272 Joannes Elmerus Episcopus Londinensis ad D. Foxun. — Salutem in Christo. Accepimus Reginam Scotorum paralyti graviter laborare, vel ad desperationem, et aliis nonnullis torqueri morbis. Rex ipse optimae spei adolescens, parlamenti autoritate decrevit de una religione confirmanda, et papistica e finibus suis exterminanda, ita ut quisque

missam auditorus primo moneatur, secundo bona ipsius fisco adjudicentur, si tertio peccaverit solum vertere cogatur. Haec ad te scripsi, tum ut hujus boni participem faciam, tum ut a te preces cum lachrymis Christo nostro fundantur, ut nos beare et suum evangelium propagare pergat. Quae concedat optimus Jhesus noster, quem non minus tibi familiarem existimo, quam est amicus quisque amico. Ora, ora, mi frater, nam plurimum apud Christum tuas valere preces non dubito.

Harl. MS. 417, art. 25, fol. 102 b. Tui amantiss.

JOHANNES LOND.

**Ft<sup>273</sup>** Harl. MS. 416, art. 130, fol. 202.

**Ft<sup>274</sup>** Lansdown MS. 982, fol. 103.

**Ft<sup>275</sup>** Harl. MS. 416, art. 131, fol. 203.

**Ft<sup>276</sup>** Perge Osorium confutare, ut confodias et jugules, etc. Harl. MSS. 417, Art. 76, fol. 118.

**Ft<sup>277</sup>** Annals, vol. 1. p. 378, folio edition.

**Ft<sup>278</sup>** Ut supra.

**Ft<sup>279</sup>** Hieronymi Osorii episcopi Sylvestis, in Gualterum Haddonum, etc. libri tres. Ulyssiponae, anno 1567, 4to.

**Ft<sup>280</sup>** M'Ilvaine on Justification, p. 110.

**Ft<sup>281</sup>** Annals, vol. in. p. 68, folio edition.

**Ft<sup>282</sup>** 1832.

**Ft<sup>283</sup>** The last most important work on the subject of justification is that by Mr. Faber. Mr. Faber, as Foxe does, in his reply to Osorius, contrasts the primitive and Trentine systems. There is an identity in the reasonings of the two books, though Mr. Faber does not seem to have read the reply to Osorius. Mr. Faber has rendered to the church the great service of proving, by quotations from the Fathers, from Clement to Bernard, that Trentine Rome teaches other conclusions than the Fathers taught, and that the reformers restored only, therefore, in the Articles of the Church of England, the doctrine of the prophets, apostles, and fathers. In this, as in other instances, well-authenticated tradition is with the Anglican, and not with the papal church.

- ft284 Account of his prayer before the sermon at Paul's Cross, for the church of Rome, *supra*, p. 102. 12
- ft285 The letter is too long to be inserted here. It constitutes No. XLIX. of the Appendix in Strype's Annals, vol in. Page of the Appendix 212, folio edition.
- ft286 Ap. Strype's Annals, vol. in. b. 2:Appendix, p. 110, No. XLIX.
- ft287 Cur dicemus, hunc vestitum papisticum. Non lineae sed seriacae, non planae et simplices sed aureae, magnificae, regales erant vestes papisticae. Poculum aureum habuit meretrix ilia in manu sua. Omnia in religione ejus sumptuosa, fastu mundano plena: ecclesia nostra quid habet simile?
- ft288 Ad omnes fideles ministros Jesu, cooperarios suos in evangelio, et qui verum Domus Dei reformandae zelum habent.
- ft289 I am merely giving the briefest abstract of the sense of each paragraph.
- ft290 Quid? annon hoc tantum ecclesiae auctoritati concedetis, ut vestem decentem praescribat ministro sacra celebranti? At quanlibet vestera hic (scio) dicetis praeter istam superpelliceam, etc.
- ft291 The earl of Suffolk, son of the duke, by his second duchess, Margaret, daughter and sole heir of Thomas, lord Audley, of Walden, in Essex, and widow of lord Henry Dudley, younger son of John, duke of Northumberland. Collins's Peerage, vol. 1.p. 108.
- ft292 Among the Foxe Papers in the British Museum are found many names of friends not enumerated by his son — Pusey, Gelibrand of Magdalene, Sharpe, Gordonius, Robert Silesius, Puis of Baliol, Cheke, Rogers, Gresop, Balyn, Regini Mortelius of Antwerp, and many more. Harl. MSS. Nos. 416, 417.
- ft293 See Strype's Life of Whitgift, ap. Strype's Annals, 1587, pp. 504, 505, folio, 1728.
- ft294 Chalmers' Biog. Diet. vol. 15:pp. 31, 32.
- ft295 The following is the inscription by his son:—  
Christo S.S. Johanni Foxo, ecclesiae Anglicanae martyrologo fidelissimo, antiquitatis historicae indagatori sagacissimo, evangelicae veritatis propugnatori acerrimo, thaumaturgo admirabili, qui martyres *Marianos*, tanquam Phoenices, ex cineribus redivivos praestitit, patri

suo omni pietatis officio imprimis colendo. *Samuel Foxus*, illius primogenitus, hoc monumentum posuit, non sine lachrymis.

Obiit die 18 mens. Aril (April) Anno Dom. 1587.

*Vita vitae mortalis est, spes vitae immortalis.  
Jam Septuagenarius.*

The other inscription upon the stone that covers his remains, indicating that two brothers of the name of Bullen were interred in the same spot, is to the following effect: —

Sacra sub hoc saxo tria corpora mista quiescunt,  
*Gulielmi Bullen*, medici, fratrisque *Richardi*,  
Ac *Johannis Foxi*, qui tres, mihi crede, fuerunt  
Doctrina clari, rari et pietatis alumni.  
*Guilelmus Bullen* medicamina semper habebat,  
Aeque pauperibus danda, ac locupletibus aequae.  
Sicque *Richardus* erat bene facere et ipse paratus  
Omnibus ex aequo, quibus ipse prodesse valebat.  
At *Foxus* noster per multas hos parasangas  
Vita praecurrit, studiisque accedimus omnes.  
Extant quae scripsit tormenta cruenta piorum,  
Extant perdocte per multa volumina scriptis  
Quae scripsit Foxus; nulli fuit ipse secundus.

Obiit An. Dom. 1587. April 16. {This is an error, it ought to be 18th. Note. Maitland's Hist. of London, vol. 2:p. 1103.}

<sup>ft296</sup> Constance Whitney, eldest daughter of sir Robert Whitney, of Whitney, in Herefordshire, who married the fourth daughter of sir Thomas Lucy. The wife of sir Thomas Lucy was Constance, daughter and heir of Richard Kingsmill, surveyor of the court of wards.

## PART II

### INTRODUCTION

<sup>ft297</sup> For the last brief account of these two, see Dowling's "Introduction to the Study of Ecclesiastical History," chap. in. sect 2.

ft298 See the lists in Dowling, "Introduction," etc. etc. and in Eyring's "Synopsis Historitae Literariae," etc. etc. one vol. 4to. Gottingae, 1733. His list extends only to 1498.

Ft299 Ex. gr. Heylyn, Arehbp. Laud, etc. etc. See their Biographies.

## SECTION 1

ft300 Maitland's Review of Foxe on the Waldenses, p. 13.

Ft301 Maitland's Six Letter — p. 2.

ft302 Ib. p. 74.

Ft303 Annals, vol. 1:part 1:p 375.

Ft304 "Many of the exiles were concerned in it, to supply Foxe with matter from England." — Strype's Annals, vol. 1:p. 375.

"Grindal supplied Foxe with collections of matters that happened before those times." — Strype's Grindal, p. 32.

Ft305 Maitland's Notes on the Contributions, etc, part 3, p. 97.

## SECTION 2

ft306 Quarterly Review, vol. 33, p. 8.

Ft307 Heylin, Hist. of Queen Jane, p. 163. Hist. of Mary, p. 25.

Ft308 Dodd, vol. 1:p. 545, etc.

ft309 Collier, p. 377. Echard, Heylin, Rapin. See extracts from Pole's letters, etc. in his life, by Philips, vol. 2.

Ft310 Philips's Life of Cardinal Pole. Echard's Hist of England. Collier, etc.

ft311 1st and 2d Philip and Mary, c. 6.

Ft312 Heylin, in his Account of the Causes of the Persecution, says, "Such were the madnesses of the people the governors of the church exasperated at these provocations." — Hist. of Queen Mary, p. 47.

Ft313 Notes of Milner — William Thomas, clerk of the council to Edward VI. and a disciple of the famous preacher Goodman, plotted the murder of the queen, for which he was sent to the Tower, and afterwards executed; at which time he boasted that he died for his country. — Wood's Athen. Oxon. Dr. Bourne and Dr. Pendleton, preaching the

catholic doctrine at St. Paul's Cross, barely escaped, the one a dagger which was thrown at him, and which stuck in a post of the pulpit; the other a bullet that was fired at him, and grazed his person. — Stow, Collier, etc.

<sup>ft314</sup> Heylin, p. 47.

<sup>ft315</sup> Dogs and cats, shaved and dressed like priests, officiating, were suspended in the streets, or otherwise exposed. — Stow, etc.

<sup>ft316</sup> In March, 1554, a girl, called Elizabeth Crofts, was concealed in a wall, near Aldgate, and there taught to counterfeit a supernatural voice, declaiming against the queen, confession, the mass, etc. — Stow, Heylin. The year following, at Eltham, in Kent, a youth of the name of Featherstone was instructed to assume the personage of Edward VI. in order to invalidate the queen's right to the throne. — Stow, etc.

<sup>ft317</sup> Such as the famous John Knox's "Blast against the monstrous Regimen of Women," and his other works against queen Mary of England, and queen Mary of Scotland. Goodman's book concerning "The Superiour Magistrate," in which he invokes the spirit of Wyat as a martyr. Poynt's "Treatise on Politic Power." — Heylin, Collier, Ant. Wood.

<sup>ft318</sup> Beza, the celebrated pastor of Geneva, writing in justification of the burning of Servetus, by his master, Calvin, for heterodoxy in religion, which event had lately taken place in that city, produces ample authorities from Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Bullinger, Capito (to whom he might have added even the conciliating Bucer,) in defense of capital punishments in matters of religion. See Beza *De Hereticis puniendis a civili Magistratu, etc. occasione mortis Serveti*. Cranmer took it upon his conscience that the young king, Edward VI., was obliged to sign the death-warrant of Joan Boucher, condemned for heresy, on account of a singular opinion concerning the nature of Christ's body. Heylin. Collier, part 2:p. 291. He also promoted the capital punishment of other dissenters, during this reign, as he had in the preceding reign that of protestants in general.

<sup>ft319</sup> This is emphatically remarked, with respect to Scotland, by Dr. Robertson in his history of that country, an. 1560. The same penal

laws against catholics were about this time enacted in England, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, etc.

<sup>ft320</sup> For the persecutions practiced by the protestants against each other in the Low Countries, see Gerard Brand, *Hist. Reft Pays Bas*. For the persecutions raised against the anabaptists and other dissenters in this country, see Stow, Collier, Neal's *Hist. of Puritans*. For the persecutions exercised by dissenters upon quakers, see Penn's *Life of G. Fox*, who complains that 3,173 friends had suffered imprisonment under the commonwealth; of whom 32 had died of the rigours of their confinement. In New England, four quakers, of whom one was a woman, were actually hanged See also Baxter's *Key to Catholics*, p. 48, and Pref., in which he boasts that his party had the sword to punish heretics. and calls upon the protector, Cromwell, to use it against papists, seekers, and quakers.

<sup>ft321</sup> Heylin's *History of Queen Mary*, p. 61, 62.

<sup>ft322</sup> “The innumerable falsehoods and misrepresentations of this work (new editions of which are annually published, to keep up that spirit which it was first written to produce) have been demonstrated by Alanus Copus, alias Nic. Harpsfield, by F. Parsons, in his *Three Conversions*, and in part by Ant. Wood, Collier, and other learned and candid protestants.”

<sup>ft323</sup> “Ant. Wood says that Foxe has committed many errors by trusting to the relations of poor simple people, and in making such martyrs that were living after the first edition of his book, though afterwards by him excused and omitted. Athen. Oxon. — It is plain, however, that these omissions only regarded such as were actually proved to be then alive by Alanus Copus: as was the case with the musician Marbeck. The same learned antiquary brings numerous proofs of remaining errors, sufficient to invalidate the credit of the whole Martyrology. See the remarkable story of one Grimwood, who was actually present in a church, when the clergyman was describing, on the authority of Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (see p. 2, 100), the circumstances of his supposed miserable and preternatural death, ' his bowels, by the judgment of God, falling out of his body in consequence.' Grimwood, in return, brought an action against the clergyman for defamation. Athen. Oxon. Hen. Morgan.”

ft324 “For example, sir John Oldcastle, sir Henry Acton, John Onley, William Flower, William Gardiner, etc.”

ft325 “For example, Savonarola, Rhedonensis, Thomas Bilney, William Taylor, etc. To these may be added the pretended confessors, Picus Mirandola, Erasmus, etc.”

ft326 “See, at large, The Three Conversions of England, part 3.”

ft327 Eccles. Hist. p. 386.

ft328 Quarterly Review, vol. in. p. 355, (1810.)

I subjoin Milner's account of the dying words of Gardiner: —

“Gardiner,” say Godwin{“In ipsa regia Westmonasterii podagricis doloribus absumptus interiit duodecimo Novembris, 1555. “Nov. 13, Memor. Ecclesiast. Strype, vol. in. p. 229. Decumbentis in lecto cadaver ita putridum foetidumque ante mortem fuit, ut praesentibus nihil molestius ipso odore esse potuit. In ipso mortis momento haec verba ejaculatus est: ' Erravi cum Petro, non flevi cum Petro.’“ — Ita Parke in Antiquit. Britan. p. 511. Godwin, p. 237.} and Parker, “died repeating these words — ' Erravi cum Petro, at non flevi cum Petro.' In the sermon which he preached before the king and queen his words were — 'Negavi cum Petro, exivi cum Petro, sed nondum amare flevi cum Petro.’“ (Dodd.) — Milner's History of Winchester, vol. 1:pp. 355 — 362.

ft329 The reader who may wish to know more of Milner is referred, for his character as an ecclesiastical historian, to the Quarterly Review, vol. 32, p. 90; for his credulity, in the matter of Sister Nativite, to vol. 36, p. 308, etc.; to vol. 25:p. 142, vol. 36, p. 356, and to vol. in. p. 347, for his conduct on the question of the Veto.

ft330 New edit. vol. 8:pp. 630, 631.

ft331 *From 2d Croke's Reports, (temp. James) p.91. In a case of slander (Brooke 5:Montague.)* “Coke [meaning Sir Edward Coke, afterwards lord chief justice] in argument ' cited a case 27th Eliz., where parson Prit, in a sermon recited a story *out of Foxe's Martyrology*, that one Greenwood [so written instead of Grimwood] being a perjured person, and a great persecutor, had great plagues inflicted upon him, and was killed by the hand of God; whereas in truth, he was never so plagued,

and was himself present at that sermon, and he thereupon brought his action on the case, for calling him a perjured person, and the defendant pleaded not guilty;' and this matter being disclosed upon the evidence, Wray, chief justice, delivered his opinion to the jury that it being delivered only as a story and not with a malicious intention, the defendant was not guilty, and so he was found. {This citation of Sir Edward Coke, alludes, as further law authorities, to 14 Hen. 6:14, and 20 Hen. 6:34, but no book of reports is specified as containing these decisions.} Popham, chief justice in the main case, now reporting, affirmed this to be good law, and the decision of the court was governed by it accordingly."

**Ft332** Vol. 1:pp. 377 — 80.

**Ft333** Vol. 8. new edition, pp. 630, 631.

**Ft334** Annals of the Reformation, vol. 1:pp. 378 — 380. Strype spells the name differently from Foxe, — Grimward for Grimwood.

**Ft335** Life of Elizabeth, cap. 21:note, new edit. vol. 8:p. 631.

**Ft336** Strype's Annals of the Reformation, vol. 1:pp. 377, 378.

**ft337** Harl. MSS. No. 416, art. 108, p. 174, and Ash. 73, p. 122. The first reference is to Rushbrooke's letter; the second to Punt's letter.

**ft338** Harpsfield's work is in dialogues.

**ft339** "Id certe diffiteri non possum, si verum sit, quod Foxus scribit, novum nobis nuper Polyo carpum inter istos pseudo-martyres in Anglia emersisse; in quem ant ignis nihil potuit, ant qui, toto corpore in cineres redacto, admirabilius quam Lazarus revixerit. En tibi enim Joannem Marbecum psallentem Vindilesoriae anno Domini 1543, et 28 Julii martyrium in igne alacri' (ut Foxi verbis utar), constantia subeuntem.' At ille adhuc vivit et Vindilesoriae eleganter, ut solet, psallit et organa pulsat. Crit. — 'Torus ad hanc narrationem obstupesco. Et jam habes, vel te ipso iudice, saltem unum martyrum nostrorum miraculum, quod cum praestantissimo, quod unquam vel a Christo vel ab apostolis editum est, contendat.' Irenaeus, — 'Hoe ego tibi non invitus concederem, si modo exustus fuisset; sed neque exustus neque igni unquam admotus fuit.'" — Edition 1566, pp. 962, 963.

- <sup>ft340</sup> New edit. vol. 5:p. 497, 497, and notes. Edit. 1684, vol 2:p. 469, col. 1.
- <sup>Ft341</sup> Harpsfield's book was printed under this reigned name.
- <sup>Ft342</sup> Athen. Oxon. vol. 1:p. 94
- <sup>ft343</sup> Hist. of Winchester, vol. 1:pp. 357. 358, and notes.
- <sup>ft344</sup> Vol. 3. pp. 61-63.
- <sup>Ft345</sup> Vol. 3. p. 288.
- <sup>Ft346</sup> I deem Collier, Fuller, and Mosheim, to be inferior to him. We require, as I have repeatedly said, an edition of Foxe which shall be incorporated with Baronins, Alford, the Centuriators, Fleury, and others.
- <sup>Ft347</sup> Died 1726.
- <sup>Ft348</sup> See Johnson's Life of Congreve.
- <sup>Ft349</sup> The first volume of which was published in folio, 1702, and the second in 1714. A new edition of Collier's work is now being published in London, in nine volumes 8vo.
- <sup>Ft350</sup> I use the word in the sense in which it occurs in Matthew 23:11.
- <sup>Ft351</sup> I write this with the view before me of all the theories of Warburton, Hooker, Coleridge, Gladstone, and the others mentioned by Mr. Gladstone.
- <sup>Ft352</sup> Vol. 1.p. 618, col. 2, folio edition. Vol. 3. p. 262, new ed.
- <sup>Ft353</sup> Vol. 1:p. 624, col. 1; vol. 3. p. 277, new edit.
- <sup>Ft354</sup> Vol. 3. p. 282, new edit.
- <sup>Ft355</sup> Vol. 1:p. 646; vol. in. p. 324, new edit.
- <sup>Ft356</sup> Vol. 1:p. 646.
- <sup>Ft357</sup> Beda, H. E. 11. 2.
- <sup>Ft358</sup> H. E. 1:25.
- <sup>Ft359</sup> H. E. 1:31.
- <sup>Ft360</sup> Collier, vol. 1:p. 66.
- <sup>Ft361</sup> Collier, vol. 1:p. 646; vol. in. pp. 325, 326, new edit.
- <sup>Ft362</sup> New edit. vol. 2:p. 340.

- Ft363** The review of these objections might lead to endless discussions. Collier goes on to accuse both Fuller and Foxe of error, in maintaining that treason and heresy were identified, because the blood was not corrupted as the punishment of both. But Collier quotes only the act of Henry IV. anno 2. See Fuller, Ch. Hist. b. 4:p. 167, and Hume, vol. in. p. 558, both of whom assert the fact.
- Ft364** Collier, vol. 1:p. 661: vol. in. p. 358.
- Ft365** Foxe, vol. 4:new edit. p. 614.
- Ft366** Collier, vol. 2:p. 43; vol. 4:p. 120, new ed.
- Ft367** Collier, vol. 2:p. 45, vol. 4:p. 126, new ed., compared with Foxe, new ed. vol. 4:pp. 616, 620.
- Ft368** Collier, vol. 2:p. 209; vol. 5:p. 154, new ed.
- Ft369** Collier, vol. 2, p. 253; vol. 5:p. 218, new ed, Foxe, vol. 6:p. 433.
- Ft370** Collier, vol. 2:p. 316; vol. 5:p. 453, new ed.
- Ft371** Foxe, vol. 6:p. 294.
- Ft372** Collier, vol. 2:p. 317; vol. 5:p. 454.
- Ft373** Foxe, vol. 6:pp. 293-295.
- Ft374** Collier, vol. 2:p. 362; vol. 6:p. 59.
- Ft375** Foxe, vol. 6:p. 414.
- Ft376** Collier, vol. 2:p. 362; vol. 6:p. 60.
- Ft377** Foxe, vol. 6:p. 414.
- Ft378** Collier, vol. 2:p. 363; vol. 6:p. 60.
- Ft379** Foxe, vol. 6:p. 425.
- Ft380** Collier, vol. 2:p. 374; vol. 6:p. 93.
- Ft381** Foxe, vol. 6:p. 581.
- Ft382** Collier, vol. 2:p. 375; vol. 6:p. 93. Foxe, vol. 6:p. 583.
- Ft383** See the Bullarium Romahum Magnum, passim.
- Ft384** Collier, vol. 2. p. 386; vol. 6. p. 124. Foxe, vol. 7:p. 432.
- Ft385** Collier, vol. 2. p. 501; vol. 6. p. 416.
- Ft386** From 1568 to 1574.

- ft387** See the references which justify my opinion of the character of Parsons in Foulis, Chalmers, and Dodd's Church History. It is customary (see the Quarterly Review), more especially, to speak of Parsons as a profligate hypocrite. I believe him to have been a conscientious traitor.
- ft388** "Accusations of History against the Church of Rome," second edit. p. 285.
- ft389** July 5, 1575.
- ft390** The Christian Directory of Father Parsons, in one closely printed, thick octavo volume, contains as perfect passages of devotion as "the Christian Year."
- ft391** May I subjoin here, for the admiration of the devoted friends of the Anglican protestant church, the beautiful and eloquent prayer which was offered in the royal chapel, and in English churches, when the Armada was preparing: —
- "O Lord God, heavenly Father, the Lord of hosts, without whose providence nothing proceedeth, and without whose mercy nothing is saved; in whose power lie the hearts of princes, and the end of all their actions; have mercy upon thine afflicted church; and especially regard thy servant Elizabeth, our most excellent queen; to whom thy dispersed flock do fly in the anguish of their souls, and in the zeal of thy truth. Behold! how the princes of the nations do band themselves against her, because she laboureth to purge thy sanctuary, and that thy holy church may live in security.
- "Consider, O Lord, how long thy servant hath labored to them for peace: but how proudly they prepare themselves unto battail. Arise therefore, maintain thine own cause; and judge thou between her and her enemies. She seeketh not her own honor, but thine; not the dominions of others, but a just defense of herself: not the shedding of christian blood, but the saving of poor afflicted souls. Come down, therefore, come down, and deliver thy people by her. To vanquish is all one with thee, by few or by many; by want or by wealth; by weakness or by strength. O! possess the hearts of our enemies with a fear of thy servants. The cause is thine; the enemies thine; the afflicted thine; the honor, victory, and triumph shall be thine.

“Consider, Lord, the end of our enterprises. Be present with us in our armies. Terrify the hearts of our enemies, and make a joyful peace for thy Christians.

“And now, since in this extreme necessity, thou hast put into the heart of thy servant, Deborah, to provide strength to withstand the pride of Sisera and his adherents, bless thou all her forces, by sea and land. Grant all her people one heart, one mind, and one strength, to defend her person, her kingdom, and thy true religion. Give unto all her council and captains wisdom, wariness, and courage, that they may speedily prevent the devices, and valiantly withstand the forces, of all our enemies, that the fame of thy gospel may be spread unto the ends of the world. We crave this in thy mercy, O heavenly Father, for the precious death of thy dear Son Jesus Christ. Amen.” — Strype's Annals: Appendix to Book II., No. liv.

May I add, too, the contrast to this prayer; those which were offered to God, and to the Virgin Mary, on board the fleet, for the success of the papal efforts against the heretics of England:—

Litaniae, et preces pro foelici successu classis regis nostri Philippi adversus Angliae hereticos, verae fidei impugnatores. De mandato serenissimi principis cardinalis excudebat Antonius Riberius, 1588.

“Versic. Exurge Domine. — Resp. Et judica causam tuam. Kyrie eleison. Christe, eleison. Kyrie, eleison. Christe, audi nos; Christe, exaudi nos, etc. — Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis. Sancta Dei Genetrix, ora pro nobis. Sancta Virgo Virginum, ora, etc. Sancte Michael, ora. Sancte Gabriel, ora. Sancte Raphael, ora. Omnes Sancti Angeli, et Archangeli Dei, orate pro nobis. Omnes sancti Beatorum Spirituum ordines, orate. Sancte Joannes Baptista, ora pro nobis,” etc.; and then naming each saint distinctly with the petition *Ora*, etc.; and so to the end of that part of their Litany. And then are Proper Psalms appointed for each day in the week, beginning at Sunday; for which is Psalm 3. “Domine, quid multiplicati sunt, qui tribulant me? Multi insurgunt adversum me,” etc.

Then follow certain versicles and responses, and after them some collects composed for the occasion; which were these: —

“Da, quaesumus, ecclesiae tuae, misericors Deus, ut Spiritu Sancto congregata, hostili nullatenus incursione turbetur.

“Concede, nos famulos tuos, quaesumus, Domine Deus, perpetua mentis et corporis sanitate gaudere, et gloriosa Beatae Mariae semper Virginis intercessione, a praesenti libera tristitia, et aeterna perfrui laetitia.

“Ecclesiae tuae, quaesumus, Domine, preces placatus admitte; ut destructis adversitatibus et erroribus universis, segura tibi serviat libertate.

“Deus, omnium fidelium pastor et rector, famulum tuum N — (quem pastorem ecclesiae tuae praeesse voluisti) propitius respice. Da ei, quaesumus, verbo et exemplo quibus praeest proficere; ut ad vitam, una cam grege sibi credito, perveniat sempiternam.

“Quaesumus, Omnipotens Deus, ut famulas tuus Philippus, rex noster (qui tua miseratione suscepit regni gubernacula), virtutum etiam omnium percipiat incrementa. Quibus decenter ornatus, et vitiorum monstra devitare et ad te (qui Via, Veritas, et Vita es) gratus valeat pervenire.

“Deus, qui conteris bella et impugnatores in te sperantium potentia tuae defensionis expugnas; auxiliare famulis tuis implorantibus misericordiam tuam; ut haereticorum et omnium inimicorum suorum feritate depressa, ineffabili te gratiarum actione laudemus.

“Deus noster, refugium et virtus ade [? adesto or attende] piis ecclesiae tuae precibus, Auctor ipse pietatis. Et praesta, ut quod fideliter petimus, efficaciter consequamur.

“Hostiam nostrorum, quaesumus, Domine, elide superbiam, et eorum contumaciam dexterae tuae virtute prosterne.

“Libera, quaesumus, Domine, a peccatis et hostibus tibi famulos supplicantes, ut, in sancta conversatione viventes, nullis afficiantur adversis.

“Protector noster, aspice, Deus, et propugnatores tuos a paganorum et haereticorum defende periculis; ut ab omnibus perturbationibus semoti, liberis tibi mentibus serviant.

“Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, moestorum consolatio, laborantium fortitudo; perveniant ad te preces de quacunque tribulatione clamantium; ut omnes sibi in necessitatibus suis misericordiam tuam gaudeant affuisse. Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

“*Versic.* Exaudiat nos, Omnipotens et Misericors Dominus.

“*Resp.* Et custodiat nos semper.” — See Strype, ut antes, No. 3.

<sup>Ft392</sup> Dodd denies that *Parsons* was the author of this work. It was compiled by cardinal Allen, Inglefield, and other papists. These committed their materials to Parsons, who prepared the book for the press.

<sup>Ft393</sup> See Beda, iii. 25.

<sup>Ft394</sup> See Hist. Eccl. p. 100.

<sup>Ft395</sup> Stevenson's Beda, vol. 1:p. 259.

<sup>Ft396</sup> Parsons, vol. 2:p. 365.

<sup>Ft397</sup> Vol. 1:p. 138, ed. 1684.

<sup>Ft398</sup> Parsons, vol. 2:p. 366.

<sup>Ft399</sup> Vol. 3. p.5.

<sup>ft400</sup> Edit. Goldhagen, 1839.

<sup>Ft401</sup> See also later ion this volume.

<sup>Ft402</sup> In my observations on Harpsfield, I have collated some of these alleged inaccuracies.

<sup>Ft403</sup> Robert. Abbot. Antilog. fol. 14, 2 ap. the Life of Father Parsons, in Foulis's History of Popish Treasons, Let. 10:chap. 1, p. 506.

<sup>Ft404</sup> Vol. 33, pp. 7, 8, 16, 21, 32, etc.

<sup>ft405</sup> Vindieiae Ecclesiastes Anglic. I think.

<sup>Ft406</sup> See Dodd, Chalmers, the references in Foulis, and the Lansdowne MSS. 983, fol. 165.

<sup>Ft407</sup> Bonif. Extrav. lib. 1:Titus I. de Major. et Obedientia.

<sup>Ft408</sup> Milton.

<sup>Ft409</sup> “He was,” says Leland, “Atticae linguae interpres fidelis, disertus, aptus,” etc. etc. up. Dodd, vol. 2:p. 63. Brussels edition, folio. I have not seen the new edition of Dodd.

**Ft410** Dodd, vol. 2:p. 63.

**Ft411** Biog. Dict. vol. 17:p. 158.

**Ft412** “Nicholas Harpsfield,” says Fuller, “bred first in Worcester school, then in New college in Oxford, where he proceeded Doctor of Law, and afterward became archdeacon of Canterbury. Under king Edward VI. he banished himself; under queen Mary he returned, and was advanced; and under queen Elizabeth imprisoned for denying her supremacy. Yet such was his milde usage in restraint, that he had the opportunity to write much therein, and among the rest his Ecclesiastical History, no less learnedly than painfully performed; and abating his partiality to his own interest, well deserving of posterity. He died at London, in prison, after twenty years' restraint, leaving behind him the general reputation of a religious man.” — Fuller's Church History, 16:cent. book 9, p. 143.

**Ft413** Notes of additions and corrections to Mr. A. Wood, in Nicolas Harpsfield, Archdeac. of Cant. deprived, who died in 1583.

1498. 13 Cal Maii. Bulla Alexandri Papae concedens Nicolao Harpsfeld, rectori eecliae Ashrengue Reignesash in dioc. Exon. ut duo alia beneficia quaecumque cum ecclia praedicta tenere possit. (Autogr. penes Decan. et Capit. Cant.)

1554. 31 Martii. Nicolaus Harpsfeld institutus ad archidiaconatum Cant. per destitutionem Edmundi Cranmer, clerici conjugati.

1554. 27 Apr. Nic. Harpsfeld coll. ad preb. de Harleston per deprivationem Johis Hodgskin episc. Bedford; qui denuo restitutus obiit ante 7 Jul. 1560. (Reg. Boner.)

1554. 29 Apr. Nich. Harpsfeld admittus, ad eccl. de Laingdon cum capella de Basildon com. Essex. per deprivat. Johis Hodgskyns, episc. Bed.

1558. 14 Maii. Magr. Johes Harpsfeld, S. T. P. coll. ad eccl. de Laingdon per resign. Nichi. Harpsfeld, LL.D.

1558. 28 Octob., (Reg. Pole 31.) Magr. Nich. Harpsfeld, LL.D factus est officialis curiae Cant. literis Reginaldi Poli, Cant. Arepi, et decanus de Arcubus literis ejusdem sub end. data.

1555. 23 Mail Nic. Harpsfield admiss, ad eccl. de Saltwood vac. per deprivat. Robti Watson, clerici conjugati. 1558. 9 Jan.

1558. 9 Jan. 29. 1 Eliz. At opening of the convocation Nicholas Harpsfield, archdeac, of Cant. chosen a prolocutor. (Parker Synodalia MS.)

11 Feb. 1558-9. A letter from the council to sir Tho. Fynch and George Maye, one of the aldermen of Cant. that where the lords are informed that Dr. Harpsfield, archdeacon of Cant. hath used himself of late very disorderly in stirring the people, as much as in him lyeth, to sedition: and that it is also reported by some of the servants of the college in Christ Ch. Cant. that religion could not nor should not be altered; they are to examine these matters. Nicolaus Harpsfield, clericus, in legibus licentiatus, habet literas reginae Marine de praesentatione ad archidiaconatum Cant. (Rymer 15:381.)

1 R. apud Westmon. 2 Apr. reg. 1, 1554.

1557. 24 Martii. D. Arepus contulit magro Nicho. Harpsfield, LL.D. eccliam de Bishopbourne Cant. dioc. vac. per mort. dni Rici Thornden, nuper episc, suffragan.

1558. 1 Nov. Arepus eontnlit magro Nieho. Harpsfield, LL.D. canonicatum et preb. in ecclia Xti, Cant. quos magister Ricus Parkhurst dudum habuit. (Reg. Pole Cant.) — Lansdowne MS. 982, p. 37.

<sup>Fi414</sup> The title of the book is — “Dialogi Sex contra summi Pontificatus, Monasticae Vitae, Sanctorum, sacrarum Imaginum Oppugnatores, et Pseudo-Martyres: —

“In quibus, praeterquam quod nonnulla, quae alii hactenus vel attigerunt leviter, vel penitus omiserunt, paullo uberius et plenius explicantur; Centuriatorum etiam Magdeburgensium, auctorum Apologiae Anglicanae, pseudo-martyrologorum nostri temporis, maxime vero Johannis Foxi, et aliorum, qui adulterino evangelio nomina dederunt, variae fraudes, putidae calumniae, et insignia in historiis Ecclesiae contaminandis mendacia deteguntur: —

“Nunc primurn ad Dei optimi maximi gloriam et catholicae religionis confirmationem ab *Alano Copo Anglo* editi, cum triplici indice, primo auctorum, altero capitum, tertio rerum et verborum. Psalm 27. 'Unum petii a Domino, hoc requiram, ut inhabitem in domo Domini omnibus

diebus vitae meae; ut videam voluntatem Domini, et vlsitern templum ejus.'

“Antverpiae, ex officina Christophori Plantini. MD LXVI. Cure privilegio.”

ft415 In the beautiful copy of Harpsfield now in my possession, in the handwriting of some former owner, apparently contemporary with the publication of the book, the letters are thus interpreted: — “Auctor hujus libri, Nicolaus Harpsfeldus, episcopus Vintoniensis electus, archidiaconus Cantuariensis.”

ft416 “Salve, mi Foxe,” says Humfrey, “in Christo fratre et Servatore nostro. Alanus Copus quidam Magdalenensis, cum nos Magdalenenses non laccessitus lacerat, tum libro dentato satis, insulso tamen, mortuos iniquissime persequitur. Ille **μαρτυρομαχεσθαι** egregie suis partibus functus est: tuum est nunc vicissim, te praestare **μαρτυρομαρτυρα** et fortem et aculeatum, ne quis deinceps audeat mordere mortuos, et sanctorum cineres turbare. Moverunt et alii hanc Camerinam, cum omnes undique audacter scriptores Martyrologium tuum legendam mendacem, et sterquilinum foetidum appellitent. Sic indies crescunt animi adversariorum; sic ubique saevit per suos satellites Satan; quem o si Christus spuma oris sui tandem aliter conterat. Nostrae res quo in statu sunt, in quo lubricoso et scopuloso loco versantur, non ignoras, audis, vides, ingemiscis: quibus autem modis tantae miseriae sublevari possint, quomodo tot malis salutaris medicina adhiberi queat, — non reperio, non invenio, nescio. Tu si quid nosti, comunica; ne desis causae bonae, officio tuo, laboranti ecelesiae. Si quid Ducis Norfol. literae, opera, gratia, auctoritas, valere possunt, age effice, ut vel scribat ad suos serio et saepe, vel praesens cum aliis instet, urgeat. Miseret me fratrum: aliorum, qui summi et primi esse volunt, pudet.

“Dux, cum essem Norwici, longe et prolixè pollicitus est omnia. Dominus sic illi dux sit, sic regat et flectat alios, ut, congruentibus animis, de studiis in causam honestissimam, sed deploratissimam, incumbant. Ultimum et praestantissimum refugium est ardens ad Deum hominum bonorum comprecatio pro Regina serenissima, pro consiliariis honoratissimis, pro episcopis, pro ecelesia. Tu, mi Foxe, ora, intercede, clama, ac vale in Domino, qui tuos omnes labores sanctificet ac fortunet, uxorem et liberos conservet.

“Angliae, ex aedibus D. Warcoppae piae et lectissimae viduae. Maii 20.  
“T. TOTUS LAURE. HUMFREDUS.”

Harl. MSS. 416, art. 113, fol. 177.

**Ft417** Vol. 1:p. 647; vol. 3. p. 348, new edit.

**Ft418** I select one specimen of the style of Harpsfield. He is railing against Foxe for inserting the names of the victims in a calendar. After saying that no pope, however ambitious, ventured thus to act, nor did ever any one of the heretics themselves arrogate such power, he adds — “Novos enim novus iste papa fastos, novas martyrum apotheoses, et tam admirabiles pro sua amplitudine excogitavit, ut nescias impudentiam et impietatem hominis, an stultitiam magis demireris, edito nuper libro, quem tu degustasse videris, ingenti quadam nugarum, mendaciorum, et blasphemiarum mole onerato, non Latine ut prius, sed Anglice: in quo solo aliquod prudentiae specimen ostendit; Ex eo enim fortassis fiet, ut impietas et stultitia illius minus per reliquum christianum orbem, et in sola fere Anglia, celebretur.” — Page 819.

**Ft419** “Iniqua pseudo-martyrum cum veris martyribus comparatio.” Margin, p. 736.

**Ft420** “Quos rectius diaboli mancipia quam martyres appellaris.”

**Ft421** “Qui nobis non modo teterrimos haereticos, sed et fures, homicidas, atque etiam divinae et humanae majestatis imminutae reos, tautum non pro martyribus adorandos objicit.” — P. 746.

**Ft422** Burnet, tom. 2:p. 248, ap. Rapin, vol. 2:p. 33, note 3.

**Ft423** Harpsfield spells the name of the person of whom he is now speaking, Tonlaeus. I looked in vain for the English name in Foxe's list, which corresponded with this word. It is evident that the word ought therefore to have been written in English, Toniey, or Tunley, or Townley. The word Tonlaeus however is a misprint for Tooleius. Harpsfield is referring to Tooley, who as he justly reports was hanged for theft. This is but a specimen of the vexatious manner in which the reader of the several works which attack John Foxe is baffled, in the attempts to discover the truth of the charges against the martyrologist. The printing of the names both of places and persons appears to have been left to the printers. I subjoin the manner in which some names of the same persons are spelt by Foxe, Parsons and Andrews. It will

enable the reader to judge of the difficulty of always ascertaining who are meant by the references of the three writers.

DATE	FOXES	DATE	PARSONS	DATE	ANDREWS
	Anne Albright, <i>alias</i> Champnes				Anne Allbright
<b>Feb. 3</b>	John Phaidon		John Claidon		John Claydon
<b>4</b>	Richard Turmine		Richard Turmyne		Richard Turmin
<b>27</b>	Robert Farrar			<b>26</b>	Robert Farrer
<b>March 4</b>	John Hougley			<b>5</b>	John Hugleyne
<b>5</b>	Petrus Flestedius	<b>6</b>	Petrus Flessidius		Peter Flessidus
<b>8</b>	Thomas Hilton	<b>9</b>	Thomas Hylton		Thomas Hilton
<b>10</b>	Davy Foster	<b>11</b>	David Foster		Daniel Foster
<b>13</b>	Father Bate				Father Batt
<b>23</b>	Robert Spicer				John Spicer
<b>April 2</b>	Archer and Howkins	<b>1</b>	Archer and Hawkins		N. Archer and N. Hawkins
<b>3</b>	Wrigsham		Wrigsham		N. Wrigsham
<b>7</b>	Jo. Awoke		John Ancock		John Awcock
<b>14</b>	Joan Bech	<b>16</b>	Joane Beach		Joan Beach
<b>15</b>	John Hullier	<b>17</b>	John Hullier		John Hallier
<b>May 16</b>	Elizabeth Thacknel		Elizabeth Thacknell		Elizabeth Thackwell
<b>June 2</b>	Nicholas Belman		Nicholas Beleman		Nicholas Belenian
<b>4</b>	Nicholas Chamberlain	<b>5</b>	Nicholas Chamberlayne		Thomas Chamberlayne
<b>6</b>	John Osward				John Oswald
<b>11</b>	Henry Wyce				Henry Wye
<b>17</b>	John Morice	<b>16</b>	John Morice		John Morris

<b>27</b>	Benden's Wife		Bendon's Wife		Benson's Wife
<b>29</b>	John Loyd				John Floyd
<b>July 1</b>	Henry Voz		Henry Voes		Henry Vose
	John Esch		John Esch		John Eske
<b>7</b>	Jahn Pelley			<b>8</b>	Margery Pulley
<b>11</b>	John Frank				John Frankiske
<b>18</b>	Askine		Atkins		Thomas Askaine
<b>29</b>	Stephen Wight				Stephen Wright
	Robert Willes				Robert Mills
<b>31</b>	Thomas Benbrick		Thomas Benbricke		Thomas Benbraike
<b>Aug. 5</b>	Patrick Patingham				Patrick Packingham
<b>14</b>	Richard Smith		Robert Smith		Richard Smith
<b>25</b>	Elizabeth Folks				Elizabeth Felks
<b>Sept. 2</b>	William Wright				William White
<b>4</b>	Thomas Coo			<b>5</b>	Roger Coo
<b>12</b>	John Goreway				John Gorey
<b>Oct. 17</b>	Robert Pygot		Robert Pyggot		Robert Piggot
<b>22</b>	Gregory Packe				Gregory Parke
<b>Nov. 2</b>	Richard Mekings		Richard Mekings		Richard Mekins
<b>5</b>	Alice Potkins		Alice Potkins		Alice Perkins
<b>21</b>	Elizabeth Driver			<b>22</b>	Alice Driver

<sup>ft424</sup> “Tonlaeus capitali supplicio propter furtum violentum affectus.” P. 747.

<sup>ft425</sup> See Foxe, new edit. vol. 7:p. 92, for the letter and proceedings.

- Ft426** “If master Cope cannot abide the lord Cobham, sir Roger Acton, Brown, and Beverley, who were hanged, as he saith for treason, to have the name of martyrs, then let them bear the name of witness-bearers of the truth, because they were also burned for the testimony of their faith; seeing there is no difference in the said names, all is one to me, by which they are called.” — Vol. 3. p. 385, new edit.
- Ft427** See Foxe, vol. 6:p. 615.
- Ft428** Vol. 1:p: 647, edit. 1684. Vol. 3. p. 348, etc. new edit,
- ft429** P. 351, vol. 3. new edition.
- Ft30** I may observe here that Foxe (p. 384, vol. in. new edit.) informs us that the English translation of his work from the Latin was made by others, while he was employed in preparing fresh materials for new editions. This may account for some errors which Mr. Maitland has pointed out: but as Foxe saw the translations, or at least published new editions, of his work, in which these translations were retained, he is justly to be deemed responsible for every error.
- Ft431** “As in the first beginning and preface of the said book of Acts and Monuments, I so diligently and expressly do warn all men beforehand, first that I make here no calendar purposely of any saints, but a table of good and godly men that suffered for the truth, to show the day and month of their suffering. My words be extant and evident, which are these, ' Neque veto ideo inter divos a me referuntur isti, quod inseruntur in calendarum,' etc.; and declaring afterward, how the same calendar doth stand but instead of a table, my words do follow thus ' Haud Miter calendarum hoc institutum est, nisi ut pro indite duntaxat suum cujusque martyris mensem et annum designante, lectori ad usum atque ad manure serviat.' “ — P. 386, vol. 3.
- Ft432** I am endeavoring to condense the meaning of the long paragraphs of Foxe. He is sometimes very diffuse and verbose.
- Ft433** P. 393, vol. 3.
- Ft434** “Nec mora longa processit, quin statutum publicum per omne regni concilium in publico emanavit edicto, quod omnes Wiclevistae, sicut Dei proditores essent, sic proditores regis, proscriptis bonis, censerentur et regni, duplici poenae dandi, incendio propter Deum, suspensio propter regem,” etc. — P. 396, vol. 3.

**Ft435** “To confirm the said sentence of Thomas Walden, it followeth also in another place of the aforesaid author, tom. 1:lib. 2:’ *De Doctrinali Fidel Ecclesiae Cathol.*’ cap. 46, where he writeth in these words, ‘Et tamen jam cum regnare coepisset illustris rex Henricus V. qui adhuc agit in sceptris, et de eorum perfidia per catholicos bene doctos legem statui fecit, ut ubique per regnum Wiclevist probatus, reus puniretur de crimine laesae majestatis,’ etc. That is, ‘And yet when the noble king Henry V. who as yet doth live and reign, began first to reign, he began to set forth a law, by his learned catholics who were about him, against the falseness of these men; so that whosoever was proved to be a Wicklevist, through the whole realm, should be punished for a traitor,’ etc. what words can you nave, master Cope! more plain than these? or what authority can you require of more, credit, who lived in the same time and both did see and hear of the same things done? “ — P. 396, vol. 3.

**Ft436** “O verus amicus! qua amico illatam injuriam sibi inferri consimiliter arbitratur, praejudicium illi intenturn reputat esse suum, et ad ejus onera conferenda, auxiliationis humeros supponere non veretur,” etc. — P. 397, vol. 3.

**Ft437** “In hoc etiam parlamento nobilitas regia hostes Christi sibi reputans proditores, volens dare intelligere universis quod ipse absque cujuscunq̄ fluctuationis dubio, quamdiu auras hauriret vitales, verus et perfectus christianae fidei aemulator existeret; statuit et decrevit, ut quotquot ipsius sectae, quae dicitur Lollardorum, invenirentur aemuli et fautores, eo facto rei proditorii criminis in majestatem regiam haberentur.” etc. — Pp. 396, 397, vol. 3. new edit.

**Ft438** “Wicleviani veto dicebantur, quicumque id temporis Scripturas Dei sua lingua lectitarent,”

**ft439** For an interesting account of Wyatt, see Ainsworth's work on the Tower.

**Ft440** Especially in p. 749.

**Ft441** 1552.

**Ft442** “Nefaria impietate.” P. 850, edit. 1684.

**Ft443** The book is an honor to the press, in type, clearness, and beauty. It was printed at Antwerp, at the press of Christ. Plantinus.

- Ft444 “Foxus apertissimi mendacii convincitur.” P. 753.
- Ft445 “Dum sacerdos de more hostiam attollebat, spectante populo, caniculum pedibus arreptum supra verticem ad sacramenti contumeliam erigebat.” Pp. 749, 861.
- Ft446 “Christum non esse mundi Redemptorem, Sed futurum mundi deceptorem.”
- Ft447 “Universos qui in nomine Christi crediderunt, in inferno damnatos.” P. 859.
- Ft448 “Habes jam tandem perversa Coubrigii dogmata, quae, cur Foxus reticuerit, veram, ni fallor, causam reddidi. Qui nullo modo ferendus, quod theologis Oxoniensibus, qui tam pie officio functi sunt, tam impie calumniatur, quasi falsis criminibus hominem innocentem circumventum obruerint.” P. 860.
- Ft449 P. 251, vol. 5: new edit.
- Ft450 In the reign of Henry VIII., 1538, who continued in communion with the church of Rome till his death.
- Ft451 P. 251, vol. 5. new edit.
- Ft452 P. 253, vol. 5: new edit.
- Ft453 vide supra.
- Ft454 Vol. 1.p. 797, edit. 1684; and vol. 3. p. 704, of the new edition.
- Ft455 Harpsfield condemns Foxe for calling Onley, “knight.” Foxe confesses he was in error, and calls Onley, “priest,” in the subsequent editions. See p. 705, vol. 3. new edit.
- Ft456 Parsons and Andrews (who wrote but fifteen years ago) gravely repeat the charge.
- Ft457 See Foxe's unanswerable reply to all the nonsense of his accuser. P. 707, vol. 3. new edition.
- Ft458 Second Part of King Henry VI. Act 1: Scene 4.
- Ft459 “Sceleratae historiarum depravationis.” P. 830.
- Ft460 Page 706, vol. 3 new edit.
- Ft461 Mendacia is the word applied by Harpsfield, to describe the supposed errors of Foxe, p. 834.

Ft462 impudens mendacium.

Ft463 Parsons, vol. 4:Dec. 10.

Ft464 Vol. 6:p. 364.

Ft465 The fourth meaning of the word “Legend” in Johnson is — “ an incredible, unauthentic story.”

Ft466 Vol. 2:pp. 8 — 17, edit. 1683; vol. 5:pp. 183-205.

Ft467 See all the depositions in Foxe.

Ft468 Burnet's History of the Reformation, vol. 1:pp. 21, 22. I might quote here Collier, Fuller, Oldmixon, and others, who all designate the death of Hunne murder, and rely upon the evidence of the coroner's inquest. Foxe indeed copies that evidence word for word, and refers to the bishop's registers as authority for the greater part of the story. Burnet and Strype have both attested that his account, when taken from such sources, is not to be doubted.

Ft469 Pages 847-849. By an error of the printer in this sixth dialogue of Harpsfield, Page 847 follows Page 836. The mistake is not rectified throughout the book.

Ft470 Vol. 4:Cal. Dec. 10.

Ft471 Vol. 3. p. 473.

Ft472 I add here Fuller's brief view of the case of Hunne: —

“Richard Hunn, a wealthy citizen of London, imprisoned in Lollards' Towel for maintaining some of Wickliff's opinions, had his neck therein secretly broken. To cover their cruelty, they gave it out that he hanged himself; but the coroner's inquest sitting on him, by necessary presumptions found the impossibility thereof, and gave in their verdict, that the said Hunn was murdered. Insomuch that *Persons* hath nothing to reply, but, that the coroner's inquest were simple men, and suspected to be infected with Wickliffian heresies. But we remit the reader to Mr. Fox for satisfaction in all these things, whose commendable care is such, that he will not *leave an hoof of a martyr behind him*, being very large in the reckoning up of all sufferers in this kind.” — Fuller, book 5:p. (166).

Ft473 “Quisquis,” says Augustine, “non habet caritatem, negat Christum in carne venisse.”

Ft474 De Verbo Dei, lib. 1:cap. 9, p. 33, edit. Ingolst. 1586.

Ft475 De Sanctorum Beatit. p. 1971, same edit.

Ft476 Opp. 5:49, edit. Cleriei.

Ft477 See Le Bas's Wycliffe, p. 309.

Ft478 I write from memory; but if the reader will refer to the accounts, he will find I am generally correct.

Ft479 See the martyrdoms of Spicer, Denny, and Poole.

Ft480 Jactitabant se nullos in igne dolores sensisse.

Ft481 Vol. 3. p. 801, col 1, edit. 1684; vol. 8:p. 628, new edit.

Ft482 “Videor mihi videre Babylonicam hanc turrim per haereticos arroganter constructam, dispersis vanis et insolentibus aedificatoribus, collapsuram,” etc. P. 999. “In catholicae ecclesiae unitate, mi Critobule, vive, vale, flore.” P. 1002.

Ft483

*“So saying, through each thicket dark and dry,  
Like a black mist low creeping, he held on  
His midnight search,” etc. —*

*Paradise Lost, b. 9:line 179, etc.*

ft484 There is a very pretty, or elegant thought in the lines to which I refer. They are printed at the end of Laurence Humfrey's Life of Jewell (4to. London, ap. John Day, 1573). Fortune, nature, grace combined to bestow their various excellences on Jewell. Fortune gave him honors. Nature gave him accomplishments; but these gifts were mortal, and have perished with him in the dust. Grace gave him gifts more excellent, more divine, and with his soul, immortal.

Ft485 See the examination of Thorpe, vol. 1:p. 610, col. 2, ed. 1683; vol. in. p. 269, new edit.

Ft486 I omit the references to Foxe as an undoubted historical authority, which are to be found in Strype (Memorials, vol. in. folio edition), with the testimony of that writer to his accuracy, p. 401; his diligence, p. 458; the citation of Foxe's MSS. pp. 60, 79, 102, 104, 138,259, 273, App. pp. 66, 19, 28, 91, etc.; the specification of his materials, pp. 66,

145, 157; his impartiality, p. 258, etc. Strype's Memorials ought to be in the possession of every student.

Ft487 Vol. 1:p. 143, edit. 1683.

Ft488 Vol. 1 p. 145. col. 1, edit. 1683.

Ft489 Vol. 1:p. 146, edit. 1684.

Ft490 Vol. 1.p. 166, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p. 44, new edit.

Ft491 Vol. 1.p. 181, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p. 78, new edit.

Ft492 Vol. 1:p. 189, edit. 1683.

Ft493 Vol. 1:p. 192, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p. 51, etc. new edit.

Ft494 Vol. 1:p. 211, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p. 150, new edit.

Ft495 I commend to the modern apologists of this sainted traitor, vol. 1:p. 255, col. 1, edit. 1683: vol. 2:pp. 250, etc. new edit.

Ft496 Vol. 1:p. 257, col. 2, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p. 257, new edit.

Ft497 Vol. 1:p. 283, edit. 1683; vol. 2:p.322, new edit.

Ft498 Vol. 1:pp. 287, 887, col. 1:edit. 1683.

Ft499 Vol. 1:pp. 571,563, 531, etc. edit. 1683; vol. 2:pp. 131, 192, 226, etc. new edit.

Ft500 Vol. 2. ed. 1683, in pp. 4 et seq. 212, 217, 225,235, 239, 246, 247, 260, 203, 485, 486; vol. 5:p. 399, new edit.

Ft501 Pp. 22 et seq. 195, etc.; vol. 5:p. 454, etc. new edit.

Ft502 Pp. 497-509, 531,532; vol. 5:pp. 648, 649, etc. new edit.

Ft503 Vol. 2:p. 182, col. 2, ad fin. edit. 1684; vol. 4:p. 560, new edit.

Ft504 Vol. 2:p. 183; vol. 4:p. 561, new edit.

Ft505 Page 184; vol. 4:p. 566, new edit.

Ft506 Page 512, ex regist, et instrumentis a Scotia missis. See also pp. 528, 529; vol. 5:p. 625, new edit.

Ft507 From a MS. in Foxe's own possession.

Ft508 Pages 279, 280; vol. 5:pp. 71-73, new edit.

Ft509 Page 202.; vol. 4:pp. 600-608, new edit.

Ft510 Page 250; vol. 4:p. 706, new edit.

- Ft<sup>511</sup> Page 307; vol. 5:p. 131, etc. new edit.
- Ft<sup>512</sup> Page 315; vol. 5:p. 150, etc. new edit.
- Ft<sup>513</sup> Page 215; vol. 4:p. 628, new edit.
- Ft<sup>514</sup> Page 428; vol. 5:p. 421, new edit.
- Ft<sup>515</sup> Page 393; vol. 5:p. 312, etc. new edit.
- Ft<sup>516</sup> Page 407; vol. 5:p. 340, etc. new edit.
- Ft<sup>517</sup> Pp. 89, 90; vol. 4:pp. 369, 371, new edit.
- Ft<sup>518</sup> Page 185; vol. 4:p. 594, new edit.
- Ft<sup>519</sup> Page 477, col. 1, and p. 476, col. 2.
- Ft<sup>520</sup> Vol. 3. p. 16, edit. 1684; vol. 6:p. 395, new edit.
- Ft<sup>521</sup> Vol. 3. p. 25; vol. 6:p. 414, new edit.
- Ft<sup>522</sup> Vol. 3. p. 33; vol. 6:p. 433. new edit.
- Ft<sup>523</sup> Vol. 3. p. 34; vol. 6:p. 434, new edit.
- Ft<sup>524</sup> Vol. 3. p. 39; vol. 6:p. 445, new edit.
- Ft<sup>525</sup> Vol. 3. p. 55; vol. 6:p. 470, new edit.
- Ft<sup>526</sup> Vol. 3. p. 74; vol. 6:p. 532, new edit.
- Ft<sup>527</sup> Vol. 3. edit. 1683, pp. 86, 87; vol. 6:p. 563, new edit.
- Ft<sup>528</sup> Vol. 3. pp. 89-91; vol. 6:pp. 568-574, new edit.
- Ft<sup>529</sup> Vol. 3. p. 92; vol. 6:p. 577, new edit.
- Ft<sup>530</sup> These are Foxe's words spoken of Rogers; other prisoners also gave their papers. Vol. 3. pp. 98. 103, 107, 110, 111,114, 115; vol. 6:pp. 591 — 636, new edit.
- Ft<sup>531</sup> Foxe. See the beautiful character given of Hooper, p. 120, vol. 3.; vol 6:p. 637, new edit.
- Ft<sup>532</sup> Page 121; vol. 6:p. 640, new edit.
- Ft<sup>533</sup> Page 123; vol. 6:p. 644, new edit.
- Ft<sup>534</sup> Page 129; vol. 6:p. 659, new edit.
- Ft<sup>535</sup> Pages 140, 141; vol. 6:p. 685, new edit.
- Ft<sup>536</sup> Pages 459-499; vol. 7:pp. 681-711, new edit.
- Ft<sup>537</sup> Page 563; vol. 8:p. 91, new edit.

- Ft538 Pages 599-615; vol. 8:p. 171, new edit.
- Ft539 Pages 155, 208; vol. 5:p. 715, new edit.
- Ft540 Page 184, col. 2.
- Ft541 Page 178; vol. 7:p. 26, new edit.
- Ft542 Pages 255-301; vol. 7:pp. 196-268, new edit.
- Ft543 Page 368; vol. 7:p. 424, new edit.
- Ft544 Page 386; vol. 7:p. 473, new edit.
- Ft545 Page 185; vol. 7:p. 39, new edit.
- Ft546 “Seeing,” says Foxe, “we have his own testimony concerning his whole life and doings,” p. 301; vol. 7:p. 287, new edit.
- Ft547 Page 416; vol. 7:p. 540, new edit.
- Ft548 Vol. iii. p. 549; vol. 8:p. 54, new edit.
- Ft549 E.g. pp. 591,629, 637, etc.; vol. 8:p. 159, etc.
- ft550 Page ; vol. 8:p. 315, new edit — Case of Gratwick; and p. 672; vol. 8:p. 334, new edit. — Narrative of the Trouble, etc. of Richard Woodman.
- Ft551 See the case of Ralph Allorton, p. 705; vol. 8:p. 406, new edit.
- Ft552 Strype's Annals, vol. 1:p. 310; Oxford, 1824.
- Ft553 Annals of Elizabeth, p. 558, 8vo. ed.
- Ft554 Fuller's Church History, book 8:p. 16.
- Ft555 Fuller, p. 231, book 5.
- Ft556 Hist. of the Reformation, Preface.
- Ft557 Annals, vol. 1:p. 376.
- Ft558 Strype's Annals, vol. L p. 377. In vol. 2:p. 44, Strype calls Foxe a “grave, learned, and painful divine.”
- Ft559 Oldmixon, History of the Reformation, pp. 336, 337, folio, London 1739.
- Ft560 Lives of Wiclif and Pecock, Preface, p. 13.
- Ft561 Wordsworth's Ecclesiastes Biography, Preface, pp. 21, 22; London, 1818.

- <sup>Ft562</sup> Soames's History of the Reformation, vol. 4:pp. 721, 722; London, 1828.
- <sup>Ft563</sup> Lectures on Modern History. Professor Smythe, vol. 1.p. 252. London, 1840.
- <sup>Ft564</sup> Ibid, vol. 1:p. 263.
- <sup>Ft565</sup> Reminiscences of a Literary Life, by the Revelation Thomas F. Dibdin, D.D. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1836.

### APPENDIX TO THE LIFE OF FOX

- <sup>Ft566</sup> Harl. MSS. 416, art. 99, fol. 158. It must he observed that the letter hears an endorsement in a different hand : — "To my verie good friend Mr. John Foxe in Grub Streete." This endorsement, however, is inconsistent with the contents of the letter.
- <sup>ft567</sup> Chare Thoma.
- <sup>ft568</sup> Garbrand Herks was a native of Holland, and a bookseller, living in St. Mary's parish in Oxford. See Wood's Athenae Oxon. VoL I. p. 241. Ed. 1721. — AUBREY.
- <sup>Ft569</sup> Palmer was a Fellow of Magdalen College, and burnt at Newbury, in the reign of quaeen Mary. — AUBREY.
- <sup>ft570</sup> Over the last clause the following words are written in the MS : — "idque rectissime meo iudicio factum" — and a caret after "Quod." — ED.
- <sup>ft571</sup> Hieronymi Osorii de Justitia: Libri Decem. 4to. Venet. 1564. A copy of this work, which, is not mentioned by Walch, is in the British Museum. The same author also wrote a curious work "in Gualterum Haddonum, magistrum Libeliorum suppUcum apud clarisstream principem Helisabetham Angliae, Francine, et Hiberniae, reginaro, printed at Lisbon, 1567."
- <sup>Ft572</sup> The "Portesse" was the breviary, which contained not only the office of the mass, but all the services except the Form Marriage. See Ellis's "Original Letters," as quoted in Mr. Russel's Notes on Tyndale's Works, p. 496; London 1831. See also infra, p. 303 note (3.) — ED.
- <sup>ft573</sup> "This work, which was composed by Jacobus de Voragine, archbishop of Genoa, is rightly called by Wharton 'an inexhaustible repository of

religious fable;’ and such was the almost sacred light in which it was considered abroad for upwards of two centuries, that the learned Claude d’Espence, in the year 1555, was obliged to make a public recantation for calling it ‘*Legenda Ferrea!*’ The popularity of the work in the fifteenth century is sufficiently attested by the great number of editions of it which were printed in the Latin, Italian, Dutch, German, and French languages. Pawzer enumerates upwards of seventy editions in the first language; eight in the second; fourteen in the third; five in the fourth; and three in the fifth.” Dibdin’s *Typograph. Antiquities*, vol. i. p. 190, upon Caxton’s English edition of 1483. Melchior Canus, bishop of the Canaries, has also spoken very freely of the *Lives of Saints* which were in general circulation in his time (1562); and declares that he could not meet with one collection, which was passable; and with regard to the compiler of the “*Legenda Aurea*,” “wherein,” he writes, “you may read of monsters rather than of true miracles; he who wrote this was a man of a brazen face, and a leaden heart.” “*Loci Theolog.*” lib. 11:cap. 6. p. 267, edit. Venet. 1759; or White’s “*Way to the true Church*,” Section 42, digres. 44, 7, where this testimony, and much more, is quoted to the same effect; Crashaw’s “*Sermon preached at the Crosse*,” (Lond. 1609,) p. 154. — ED.

Ft574 Our author found the advantage afterwards of having anticipated the objections to his *Calendar*: see *infra*, vol. 3 p. 385, etc. — ED.

Ft575 Plutarch. “*de Gloria Athen.*” A Latin version may be seen in Plin. “*Hist. Nat.*” lib. 35 cap. 9; or Section 36. — ED.

Ft576 This address is reprinted from Foxe’s rare and valuable edition of 1563.

Ft577 *Camarina*, a Sicilian lake, drained contrary to the advice of Apollo (as the ancients supposed), whence a pestilence ensued: the lake, however, cannot be drained, as it lies below the level of the sea. Luther makes a similar metaphorical use of *Lerna*, the Grecian lake, *infra*, vol. 4 p. 675, art. 4. “*Camarinam movere*” or “*tentare*,” means to make a hazardous attempt. Foxe uses this phrase in the Latin edition (Bas. 1559), p. 4. “*Ac quoniam sine magna perturbatione videbat tam periculosam Camarinam tentari haud potuisse, nec subito revelli posse, etc.*,” translated *infra* vol. 2 p. 796, “this dangerous meddling could not be attempted or stirred,” etc. — ED.

**Ft578** See *infra*, vol. iii. p. 239, 400. — ED.

**Ft579** Petrus Paulus Vergerius was bishop of Capo d'Istria, and many years a confidential agent of the court of Rome. Being suspected of an inclination towards Lutheranism, he retired to Germany, intending to clear himself from the imputation by writing a book "Against the Apostates of Germany." In prosecuting this intention, his eyes were opened, and he became a zealous protestant. He wrote many treatises against popery, but few are extant, owing to their having been destroyed as much as possible by the church of Rome. He died Oct. 4, 1565. His works were about to be collected and published at Tubingen, but only tom. 1 appeared, in 1563. The treatise alluded to by Foxe is included in that volume, and is intituled "Postremus Catalogus haereticorum [librorum] Romae confiatus 1559, continens alios quatuor Catalogos qui post decennium in Italia, necnon eos omnes qui in Gallia et Flandria post renatum evangelium, fuerunt editi: cum annotationibus Vergerii." His own dedication of it is dated "Tubingae, die 12 Sept. 1559." At p. 266, Vergerio enters on the topic of the persecution of the protestants thus — "Cum 40 fluxerint anni a renovato evangelio, horum regnorum et provinciarum fere omnium patres-familias aut sunt extincti aut oblivioni tradiderunt vestros corruptissimos cultus; successit vero alia aetas, quae longe diversam ac multis magnisque in rebus omnino contrariam doctrinam et disciplinam, hoc est sinceram, hausit." Afterwards, at p. 267, he goes on, "Postremo, quantus est numerus nostra aetate, non modo eorum qui Mortis, Carcerum, atque Triremium, sed etiam qui exiliorum tulerant, et ferunt etiamnum, martyria. Qui jam migrarunt ad Dominum Deum nostrum per vestra, inquam, martyria sunt ferme millia centum; atque hi ipsi sunt de quibus Scriptura ait, Vidi sub ara, etc. (Revelation 6:9, 10.)" Foxe says in the text (supposing the text not corrupt) "forty or an hundred years," apparently doubtful as to the meaning of "aetas"; it seems pretty clear, however, that Vergerio did not intend it to embrace more than the 40 years "a renovato evangelio." — ED.

**Ft580** Vergerio, ut supra. — ED.

**Ft581** Idem. — ED.

**Ft582** Hor. Ep. lib. 1. 18. — ED.

**Ft583** The first edition, London, 1563. — ED.

- Ft584** Orat. 2: pro Roscio, cap. 20. — ED.
- Ft585** Plin. 35:cap. 10.
- Ft586** See *infra*, vol. 2:pp. 455 — 509, 472, and vol. 4:pp. 143, 144.—ED.
- Ft587** “Lightly,” *i.e.* commonly, usually. Todd’s Johnson. See *Infa*, p. 380, note (1). — ED.
- Ft588** Respecting the foregoing worthies, see *infra*, pp. 349 — 353, 363, 364, 376; and vol. 2 p. 30. — ED.
- Ft589** See vol. 5 p. 280. — ED.
- Ft590** Aeneas Sylvius saith, that Matilda made the pope heir of those lands which are called the patrimony of St. Peter. Ex Aventino, lib. 6. See *infra*, vol. 2 116 — 120. — ED.
- Ft591** For more about these worthies see *infra*, pp. 350 — 353, 355, 358, 359, 368; and vol. 2 50 — 54, 62, 65, etc. — ED.
- Ft592** See *infra*, vol. 2 pp. 67, 68. — ED.
- Ft593** This was in the year 1212 — but the bp. of Strasburg was the more immediate executioner: vide “Mutii Chron.” lib. 19 apud “Rerum Germ. Scripp.” tom 2 p. 809. Ratisbonae, 1726. — ED.
- Ft594** The title of this work, which may be seen more at length in “Sagittari Introduct. in Hist. Eccles.” (tom. 2 p. 113, and tom. 1 p. 95,) is “De Germanorum prima origine, moribus, institutis, etc.” Auct. H. Mutio. Basil. 1539. — ED.
- Ft595** Extravagant [Alexandri IV.] cap. “Non sine multa.” [This Extrav. of pope Alexander IV. is given by Bzovius, “Annal. Eccl. post Baron.,” sub an. 1257, Section 5, dated Lateran. III. Cal. Apr. pont. nostri an. 3. See *infra*, vol. 2 p.752. — ED.]
- ft596** Ex Nicol. Eymerico. [Many of the presumed heretics here mentioned find a place in his work entitled “Directorium Inquisitorum Nicolai Eymerici, cum Commentt. Ft. Pegnae:” Romae, 1587. Pp. 248, 254, 265, etc. — ED.]
- ft597** Alb. Crantzii [Saxonia, lib. 8 c. 16.— ED.]
- ft598** He is mentioned in “Genebrard’s Chronology,” p. 670, Edit. 1599. — ED.
- Ft599** By Matthew Paris, p. 876. Edit. 1640. — ED.

- Ft600** Rather “Janduno.” See “Oudin de Script. Eccles.” tom. 3 col. 883.—  
ED.
- Ft601** In Flacius Illyricus, from whom all of the witnesses in this and the next paragraph are borrowed, it is “Eudo.” See “Cat. test. verit.,” col. 1665. Edit. 1608. Foxe himself also reads “Eudo,” infra vol 2 p. 706.—  
ED.
- Ft602** Ex Joan. Aventino, lib. 7. Extravagant. cap. “Licet infra doctrinam.” Ex bullis quibusdam Othonis Episc. Herbipolensis.
- Ft603** Extravagant. Iohan. 22. Ex Joan. Froisard. vol 1 cap. 211.
- Ft604** Ex Trithemio.; Ex bulla Gregorii. cap. 11; Ex Illyrico.
- Ft605** The same person as Rochtaylada, just before mentioned. — ED.
- Ft606** Henricus de Hassia was vice-chancellor of Paris, canon of Worms, and finally professor of theology at Vienna, where he died, from 1384 to 1397. The letter, which appears in vol. 3 p. 189 of the present edition of Foxe, is assigned to him by Fabricius (*Bibliotheca mediae et inf Latinitatis*, tom. 2 p. 219. Edit. Patavii, 1754). — ED.
- Ft607** “Gaspar Bruschius Egranus:” *De omnibus Germaniae Episcopatus Epitomes*, lib. primus. Archiep. Moguntinum comprehendens; 8vo. Norimb. 1549: see a long list of his writings in *Gesneri Bibliotheca*, p. 256, edit. 1583; also *Sagittarii Introd. in Hist. Ecclesiastes* tom. 1 p. 498. — ED.
- Ft608** Dist. 2 Quaest. 1. [John Bacon, alias Baconthorpe, praeceptor to Armachanus, mentioned infra, vol. 2 pp. 749, 782. He wrote, in 1321, “*Commentaria seu Quaestiones in 4 libros Sententiarum*.” (Bale, Cave.) — ED.]
- ft609** The contents of this and the preceding paragraph will be found amplified infra, vol. 2 pp. 301, 349, 350, 509-534, 613-640, 705-711, 727, 752-782. —ED.
- ft610** Thomas Oclefe, the poet, was born 1370, and flourished 1410. He was a pupil of Chaucer, which will account for his espousing Wickliff’s doctrines: see what Foxe says of Chaucer and Gower, vol. 2 p. 357, and vol. 4 248. Foxe mentions Ocliff again infra, vol. 2 p. 791: see note in the Appendix on that passage. — ED.
- Ft611** Stat. in anno 5, Rich. II. A.D. 1382.

- Ft612** Stat. in anno 2, H. IV. cap. 15., A.D. 1401.
- Ft613** Ex literis Archiepisc. Cant. ad Martin. V., A.D. 1422.
- Ft614** See *infra*, vol. 4 p. 257. — ED.
- ft615** The year in which Foxe published his second edition.
- Ft616** See *infra*, vol. 4 p. 262. — ED.
- ft617** This short piece is given as it stands in the third edition of 1570, two or three expressions only being altered according to the first edition of 1563. — ED.
- Ft618** Cicero, “De Natura Deor.” lib. 3 cap. 34. — ED.
- ft619** For particulars upon this, among other schemes, for lessening and keeping down the members of the reformed church in France. see “Hist. Ecclesiastes des Englisches reformees au Royaurae de France.” Anvers, 1580, vol. 2 pp. 1-3; or “Recueil des choses memorables avenues en France sous le regne de Henri II., Charles IX., etc.” p. 148; also Laval’s History of the Reformation in France; book 4 Section 10. — ED.
- Ft620** This freedom from molestation is admitted by all the sects in the church of Rome, including the Jesuits: “thus” (to use Watson’s words) “these great emperor-like Jesuits do speak to her majesty: ‘In the beginning of thy kingdom thou didst deal something more gently with catholics; none were then urged by thee, or pressed either, to thy sect, or to the denial of their faith. All things indeed did seem to proceed in a far milder course: no great complaints were heard of: there were seen no extraordinary contentions or repugnancies; some there were that, to please and gratify you, went to your churches. But when afterwards thou didst begin to wrong them,’ etc. ‘And when was that, our great monseigneurs? Surely whensoever it was (to answer for you) we ourselves—certain catholics of all sorts —were the true causes of it.’” See Watson’s Important Considerations, p. 40, edit. Lond. 1831. — ED.
- Ft621** See *infra*, p. 288 of this volume, note (2). — ED.
- Ft622** Of these forty-two months, and the exposition thereof, read after.
- Ft623** Ex Platina in Vita Gregor. VII. [He thus calls upon the apostolical choir to second his assumptions: “Agite igitur apostolorum sanctissimi

principes, et quod dixi, vestrae, auctoritate interposita, confirmate, ut omnes nunc demum intelligant, si potestis in coelo ligare et solvere; in terra quoque imperia, regna, principatus — et quicquid habere mortales possunt — auferre et dare vos posse,” etc.; fol. 180, edit. Lugduni, 1512. A somewhat different turn is given to this address by the author cited in Bower’s “Lives of the Popes,” (vol. 5 p. 280,) Paulus Bernriedensis. — ED]

Ft624 See *Infra*, pp. 7, 8 of this volume:—ED.

## MATTERS ECCLESIASTICAL

ft625 “Namely” is continually used by Foxe for *especially*. — ED.

Ft626 These observations compose the opening paragraph of the Second Edition of the Acts and Monuments. London: 1570. — ED.

Ft627 Cicero, *De Orator.* lib. 2. c. 15.

Ft628 **See note in the Appendix.** <sup>a1</sup> — ED.

Ft629 **See note in the Appendix.** <sup>a2</sup> — ED.

ft630 Silvester I. was the thirty-second bishop of Rome, and was elected to the pontifical chair in the room of Melchiades, Jan. 31, A.D. 314. In his time were held the famous councils of Aries and Nice. Euseb. *Hist.* lib. 10. c. 5, and Vit. Const. lib. 3. c. 6.

Ft631 “AEquivoce;” that is, in name only, and not in very deed.

Ft632 “Univoce;” that is, both in name and also in definition and effect, agreeing with the name.

Ft633 For an explanation of the logical terms here and elsewhere used, **see the Appendix.** <sup>a4</sup> — ED.

Ft634 **See note (4), p. 4, supra.** <sup>a5</sup> — Ed.

Ft635 Wernerus Rolwink, a monk of the Carthusian order, has reckoned the schisms in the Romish church at twenty-three, and they have been treated, at some length, in “Theodorici a Niem. Pontif. quondam scribae hist. sui temporis libri 3;” Argent. 1609. See also Geddes’ “Tracts,” vol. 3, Lond. 1706; and Bishop Stillingfleet “On the Idolatry practiced in the Church of Rome,” ch. 5. There is a notice of Rolwink in “Oudin. Comment. de scripp. eccles.” tom. 3. col. 2738, and in “Fabricii Biblioth. medii aevi,” vol. 6; and his chronicle is included in

the collection of “Scriptores rerum Germanic.” by Pistorius, as re — EDited by Struvius (Ratisbonae, 1726); tom. 2. p. 393. — ED.

**Ft636 This passage on the sources of revenue to the papal court is taken from a work of Carolus Molinaeus, an eminent French civilian, entitled “Commentarius in Edictum Henrici Secundi, contra parvas datas,” etc., first written in Latin in 1551, and ten years after in French. In fact, the greater part of what Foxe says on the Life, Jurisdiction, and Title of the bishops of Rome has been culled from that work. Collation with the original has detected several blemishes in Foxe’s translation, which have been removed.** <sup>a6</sup> — ED.

**Ft637** “Elective benefices” are explained by Car. Mol. to be those which were not rated in the pope’s books, and whose annual income was between 12 and 24 ducats. — ED.

**Ft638** That is, when the incumbent dies in Rome, or within twenty leagues of it, though it be only by accident that he was there. The pope nominates to all benefices vacant in Curia Romana, excepting those of the neighboring bishoprics. — ED.

**Ft639** Episcopi Nullitenentes, or Portatiles, or Vagantes, were such as had no diocese, but were appointed to extraordinary services. See Ducange’s Glossary, 5 Episcopus.

**Ft640** Nicen. Con. can. 6. Vide infra, p. 31.

**Ft641** Ex Aimonio de gestis Francorum, lib. 5. cap. 33.

**Ft642** Ennead 8. lib. 6.

**Ft643** See Molinaeus, tom. 4. p. 357 — ED.

**Ft644** He took his election from Theodosius, exarch of Ravenna. Vid. Platin. vit. Conon.

**Ft645** “De ordinatione episcopi: nullus invitis detur episcopus; cleri, plebis, et ordinis consensus et desiderium requiratur,” etc. — Rubrica de ordinatione episc. ex Caelestino Papa Dist. 61. Section 13; Dist. 63. cap. 26. “*Cleri.*”

**Ft646** Dist. 63. Section 34, “Sacrorum.” — ED.

**Ft647** Dist. 63. [Section 30. The copy in the “Corpus Juris Canonici” varies a little from that quoted by Foxe. Page 86. Edit. Paris, 1687. — ED.]

- ft648 “Omnes Romani uno consilio, et una concordia, sine aliqua promissione, ad pontificatus ordinem eligerint.” — Dist. 63, cap. “Ego Ludov.”
- Ft649 Dist. 23. cap. 1. “In nomine Domini.”
- Ft650 G. Turonens. in Francorum historia, lib. 10. cap. 18.
- Ft651 [Causa] 16. quaest. 7. cap. [10.] “Omnes Basilicae.”
- Ft652 Can. 6.
- Ft653 Causa 9. quaest. 3. cap. 2. “Per singulas.”
- Ft654 **“Item, exactiones et onera gravissima pecuniarum, per curiam Romanam ecclesiae regni nostri impositas vel imposita (quibus regnum miserabiliter depauperatum existit) sive etiam imponendas vel imponenda levare aut colligi nullatenus volumus: nisi duntaxat pro rationabili, pia et urgentissima causa, vel inevitabili necessitate, ac etiam de expresso, et spontaneo jussu nostro, et ipsius ecclesiae regni nostri,” etc. [More evidence on this particular case may be seen, if desired, in Riveti Jesuita Vap. (Lug. Bat. 1635,) cap. 18. Section 4 and 5. — Ed.]<sup>a12</sup>**
- ft655 Institutiones Canonicae sub Ludovico Pio. [lib. 1. cap. 83, in “Karoli Magni et Ludovici Pii capitula sive leges eccles. ab Ansegiso collectae:” Paris, 1588. — ED.] “Res ecclesiae vota sunt fidelium, pretia peccatorum, et patrimonia pauperum.” [See note in the Appendix. — ED.]
- ft656 “Viros sanctos ecclesiae res non vendicasse ut proprias, sed ut commendatas pauperibus givisse.” Prosper de Vita Contemplativa, lib. 2. cap. 9. — ED.
- Ft657 “Quod habet ecclesia, cum omnibus nihil habentibus habet commune.” — Ibid.
- ft658 Aug. ad Bon. Epist. 185. Section 35. — ED.
- Ft659 As appeareth, Dist. 10. cap. 1 and 2; Dist. 97; [causa] 24, quaest. 3 [cap. 6], “De illicita.”
- Ft660 See Jewel’s “Defence of the Apology,” part 4, chap. 7, div. 3. — ED.
- Ft661 [Decret. Greg. IX lib. 2] De Juramentis calumniae, [‘it. 7.] — ED.
- Ft662 Dist. 97. cap. 1.

- Ft663 Plat. in vita Euge, 2.
- Ft664 “Universos erudit, sive sacerdos sit ille, sive monachus, sive apostolus, ut se principibus subdant.”
- Ft665 “Quicumque autem legibus imperatoris, quae pro Dei veritate feruntur, obtemperare non vult, acquirit grande supplicium.” — Aug, ad Bonifacium. [Epist. 185. Section 8. Edit. Ben. 1688. — ED.]
- ft666 “In hoc enim reges, sicut eis divinitus praecipitur, Deo serviunt in quantum reges sunt, si in suo regno bona jubeant, mala prohibeant, non solum quae pertinent ad humanam societatem, verum etiam quae ad divinam religionem,” etc. — Aug, contra Cresconium, lib. 3. cap. 51.
- Ft667 “Hoc, inquit, officium rex se suscepisse cognoscat, ut sit in regno sicut in corpore anima, et sicut Deus in mundo,” etc. — Thom. Aquinas “de Regim. princip.” lib. 1. cap. 32.
- Ft668 “Dominus meus fuisti, quando adhuc dominus omnium non eras; ecce per me servum ultimum suum et vestrum respondebit Christus,” etc. — Greg, ad Mauric. Aug. lib. 3. Epist. 61.
- Ft669 [Causa] 23. quaest. 5. [cap. 20.] “Principes;” cap. [26.] “Administratores.”
- Ft670 Dist. 97. cap. [1.] “Ecclesiae,” cap. [2.] “Victor.”
- Ft671 Dist. 79. cap. 8. “Si duo.”
- Ft672 Causa 24. q. 3. cap. 6. “De illicita.”
- Ft673 Justinian. Novell. Const. 3. [Corpus Juris Canonici, Paris, 1628, tom. 2. whence the following references have been corrected. — ED.]
- ft674 Ibid. 5.
- Ft675 Ibid. 6.
- Ft676 Ibid. 16.
- Ft677 Ibid. 37.
- Ft678 Ibid. 58.
- Ft679 Ibid. 57.
- Ft680 Ibid. 59.
- ft681 Ibid. 67.
- ft682 Ibid. 83.

- Ft683 Ibid. 137.
- ft684 Foxe (copying Molinaeus) says thirty-*three*; but see “Labbe,” tom. 4. col. 1403, with the title “xxxii. Episcoporum;” anno 511; and the Magdeburg “Centuriators,” (cent. 6. col. 244, edit. Basil. 1624). — ED.
- ft685 A.D. 511. — ED.
- ft686 See Labbe, tom. 7. col. 1231 — 71. — ED.
- ft687 “Rome” (in Foxe’s text) is a mere slip for Roan or Rouen, which is the reading in Molinaeus, who quotes Abbas Urspergensis, a chronicler of the 13th century: but Regino, abbot of Pruyrn, who published his chronicle about A.D. 900, says “Tours.” Also Labbe, Con. General. tom.7. col. 1239, and M. Westmon. p. 153, an. 813. — ED.
- ft688 Ansegis. Capit. lib. 1. cap. 20.
- ft689 Conc. Carthag. 3. c. 47. Labbe places this council under 397; tom. 2. col. 1165. — ED.
- ft690 “Episcopus monemus ut sive per se, sive per vicarios, pabulum verbi divini sedulo populis annuncient; quia, ut ait beatus Gregorius, iram contra se occulti iudicis excitat sacerdos, si sine praedicationis sonitu incedit: et ut ipsi clerum sibi commissum in sobrietate et castitate nutriant: et ut superstitiones quas quibusdam in locis in exequiis mortuorum nonnulli faciunt, eradicent.” Ansegis., Capitul. lib. 1. cap. 82.
- Ft691 Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 109. — ED.
- Ft692 Ex Ansegiso, lib. 1. cap. 87.
- Ft693 Ibid. cap. 89.
- Ft694 Ibid. cap. 19.
- Ft695 Ibid. cap. 84.
- Ft696 Ibid. cap. 120.
- Ft697 Ibid. lib. 1. cap. 101, 107, 159. “De sacra Eccle.”
- Ft698 Justin. in Novel. 17. cap. 7.
- Ft699 “Ut si non frequentius, vel ter, laici homines communicent: nisi forte gravioribus quibusdam criminibus impediuntur.” — Anseg. Capitul. lib. 2. cap. 45. The edition of Paris, 1588, reads, “in anno communicent.” — ED.

- ft700 Ibid. 2. lib. cap. 29.
- ft701 “Ita et nunc suum robur propriumque vigorem obtineat.” — Dist. 10, cap. ult. “Vestram.” Decretum Ivonis Carnotensis, par. 4. cap. 181. [fol. L. edit. Basilleae, 1499. — ED.]
- ft702 Causa 2. quaest. 7. cap. 41. “Nos si incompetenter.” [See also Decretum Ivonis, par. 5. cap. 22. — ED]
- ft703 Ex regist, antiquarum constit, chart, 26.
- ft704 Ex Molinaeo in Commentariis. [Molin. Opera, Par. 1681, tom. 4. pp. 308 — 9, Section 18, 19. Some clauses have here been interchanged, to render the history correct. — ED.]
- ft705 Ex Act. 5. univers, concil. Constantinop. anno 528; [518 in Labbe, tom. 5. col. 151. — ED.]
- ft706 “Summus orbis Pontifex, Stupor mundi.”
- ft707 [Causa] 24. q. 1. cap. [18.] “Loquitur;” Dist. 50. cap. [35.] “De eo tamen.” cap 26. “Absit.” [There is no title of “Papa” given to Cyprian in the first of these references in the edit. of Paris, 1687. — ED.]
- ft708 Greg. Turon. Hist, lib. 2. cap. 27. — ED.
- ft709 Ruffin. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 28. — ED.
- ft710 Ex Epistola Pii II. 301. [See his Epistles, Lugduni, 1505, but in the collected works, (Basil. 1571,) the passage appears in Epist. 288, p. 802. “Ante Concilium Nicaenum, sibi quisque vivebat, et ad Romanam ecclesiam parvus habebatur respectus.” — ED.]
- ft711 Ex Epist. Pii II. 301. See Note (4) p. 39.
- ft712 Ex concil. Nicaen. can. 6, 7. Labbe, Con. Gen. tom. 2. cols. 31 and 327. — ED.
- ft713 Ex 1. concil. Constantinop. can. 3. Labbe, tom. 2. col. 948 — ED.
- ft714 “Τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα τῶν θρόνων, καὶ τῆς τιμῆς.” — Ex concil. Constantinop. 2. cap. 26.
- ft715 “Ἐπισκόπους ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι, μηδὲ συγγέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας.” — Ex concil. Constantinop. I. can. 2. [Labbe, tom. 2. col. 948. — ED.]
- ft716 “Ejusdem meriti et honoris et successores apostolorum.”

ft717 “Ομοταγείς καὶ ἰσοτίμους.”

ft718 “Ὡστε τὸν τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας ἐπίσκοπον μὴ λέγεσθαι ἕξαρὸν τῶν ἱερέων, ἢ ἄκρον ἱερέα, ἢ τοιουτότροπον τι πότε.”  
— Ex concil. Carthag. can. 39. [Labbe, tom. 2. col. 1069. — ED.]

ft719 “Καὶ γὰρ τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς πρεσβυτέρας ῥώμη· διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πρεσβυτέρας ῥώμη· διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἱ πατέρες εἰκότως ἀποδεδωκάσι τὰ πρεσβεῖα.” — Ex concil. Chalcedon. cap. 28. [Act 15. can. 28. p. 330, edit. Binii. 1618, or in Labbe, tom. 4. col. 770. “The modern Romanists do all they can to suppress or baffle this canon. The editors put a note before it that it is not in their Greek MSS.; but that is no wonder, since it has been long the design of their church to conceal this canon; but that such a canon was really made at Chalcedon is apparent, not only from the 16th Action, where it was read at large, and allowed by the whole council, and confirmed by the lay-judges, notwithstanding the opposition of the pope’s legates — but it is also found in all the Greek collectors, cited in Photius’s ‘Nomocanon,’ (written above 900 years ago,) and is also extant in the old Latin interpreter,” etc. See Comber’s “Roman Forgeries in the Councils,” (Lond. 1689,) part 3, p. 109; and Howel’s “View of the Pontificate,” (Lond. 1712.) p. 69. — ED.]

ft720 “Quod excellentia Romani imperii extulit papatum Romani pontificia supra alias ecclesias.” — Ex Gabri. Biel [Gabrielis Biel “Sacri Canonis Missae Expositio,” 4to. Tubingen, 1499, Lectio 23. — ED.]

ft721 “Nicena synodus hoc contulit privilegium Romano pontifici, ut sicut Romanorum rex Augustus prae caeteris appellatur, ita Romanus pontifex prae caeteris episcopis papa vocaretur.” — Ibid.

ft722 Jure, non divino, sed humano.

ft723 “Romanam ecclesiam non a concilio aliquo, sed a divina voce, primatum accepisse.”

ft724 “Quod sit de necessitate salutis ut credatur primatus ecclesiae Rom. et ei subesse.” — Boniface VIII. Extrarag. de majoritat. et obedient. [lib. 1. tit. 8.] “unam.” A more accurate citation of this passage will be: “Porro subesse Romano pontifici omni humanae creaturae declaramus dicimus definimus et pronunciamus esse de necessitate salutis. Datum Laterani, Pontif. nostri anno 8.” See “Corpus Juris Canonici,” tom. 2.

pp. 394, 395. In the life of Boniface, by Rubei, (Romae 1651,) the date is more particular, “14 Cal. Decemb.,” p. 102. This solemn affirmation has received the distinct applause of several eminent writers in the church of Rome, which may be seen in “Barrow on the Pope’s Supremacy,” pp. 8, 9, edit. Oxford, 1836. — ED.

**Ft725** Sext. Decret. lib. 1. de elect, et electi potest, tit. 6, cap. 17, in prooemio glossae.

**Ft726** Ex frat. Barth. et aliis.

**Ft727** [Decretal. Greg. IX. lib. 1.] tit. 7. Section 3. De translat. Episc. “Quanto.”

**Ft728** “Dist. 40, cap. [6] si Papa” [The conclusion of the sentence quoted by Foxe is, “nisi deprehendatur a fide devius,” which, in the present day, might be considered a great omission: but who is to judge *him* from whom there is no appeal? For we read in “Causa 9. quaest. 3, cap. 17,” the following decision, “Cuncta per mundum novit ecclesia, quod sacrosancta Romana ecclesia fas de omnibus habeat judicandi, neque cuiquam de ejus liceat judicare judicio.” A reforming member, however, of the church of Rome, John, bishop of Chiemsee, suffragan to the archbishop of Saltzburg, fully enters into this idea of the errability of a pope, so inconsistent to be held by a Latin priest: “At si papa, suae et fraternae salutis oblitus, tyrannus esse deprehenditur, aut inutilis, et remissus in suis operibus, a bono insuper taciturnus, officit sibi et omnibus: quoniam salus omnium ex ipso dependet, similiter et ejus perversitas in damnationem plurium cedit. Ideo perversus papa sine spe veniae condemnandus est, ut diabolus.” See “Onus Ecclesiae, auctor est Joh. Epis. Chiemensis,” etc. Colon. 1531, cap. 19. Section 4. — ED.]

**ft729** Ex concil. Nicaen. canon.

**Ft730** “Secundum morem antiquum.” Dist. 65, cap. 6. “Mos antiquus.”

**Ft731** Ex concil. Nicaen. canon. 4, 6, 7. Labbe, tom. 2. cols. 30, 31, 1595.

**Ft732** [Most truly so: Blondel considers that the former was written A.D. 780. “Examen Epist. Decretal.” (Genevae, 1635,) p. 144; see also p. 336. — ED.]

**ft733** Dist. 22. cap. 2. “Sacrosancta.”

- Ft734** This was rather a succession of councils, than one continued council. — ED.
- Ft735** Foxe's account of the affair of Apiarius has been made more accurate by a few changes in his text. See Appendix. — ED.
- Ft736** "Ad comitatum," to the imperial court, or camp. — ED.
- Ft737** "Fumosum typhum seculi." [See Labbe, tom. 2. cols. 1589, 1599, 1671, 1676; "Ad rationes Campiani respons. G. Whitakeri." (Lond. 1581) rat. 7, pp. 131, 132; and Bp. Jewel's "Replie to Harding," art. 4, p. 198, edit. 1611. See also Mr. Gibbing's preface to "An exact reprint of the Roman Index Expurgatorius." Dublin, 1837, p. 82. — ED.]
- ft738** "Universalis autem, nec etiam Romanus Pontifex appelletur." — Dist. 99, cap. 3, "Primae sedis epis."
- Ft739** Conc. Milev. II. can. 22, 24. See Labbe, Conc. Gem tom. 2. cols. 1542, 1667. — ED.
- Ft740** "Εἰ μὴ μετὰ ψηφίσματος τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας τοῦ ἰδίου ἐκάστης χώρας ἐπισκόπου· τοῦτ' ἐστὶν, εἰ μὴ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πρωτεύοντος κατεξάιρετον λάβη." — Conc. Car. can. 23. Labbe, 2. cols. 1062, 1171.
- Ft741** "Ὡστε τὸν τῆς πρώτης καθέδρας ἐπίσκοπον μὴ λέγεσθαι ἕξαρχον τῶν ἱερέων, ἢ ἄκρον ἱερέα ἢ τοιοῦτου τι πότε." — Concil. Car. can. 39. Labbe, 2. col. 1070.
- Ft742** Ex Epist. Decret. Anicet. Step. Felicis.
- Ft743** Dist. 80, cap. "Urbes," et "loca," *ibid.* cap. "In illis."
- Ft744** Epist. 3.
- Ft745** ["Jam monuimus saeculo Anacleti Christianam ecclesiam nullos patriarchas agnovisse; idem de primatibus sentiendum. Prima primatum mentio habetur Conc. 2. Carthag. cap. 12. A.D. 390. (Valent. IV. et Neoterio Coss); et Concil. Sardic. cap. 6. num. 347. Erant autem inter Afros primates non soli Carthaginenses episcopi totius Africanæ dioceseos rectores; sed antiquissimi singularum Afric. provinciarum episcopi; sive in metropoli sive alibi sederent. Vide Augustin. Epist. 217 et 261. Patriarchæ nulli nisi inter hæreticos, ad A.D. 380. Hieronymo teste Epist. 54." Which is then quoted with other evidence by Blondel, Examen. Epist. Decret. (Genevæ, 1635), p. 127. — ED.]

- ft746 Cano. Apost. 24. Labbe, tom. 1. col. 29. — ED.
- ft747 “Τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἐκάστου ἔθνους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον.” — Cano. Apost. 33. Labbe, tom. 1. col. 32. — ED.
- ft748 Conc. Ant. Can. 9. Labbe, tom. 2. col. 565. The Greek of the Antiochian canon is also given in the “Cor. Rom.” of the Corpus Jur. Can. Causa 9, quaest. 3, cap. 2, “Per singulas provincias.” — ED.
- ft749 Dist. 99, cap. “Anacletus.”
- ft750 Novella Justiniani 123, cap. 3.
- ft751 See supra p. 27.
- ft752 “Οἱ τίνες ὑπὸ τὸν μακαριώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως καὶ πατριάρχην εἰσίν.” Novel. Justin. 123, cap. 9.
- ft753 “Εἰῖπερ ἐπίσκοπος εἶη ὁ κατηγορούμενος, τὸν τούτου μητροπολίτην ἐξετάζειν τὰ λεγόμενα, εἰ δε μητροπολίτης εἶη, τὸν μακαριώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον, ὑφ’ ὃν τελεῖ.” Novell. 137. cap 5.
- ft754 “Εἰ δὲ καὶ παρὰ κληρικοῦ, ἢ ἄλλου οἰουδήποτε προσέλευσις κατὰ ἐπίσκοπον γένηται, πρῶτον ὁ μητροπολίτης τὸ πρᾶγμα διακρινέτω, καὶ εἰ τίς τοῖς κεκριμένοις ἀντεῖποι, ἐπὶ τὸν μακαριώτατον ἀρχιεπίσκοπον καὶ πατριάρχην τῆς διοικήσεως ἐκείνης ἀναφερέσθω τὸ πρᾶγμα,” etc. Novell. 123. cap. 22. See Appendix.
- ft755 “In illis autem civitatibus,” etc. Labbe, tom 1, col. 91. — ED.
- ft756 Art. 4, “Provinciae,” dist. 99, cap. “Nulli Archiepiscop.” [Anicetus is the bishop referred to in the Corpus Juris Canonici; but see Blondel (ut supra) pp. 15, 126, 202. Labbe, tom. 1. cols. 524, 528, 581. — ED ]
- ft757 Art. 6. [Epist. 2. See Labbe, tom. 1. col. 734, and Blondel, p. 336. — ED.]
- ft758 Art. 12. Labbe, tom. 2. col. 852. — ED.
- ft759 Dist. 38, cap. 6, “Omnes.”
- ft760 “De pontificibus in summo sacerdotio constitutis.” Ex Concil. Agathensi, can. 6. Labbe, tom. 4. col. 1383. Causa 12, q. 3, cap. 3, “Pontifices.” — ED.

- Ft761** “Deus ergo, fratres, qui praeordinavit vos, et omnes qui summo sacerdotio funguntur,” etc. Causa 3, q. 1, cap. 6, “Deus ergo.”
- Ft762** Ex Anaclet. Epist. prim. Labbe, tom. 1. col. 521. Causa 2, q. 7, cap. 15, “Accusatio.” — ED.
- Ft763** Dist. 61, cap. 4, “Miserum.”
- Ft764** Dist. 59, cap. 1.
- Ft765** Ex Urban I. dist. 59, cap. 2, “Si officia.” [This chapter should be attributed to Zosimus, not to Urban. See Rom. Corr. in loc. — ED.]
- ft766** Ex Erasm. epist lib. 3. epist. 1, art. 73, [p. 119, Edit. 1540. — ED.]
- ft767** Ex quinta synodo universali, actione prima, cap. “Post consulatum.” [Foxe erroneously calls this the 5th General Council, which was indeed held at Constantinople, but not till A.D. 553, under the patriarch Eutychius; and he does not properly distinguish between John II. and John IV. his text has, accordingly, been somewhat altered here. In Labbe’s Concil. General. tom. 5. col 50, actio. 2, Menna is spoken of as *ἀγιωτάτου καὶ μακαριωτατου ἀρχιεπισκόπου καὶ οἴκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου*; see also cols. 71, 81, 89, 97, 253. — ED.]
- ft768** Labbe, ut supra, actio 5, cols. 157, 161, 180, 185. John II. was patriarch A.D. 517 — 520, Menna A.D. 536 — 552, John IV. A.D. 582 — 595. L’Art de Verif. des Dates. — ED.
- Ft769** Ex Pelagio, epist. 8. [apud Blondel examen, p. 638;] dist. 99, cap. 4, “Nullus.” Labbe, tom.5. col. 948.
- Ft770** Ex Antonino, tit. 12. cap. 3. Section 13. Labbe, tom. 5. cols. 1184, 1185, 1269, 1273,1275,1276. — ED.
- Ft771** “Neque enim quisquam nostrum se episcopum episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico more ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit,” etc. De Baptismo contra Donat. lib. 2. cap. 2. Section 3. — ED.
- Ft772** Epist. 301. [See supra, p. 27, Note (5) — ED.]
- ft773** See note in the Appendix on Page 31.
- Ft774** Illyricus, Tractatus “Contra Primatum Petri et Papae,” cap. 6. — ED.’

- Ft775** Ex Antonino, tit. 12, capitul. 3. Section 3, 13. See also Labbe, tom. 5. col. 1184. — ED.
- Ft776** Dist. 99, cap. “Ecce.” [Epist. 30. S. Gregorii, in tom. 2. p. 290 of “Epist. Decret. Romae, 1591.” See also Labbe, tom. 5. col. 1305. — ED.]
- ft777** “Sed negari ibi aliquem posse esse universalem episcopum, sub eo sensu duntaxat, quod esset cujusque ecclesiae proprius rector, ita quod nullus alius esset episcopus,” etc.
- ft778** Foxe says by mistake, “the council of Calcedon and the emperor Justinian,” with neither of which was John IV. contemporary. — ED.
- Ft779** Anton. Tit. 12, capitul. 3, Section 13.
- Ft780** “Qui enim indignum te esse fatebaris, ut episcopus dici debuisses, ad hoc quandoque perductus es, ut despectis fratribus episcopus appetas solus vocari.” Labbe, tom. 5. col. 1191. — ED.
- Ft781** A.D. 451. See Labbe, tom. 5. col. 1192. — ED.
- Ft782** Pelag. II. epist. 8. [apud Blondel examen. Epist. Decret. p. 639.]
- ft783** “Quia videlicet si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen caeteris derogatur, sed absit hoc,” etc. Ex Epist. Greg. 36. lib. 4. [The same Epistle as is quoted supra p. 40. — ED.]
- ft784** “Ut et nulli subesse, et solus omnibus praeesse videretur.” Ex Epist. Greg. 38, lib. 4.
- Ft785** The second untruth is specified in p. 48 infra. — ED.
- Ft786** “Non dominantes in clerum.” 1 Pet.
- Ft787** “Vos autem non sic.” Luke 22.
- Ft788** Vide Baldum, Consi. 169, lib. 3. secundum novam impressionem; et secundum veterem Consi. 359, lib. 1.
- Ft789** Aug. in Praef. Psal. 103.
- Ft790** Chrysost. lib. 2. “De Sacerd.” [p. 454, tom. 1. Edit. Paris, 1834. — ED.]
- ft791** In Johan. Tract. 124, Prefat. in Psal. 108.
- Ft792** De Trinitate, lib. 6. [Bas. 1550, pp. 102, 103. — ED.]
- ft793** “Omnes apostolorum successores sunt,” etc. Epist. ad Evagrium.

- Ft794** Orosius; Tertul. lib. de Praescript. advers. Haeres.; Cypr. lib. 1. epist. 3; Hier. in Catal. et epist. 42.
- Ft795** Canon, Apo. 13. 14.34; Con. Nicae. can. 15; Con. Antioch. cap. 3. 13. Labbe, tom. 1. cols. 28, 32; tom. 2. cols. 36, 564. — ED.
- Ft796** The first untruth was stated supra p. 43. — ED.
- Ft797** Irenaeus, lib. 3. cap. 3; Amb. de Vocatione Gentium, lib. 2. cap. 16; [This work is now ascribed to Prosper, and is printed in his name. Cave, Hist. Lit. A passage to our purpose is in Ambrose, Epistol. Classis I. Ep. 11. Section 4. See also Rivet. Crit. Sac. lib.3. cap. 17. — ED.] Aug. Epist.162.
- ft798** “Non sic,” saith Christ: “Quod sic,” saith the pope.
- Ft799** “Ordo est parium dispariumque rerum sua cuique loca tribuens dispositio.” [Lib. 19. “De Civit. Dei,” cap. 13. — ED.]
- ft800** See Ruffinus’ Version of the Nicene Canons, given in note on p. 31 in the Appendix; also Beveregii, Annotat. p. 51, tom. 2. “Pandectae canonum.” Oxon, 1672. — ED.
- Ft801** “Ne dum privatim aliquod daretur uni, honore debito sacerdotes privarentur universi.” Ex Registro Greg. lib. 4. epist. 32. [See supra, p. 39. — ED.]
- ft802** “Ne sibi debitum subtrahat, cum alteri honorem offert indebitum.” Ex Epist. 8. Pelagii II. dist. 99. cap. “Nullus.”
- Ft803** “Quia si summus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen caeteris derogatur.” Ibid.
- ft804** Διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην. Ex Concil. Chalced. cap. 28. [Labbe, Conc. Gen. tom. 4. col. 769. — ED.]
- ft805** This “First” answers to “Secondly” in next page. — ED.
- Ft806** See note Page 8 of this volume. — ED.
- Ft807** See footnote (2) last page. — ED.
- Ft808** Codex Justin. lib. 1. tit. 1. “De summa trinitate et fide cath.” [Corpus Juris Civilis, Par. 1628. tom. 2. col. 12; Labbe, Conc. Gen. tom. 4. col. 1743, 1745. This letter appears to be forged. — ED.]
- ft809** In Praef. in 4. Evang. Item Ep. 42. tom. 1. Item Ep. 41. tom. 2.
- Ft810** Epist. 66, tom. 3. fol. 209. Edit. Paris, 1529. — ED.

- Ft811** Ad Bonif. contra duas Epist. Pelag. lib. 1. cap. 1. Item lib. 2. De Bapt. cap. 1.
- Ft812** Epist. commentar, in Pauli Ep. praefixa.
- Ft813** Epist. ad Innocentium, tom. 10.
- Ft814** “*Princeps* Latinis est idem ac primus; qua de re mox. Apud interpretes Graecorum patrum observavi hanc vocem persaepe esse positam pro Graeca ἀρχηγός; quae ductorem ordinis designat, non monarcham: sic quod dixerat de Petro Hieronymus in Catalogo, *princeps apostolorum*, recte verum est a Sophronio, ἀρχηγός τῶν Ἀποστόλων: vel pro κορυφαίος id est, *proesultor in choro*: vel alia simili, quae dominationis nullam significationem continet: quam hodie in vote *Princeps* inesse volunt ex homonymia ejus vocis mox explicanda. Meminerit igitur lector, cum apud Graecorum patrum interpretes, Chrysostomi, Cyrilli, Eusebii, Hippolyti, aliorum, occurrit ea dictio Petro attributa, in Graeco textu ejusmodi nomen extare, quod sine ulla ambiguitate primum in ordine significet, non eum qui caeteris dominetur. Exemplum unum afferam insigne. Eusebius Hist. lib. 2. cap. 14. Petrum appellat τὸν τῶν λοιπῶν ἀπάντων προήγορον, ad verbum, *reliquorum omnium prolocutorem*. Ruffinus haec verba sic vertit: *primorum principem Petrum*; ineptissime, unde enim illud *primorum*? in Graeco nihil ejusmodi: deinde προήγορος, non est *princeps*; quod verbi apud Ruffinum si accipias pro dominatore, falsissimam Eusebio sententiam affinges: si pro primo, mentem illius ex altera tantum parte expresseris: nam προήγορος non est primus simpliciter; sed *primus locutor*; itaque absurdissima est Ruffini versio: nec multo melior aut fidelior *Christophorsoniana, reliquorum omnium apostolorum facile principem*.” Casaubon, “*Exerc. 15 ad Annal. Eccles. Baronii*,” p. 268. edit. Francof. 1615 — ED.
- Ft815** Lib. 1. Offic. [Rather “*Principe hujus memoriae philosophorum*.” De Officiis, lib. 3. cap. 2. See also “*De Natura Deorum*,” lib. 2. Section 66. “*Socrates princeps philosophorum*.” — ED.]
- ft816** Taken apparently from Illyricus, “*Cat. Test.*” Goul. col. 271, whence Foxe’s text has been in several places improved. — ED.
- Ft817** Euseb. lib. 10. cap. 5.
- Ft818** See note in Appendix on Page 31.— ED.

- Ft<sup>819</sup> Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 15; Sozom. lib. 3. cap. 8.
- Ft<sup>820</sup> Lib. 10. Epist. 78. Ambros. ad Theophilum.
- Ft<sup>821</sup> Socrat. lib. 4. cap. 37.
- Ft<sup>822</sup> Sozom. lib. 6. cap. 22.
- Ft<sup>823</sup> Athanas. Apol. 2.
- Ft<sup>824</sup> Socrat. lib. 2. cap. 24.
- Ft<sup>825</sup> Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 4.
- Ft<sup>826</sup> Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 23.
- Ft<sup>827</sup> If any one cares to examine into this well-grounded suspicion of these letters being “forged,” he may consult Blondel’s “Examen Epist. Decretal.” pp. 430 — 433, etc. — ED.
- Ft<sup>828</sup> Theodoret. lib. 5. cap. 9, 10.
- Ft<sup>829</sup> “Arma militiae nostrae non sunt carnalia, sed spiritualia,” etc. 2 Corinthians 10:4; Ephesians 6:12.
- Ft<sup>830</sup> The majesty, which attached to this rank formerly, is thus spoken of by an Italian writer, and we quote it the more readily, as the existence of such pretensions and ideas is not, we imagine, much known in England; nor, we may add, much believed: — “Tanta est hujus dignitatis majestas, ut non cardinalis solum, velut sacrosanctus, *absque sacrilegii culpa, tangi non possit*, verum nec ille, qui ad capitale supplicium ducitur, si cardinali obviam factus, ejusque pileum aut vestem attigerit, (teste Baldo, quem alii, Barbatio et Albano testibus, communiter sequuntur) occidi nequeat.” — Anast. Germonii de Sacrorum immunitatibus; lib. 3. cap. 6. de Cardinalibus in Oper. Romae, 1623. Nor were the privileges of the vestal virgins less in *Pagan Rome*; nay, a greater benefit was apparently derived by a criminal in meeting a vestal virgin, than in the other case of a cardinal: *ῥαβδουχοῦνται δὲ προϊοῦσαι (αἱ παρθένοι), καὶ ἀγομένῳ τινὶ πρὸς θάνατον αὐτοματως συντύχωσιν, οὐκ ἀναιρεῖται.* “Plutarch. Vit. Numae,” Section 10. — ED.
- Ft<sup>831</sup> “Must,” sweet wine, fresh from the grapes. Perhaps it is in reference to the idea of freshness, that Foxe uses the term “verdour,” which otherwise might be thought a slip for “odour.” — ED.

Ft832 “Colligimus enim justificari hominem per fidem sine operibus legis.” Romans 3:28.

Ft833 “Sine operibus;” “absque operibus legis;” “non ex operibus, Dei donum est;” “secundum misericordiam;” “non ex operibus, ne quis gloriatur.” Ephesians 2. “Non ex operibus justitiae quae fecimus nos, sed secundum propositum suum et gratiam,” etc. Titus 3:5. “Non secundum opera nostra,” etc. 2 Timothy 1:9. “Non justificatur homo ex operibus,” etc. Galatians 2:16. “Ei qui non operatur, credenti autem in eum qui justificat impium, fides imputatur ad justiciam,” etc. Romans 4:5.

Ft834 Such characters, as are here alluded to by Foxe, are not necessarily to be estimated according to the qualities for which their professed followers and eulogizers have most eagerly desired to honor them, and for which they have been most celebrated. The fictions of Romish hagiographers are quite notorious. Some Protestant writers have proposed to set aside all the peculiarities, miracles, and extravagances attributed to the heroes and founders of the various Romish orders, and have then claimed for them our approbation, or at least an absence of blame. ‘Let the Francises, the Anthonies, and the Dominics’ (say they) ‘be stripped of their variegated fooleries and juggleties, *then* they become such as in all probability they were, — reasonable men, and still very praiseworthy characters.’ We may charitably hope that this was the case with many of them. Protestants may then easily praise what they have themselves first purified, and helped to render respectable. But their professed admirers and followers, we apprehend, would then find nothing very attractive in them, and would strongly object to this mode of dealing with them: as it is *these very peculiarities* in their founders, which form the great boast of the different orders, and the ground for inducing persons to enter them. For an examination into the biographical representations of three eminent *canonized* Romish captains, we may refer to Zimmerman’s “De miraculis, quae Pythagorae, Apol. Tyan., Francisco Assis., Dominico, et Ignatio Loyolae, tribuuntur, libellus;” Duaci. 1734; and to “Ordres Monastiques — histoire extraite de tousles auteurs qui ont conserves ce qu’il y a de plus curicux dans chaque ordre;” 6 vols. Berlin, 1751.

The fourth chapter in Bishop Stillingfleet, “On the Idolatry practiced in the Church of Rome” will repay consultation. — ED.

**Ft835** “Qui de evangelio Christi faciunt hominis evangelium, vel quod pejus est, diaboli,” etc. Hierom. in Epist. ad Galatians cap. 1.

**Ft836** “Fides illa qua quis firmiter credit, et certo statuit propter Christum sibi remissa esse peccata, seseque possessurum vitam aeternam, non fides est, sed temeritas; non Spiritus sancti persuasio sed humanae audaciae praesumptio.” Ex Lindano, in epitome doctrinae evangelicae. [The passage will be found in a small collection, entitled “De M. Lutheri et aliorum sectariorum doctrinate varietate opuscula,” etc. (Colon. 1579,) p. 277. — ED.]

**ft837** Hosius in 2. tom. Confessionis, cap. 1.

**Ft838** Tho. Aquin.; Hosius in 2. tom. Confessionis, cap. 1.

**Ft839** Τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς. Romans 8:6.

**Ft840** “Salva omnes qui te glorificant.”

**Ft841** See vol. 6. p. 381. — ED.

**Ft842** It will be remembered that Transubstantiation was no point of faith till the Council of Lateran, in 1215. — ED.

**Ft843** See vol. 2. p. 13 (note 1), and p. 645; also Bp. Hall, “Honour of the Married Clergy,” b. 1 Section 2; b. 3. Section 3. — ED.

**Ft844** A “trental,” *trigintal*, or *tricennial*, was a service of thirty masses, rehearsed for thirty days successively, after the death of the party. It takes its name from the Italian “*trenta*,” *thirty*. See Du Cange in 5. “*Trentale*;” and Mr. Russell’s note, from which the above is extracted, vol. 1, Page 553 of the “Works of the English Reformers; Tyndale and Frith:” London. 1831. — ED.

**Ft845** Ex Thom. Moro et allis.

## BOOK 1

**ft846** Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 1.

**Ft847** Euseb. lib. 2. cap. 2: who quotes Tertul. Apol. cap. 5.

- Ft848** Suetonius says “Nepotes.” They were the sons of Germanicus, who was Tiberius’s adopted son. “Nephew” is often, in Old English, used for “grandson.” See Nares’s Glossary. — ED.
- Ft849** Suetonius in *Vita Tiberii*, cap. 61. — ED.
- Ft850** Ex Suet. in *Vita Tiberii*, cap. 50, 51, 54, 55, 61.
- Ft851** Rather “in whose reign.” — ED.
- Ft852** Foxe says “Lyons;” on what authority, does not appear. — ED.
- Ft853** Pilate was accused to Vitellius, governor of Syria, for cruelty to the Samaritans: in consequence of which he was sent to Rome, to answer for his conduct there: but Tiberius died just before he got there. So far Josephus, *Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 4. Section 1, 2.* Eusebius states (*Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 7.*), that he fell into great troubles in Caligula’s reign, and that he died in despair, by his own hands, but without mentioning where: in his *Chron.* he places this event under the third year of Caligula. Baronius, in his *Annals*, records the death of Pilate under the same year, and adds, on the authority of Ado, archbishop of Vienne in Dauphiny in the ninth century, that he died at Vienne. M. Tillemont (*L’Histoire des Empereurs, Ven. 1732, tom. 1. p. 432*) follows this authority, and refers us for Ado’s words to *Bibl. Patrum, tom. 7. p. 338.* — ED.
- Ft854** Joseph. *Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 6.*
- Ft855** Suet. in *Vita Tiberii*, cap. 42. — ED.
- Ft856** From the death of Augustus, August 19th, A.D. 14, Tiberius reigned 22 yrs. 6 m. 26 d. — ED.
- Ft857** Joseph. *Antiq. lib. 18. cap. 7, and Bell. lib. 2. cap. 9.* — ED.
- Ft858** Vid. Suet. in *Calig.* Section 49; also Gotfrid. *Viterbiens. part 15, apud Rerum Germanicarum Scripp tom. 2. p. 253, Ratisbonae, 1726.* — ED.
- Ft859** Suet. in *Vita Claudii. cap. 29* says, 35 senators and more than 300 knights. — ED.
- Ft860** Sueton. in *Vita Neronis*, cap. 32. — ED.
- Ft861** St. Paul is supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom in the year 65; by others in 67. St. Peter obtained a similar honor in 66 or 67.

Several of Foxe's dates hereabouts have been corrected from L'Art de Ver. des Dates. — ED.

- Ft862** The dates in this Historical Summary are taken from L'Art de Verifier des Dates. — ED.
- Ft863** More commonly called Caracalla, sometimes Antoninus. — ED.
- Ft864** So says Eusebius in his Chronicon and (though more doubtfully) in his History, lib. 6. cap. 35. Elsewhere, with most of the ancients, he represents Constantine as the first christian emperor. It is doubtful whether Philip was a Christian at all. — ED.
- Ft865** Ex libro "Historiae Ecclesiasticae quam Tripartitam vocant: ex tribus Graecis auctoribus, Sozomeno, Socrate, et Theodorito," etc. [compiled and published by Cassiodorus, about A.D. 550, and extending from Constantine to Theodosius II. inclusive: it relates the death of Julian the Apostate, A.D. 363, in lib. 6. cap. 47, and the burning of Valens, A.D. 378, in lib. 8. cap. 15. It was published at Basil in 1539, with abridgements of Eusebius and Nicephorus, in a volume intituled "Scriptores Ecclesiastici:" Foxe may have used that volume in making this summary, for at p. 606 will be found the story of Basiliscus and Zeno, from Nicephorus; and most of the rest may be found in the selection of Eusebius. Basiliscus was deposed A.D. 477. — ED ]
- ft866** Hist. Eccle. lib. 2. cap. 9. ex Clement septima Hypotyposeon.
- Ft867** This is occasionally rather indifferent ground to found any assertion upon, as the book of Dorotheus is thus characterised by Miraeus: "Sub nomine Dorothei Tyrii in Biblioth. vet. Patrum extat 'Synopsis de vita et morte Apostolorum, Prophetarum ac Discipulorum Christi,' quae plena est fabulis; ut Molanus, Baronius, Bellarminus et alii observarunt." De Script. Illust. p. 5. Rivet confirms this by several instances, and is surprised, consequently, that Bellarmine (de Pontif. Rom. lib. 2. cap. 4) should attempt, as he does, to support St. Peter's Roman episcopate from such a source. "Dorotheus Presbyter passus est sub *Juliano* circa 363. Episcopum fuisse existimavit *Sixtus Senensis*, qui biblioth. lib. 4, ascribit eidem synopsis univ. Scripturae sanctae, in qua omnium librorum utriusque Testam. argumenta complexus est. Hanc interpretatus est *Wolf. Musculus*, et excudit Frobenius Basileae 1557 inter Eccles. Historiae auctores." "Crit. sac."

lib. 3. cap. 13. There is a translation of Dorotheus in Hammer's Eusebius, and his testimony in the present case seems to be admitted; see "Martyrolog. Rom. a Baronio," Jan. 10. — ED.

**Ft868** "Erroris arguitur et Dorotheus, dum in Synopsi hunc non Beroensem sed Bostrensem fuisse Episc. scribit." Martyrol. Rom. auct. a Baronio, p. 173. Antv. 1579. — ED.

**Ft869** Ex Dorotheo in Synops.

**Ft870** Vide Appendix I. to Hieron. lib. de viris illustribus, p. 225 in the Biblioth. Eccles. of Fabricius, Hamb. 1718. — ED.

**Ft871** See Fabricii "Codex Apocryphus N. T." p. 689, edit. Hamb. 1719; and, with regard to the popular idea of his having been the apostle of India, Witsii "Miscellanea Sacra," tom. 2. p. 352; or Hough's "History of Christianity in India," vol. 1. — ED.

**Ft872** See the Magdeburg centuriators (cent. 1. lib. 2. col. 445, edit. 1624,) who, noting down this and other statements respecting Thomas, then remark, "sed certioribus testibus ista omnia destituuntur." — ED.

**Ft873** Foxe here confounds Thaddaeus, the apostle, with another Thaddaeus, one of the seventy disciples according to Eusebius, who (Hist. lib. 1. cap. 13; lib. 2. cap. 1) relates, from the Acts of the Edessene Church, Thaddaeus's proceedings, and his planting that church under the favorable auspices of Abgarus the king. He died in peace at Berytus (hod. Beirut). He is commemorated as the Apostle of Edessa by the Greeks, in the Menaea, August 21st. See Baron. Martyrol., and Alban Butler, at October 28th. — ED.

**Ft874** The assertions of Abdias are not considered to be well founded: vide Cent. Magdeburg. cent. 1. lib. 2. col. 449. See also Abdiae hist. certam. Apost. lib. 6. Section 20. Fabricius, who has reprinted Abdias in his "Codex Apocryphus Nov. Test." remarks (p. 630, edit. 1719,) with regard to the alleged *place* of martyrdom, "de civitate Persidis, cui nomen *Suanir*, altum apud veteres silentium." Alban Butler thinks they were the Suani in Colchis, a dependency of Persia. — Foxe has confounded Simon Cananeus or Zelotes (for they were the same, see Matthew 10:4, Mark 3:18, Luke 6:15, Acts 1:13), one of the apostles, with Simon, one of our Lord's relatives, Matthew 13:55, Mark 6:3. This mistake is common, as well as that respecting the two Thaddaei.

See Baron. Martyrol. Oct. 28. A slight transposition has corrected the error. — ED.

- Ft875** See Tillemont's "Memoires a Hist. Ecclesiastique," edit. Bruxelles, 1695, tom. 2. pt. 1, pp. 171 and 408. — ED.
- Ft876** Ex Johan. de Monte Regali.
- Ft877** Ex Hieron. in Catalogo Scrip. Eccles. [Appendix I. p. 224, in "Biblioth. Eccles. Fabricii," Hamb. 1718. The next authority, the treatise "De duplici Martyrio," is incorrectly assigned to Cyprian: "Cypriani non esse patet, quod in eo Diocletiani Imp. et belli Caesarei contra Turcas fit mentio." Rivet. crit. sac. lib. 2. Section 15. — ED.]
- ft878** There is some mistake here: Jerome assigns no date whatever. — ED.
- Ft879** The foregoing narrative is from the "Acta Martyrii S. Andreae," a production ascribed to the presbyters and deacons of Achaia, but rejected by M. Tillemont, as of no authority. Ribadeneira quotes the work, in Vita S. Andr. — ED.
- Ft880** The cross here is not taken for the material cross of wood, but for the manner of death upon the cross, which death was to him welcome.
- Ft881** Ex Bernardo, Serm. 2, de Sanct. Andrea.
- Ft882** As recordeth Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 24. 39; lib. 5. cap. 8 and 10; also Irenaeus, lib. 3. cap. 1; Item Hieronymus, in Catalogo Scrip. Ecclesiast.
- Ft883** Lib. 7. Section 10. Julius Africanus is represented as the *translator* of Abdias; but as Sixtus Senensis and Vossius (de Hist. Gr. lib. 2. c. 9,) ask, "quomodo Abdiam eum latine transtulit Jul. Afr., quem Graecum fuisse scriptorem ex Eusebio et aliis constat?" See Fabricius, pp. 392, 397. — ED.
- Ft884** Sophronius, in the Appendix to Jerome, before referred to, is better authority; Section 7. — ED.
- Ft885** Ex Isido, lib. De Patribus Novi Testam.
- Ft886** Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 23. Foxe's translation has been revised from the Greek. — ED.
- Ft887** Hegesippus, a converted Jew, the first ecclesiastical historian after the apostles, born about A.D. 100, died about A.D. 180: he wrote five books of ὑπομνήματα τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων — ED.

- Ft888** Hegesippus (quoted by Euseb. lib. 4. c. 22.) explains the seven sects of the Jews to be the Ἑσσαῖοι, Γαλιλαῖοι, ἡμεροβαπτισταί, Μασβωθαῖοι, Σαμαρεῖται, Σαδδουκαῖοι, Φαρισαῖοι. — ED.
- Ft889** Τίς ἡ θύρα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἑσταυρωμένου; Valesius explains “door” to mean, “the first rudiments, or the main principles, of Christianity.” — ED.
- Ft890** Chap. 3. [“Hic locus legitur in Esaia, cap. 3. δῆσῶμεν τὸν δίκαιον — ita quidem legitur in edit. Romana. Verum Justinus in dialog, adv. Tryh. diserte testatur in edit. LXX. interpretum scriptum fuisse ἄρῶμεν τὸν δίκαιον, pro quo Judaici interpretes δῆσῶμεν verterunt. Justini lectionem confirmat etiam Tertul. contra Marc., 3. 22. “Venite, inquit, auferamus justum, quia inutilis est nobis.” Vales. not. in Euseb. — ED.]
- ft891** See “Clementina.” Col. Agripp. 1569, page 22. — ED.
- Ft892** Dr. Hudson observes that Origen is the first who (by a mistake of memory) attributes this sentiment to Josephus; and that Eusebius and others have copied Origen’s blunder. Josephus (Antiq. lib. 20. cap. 8. Section 5.) expressly attributes the ruin of his country to the anger of God at the murder of Jonathan the high-priest by the assassins.
- Ft893** Joseph. Antiq. lib. 20. cap. 9.
- Ft894** See Augustine “De civitate Dei,” lib. 18. cap. 52. — ED.
- Ft895** “Alii ferro perempti; alii flammis exusti; alii flagris verberati; alii vectibus perforati; alii cruciati patibulo; alii demersi pelagi periculo; alii vivi decoriati; alii vinculis mancipati; alii linguis privati; alii lapidibus obruti; alii frigore afflicti; alii fame cruciati; alii truncatis manibus; aliique caesis membris spectaculum contumeliae nudi propter nomen Domini portantes,” etc.
- ft896** Aug. De civit. Dei, lib. 21. c. 6.
- Ft897** “Nullus esset dies cui non ultra quinque millium numerum martyrum reperiri posset ascriptus, excepto die calendarum Januarii.” [On the number of martyrs, many passages are collected from the Fathers, and other writers, in “Basnagii Annales polit.” ad an. 96. Section 7. — ED.]
- ft898** “Usque adeo Ut videres repletas humanis corporibus civitates, jacentes mortuos simul cum parvulis senes, foeminarumque absque ulla

sexus reverentia nudata in publico rejectaque starent cadavera.” —  
 Histor. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 26; [Eusebius, however, is describing Nero’s  
 severity toward the *Jews*, not the Christians; and is quoting from  
 Josephus, “De bello Jud.” lib. 2. cap. 18. Section 2. — ED.]

ft899 Orosius, lib. 7. [cap. 7. — ED.]

ft900 This date is not in Jerome. — ED.

ft901 This report seemeth neither to come of Jerome, nor to be true in Peter.  
 [See this assertion of Jerome’s disproved in “Essays on Romanism,”  
 Seeley and Burnside. London, 1839, p. 183. — ED]

ft902 Hieron. Catal. Scrip. Eccles.

ft903 Abdias, lib. 1. [Hist. Apost. Section 16. — ED.]

ft904 Pseudo-Abdias, bishop of Babylon, is supposed to have flourished in  
 the beginning of the tenth century. His first editor had an extraordinary  
 opinion of his excellence: “Wolfgangus Lazius, qui primum illum in  
 lucem anno 1551 Basileae cum praefatione ampla protraxit, (unde  
 postea etiam Parisiis, 1566 et Coloniae, 1569 prodiit) tanti eum fecit,  
 ut dubitare se dicat, utrum ea in quibus cum Luca consentit hauserit ex  
 hoc evangelista, an Lucas ea potius ex Abdia isto descripserit;” Vossius  
 de Hist. Gr.; (quoted by Oudin. Script. Eccles. tom. 2. col. 419) who  
 also states that the book was once condemned by Paul IV. for its oft-  
 times fabulous and mendacious narratives, an act (all things considered)  
 somewhat ungracious; and for which reparation was afterwards made,  
 by withdrawing the name from the Index Prohibitorius: see *Yet more  
 work for a Masse-Priest* (Lond. 1622), p. 5. From Foxe’s residing so  
 long as he did at Basle, he seems to have become acquainted with  
 books, and introduced their contents into his Acts and Monuments,  
 which under other circumstances would not have engaged his attention;  
 nor, as in the present case, much deserved it. — ED.

ft905 Hegesippus, lib. 3. De excidio Hierosol. cap. 2. [This is a different  
 Hegesippus from that mentioned supra, p. 98, and lived after the time  
 of Constantine. See Cave. — ED.]

ft906 [There is a slight obscurity in these words, which will be removed by  
 quoting the original: “ita Magus Caesaris animum obtinuerat, ut eum  
 salutis suae praesulem, vitaeque custodem, remota ambiguitate

confideret.” Vide Baronius, “*Annales Eccles.*” anno 68. Section 13. — ED.]

ft907 Euseb. lib. 3. Hist. Eccles. cap. 30. [quoting from Clemens. Alex. Strom. 7. cap. 11. Section 63. — ED.]

ft908 Not in the Greek, or the Latin version. — ED.

ft909 In the Latin version, but not in the Greek. — ED.

Ft910 Foxe’s translation has been revised from the original Greek of Jerome. — ED.

Ft911 Abdias, Hist. Apost. lib. 2. Section 7. — ED.

Ft912 Some moderns appear so much disposed to put a value upon whatever the stream of tradition has carried down, that a few lines may be necessary in refutation of this tale. “Neque ullus ante Ambrosium scriptor ecclesiasticus loco sauguinis lac e Pauli cervice manasse scribit. Argumento inauditum hoc patribus fuisse miraculum. Quin etiam dissentiunt inter se Chrysostomus atque Ambrosius, quod commenti novum est indicium. Martyrologia ipsa de eo miraculo silentium agunt” “Basnagii Annales politico-eccles.” (Roterod. 1706) ad an. 65, Section 17. — ED.

Ft913 This is a mistake. Jerome represents each as having suffered in the 14th or last year of Nero: see supra, pp. 100, 102, and Foxe’s next note. — ED.

Ft914 If this be true, which Prudentius recordeth of Paul, that he suffered under Nero and the year after Peter, then it is false which Jerome before testifieth, that Peter suffered the last year of Nero.

Ft915 See the extract from Jerome, supra, p. 102. — ED.

Ft916 Ex Orosio, lib. 7. [cap. 10. — ED.]

ft917 Foxe is not quite correct in this assertion: see the extract from Eusebius in p. 108. — ED.

Ft918 Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 12, 19, 20, 32, 35. — ED.

Ft919 This was probably Joachim Perionius, who wrote “Liber de rebus gestis vitisque Apostolorum,” Basil, 1552. There is a flourishing account of him in the Bibliotheca of Miraeus, “De Scrip. Eccles.” as re — EDited by Fabricius. p. 169. — ED.

- Ft920** Isidorus, De Patribus Novi Testamenti.
- Ft921** Jerome, “Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum.” Foxe’s text has by mistake “Eusebius” instead of Jerome. — ED.
- Ft922** Foxe has stated *Pertinax*, although in the errata of the second edition he corrected it. Erasmus in a Scholium on this passage of Jerome observes, that Sophronius and some copies of Jerome read *Pertinax*. — ED.
- Ft923** If John died (as Jerome states) 68 years after our Lord’s passion, the statement of Foxe is very improbable, that he was then 120 years old; for that would make him 52 years old in A.D. 33, the date usually assigned to our Lord’s passion: whereas he is commonly supposed to have been younger than our Lord. The general expression “about one hundred” has, therefore, been substituted for Foxe’s “one hundred and twenty.” Several other dates hereabout (not in Jerome) have been corrected. See sup. p. 96, note (3), p. 100, note (5), and p. 102. — ED.
- Ft924** Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 23.
- Ft925** Iren. Contr. Heres. lib. 2. cap. 39, and lib. 3. cap. 39.
- Ft926** That is Clement, quoted by Eusebius, lib. 3. cap. 23. Foxe’s translation has been revised from the original Greek of Clement, printed at Oxford, 1683. — ED.
- Ft927** The Alexandrine Chron. says Smyrna. — ED.
- Ft928** Gr. ἐλπίζομένης, Euseb. βλέπομένης. — ED.
- Ft929** Iren. adv. Heres. lib. 3. cap. 3.
- Ft930** Eccl. Hist. lib. 3. cap. 28, and lib. 4. cap. 14.
- Ft931** Albertus Magnus, or Teutonicus, was born at Lavingen, in Swabia, about A.D. 1200, and died in 1280.
- Ft932** Albert. cap. 17 et 74 super Evang. “Missus est,” etc.
- ft933** “Watring,” an Anglicised form of Aquino, in Italy, where St. Thomas was born. — ED.
- ft934** St. Thomas, par. 3. quaest. 37, art. 4.
- Ft935** Ex Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 18.
- ft936** Haec Hegesip. et Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 20. A.D. 98. — ED.

- ft<sup>937</sup> Non debere dimitti Christianos, qui semel ad tribunal venissent, nisi propositum mutent. Ex Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 21.
- ft<sup>938</sup> Ex Just. Mart. in 2 Apolog. [See infra, p. 125, note (1). — ED.]
- ft<sup>939</sup> Vid. Epist. Fratrum Viennensium et Lugdunensium, ad Fratres per Asiam et Phrygiam scripta.
- ft<sup>940</sup> Ex Nicephoro. lib. 3. cap. 22.
- ft<sup>941</sup> Ex Just. Mart. in Dialogo cum Tryphone.
- ft<sup>942</sup> Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 13, et lib. 5. cap. 6.
- Ft<sup>943</sup> AEnead 7. lib. 2.
- Ft<sup>944</sup> Iren. lib. 3. Contra Haeres.
- Ft<sup>945</sup> Jacobus Philippus Bergomensis in “Histotia Supplementum Chronicarum Appellata,” pp. 149, 154, edit. Brixiae, 1485. See infra, p. 112, note (5). The author of this chronicle died in 1518, and is therefore, with the others mentioned in connection, comparatively modern. “Aloisius” is Aloysius Lippomanus, bishop of Verona, who drew up the “Vitae Sanctorum,” in 8 tom. folio, Venet. 1556. Possevin Appar. Sac. tom. 1. p. 42. — ED.
- Ft<sup>946</sup> “Bonifacius Simoneta Mediolanensis circa annum 1490, in lucem emisit Commentarios in Persecutionem Christian. Pontificumque historiam a Petro, ad Innocent. VIII. Prodiit Mantuae, 1509.” Hallervordii de Hist. Lat. in Supplement. ad Vossium; Hamb. 1709: Page 692. — ED.
- Ft<sup>947</sup> Col. 238, edit. Basil, 1559. — ED.
- Ft<sup>948</sup> Fascicul. tempot.
- Ft<sup>949</sup> Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3.
- Ft<sup>950</sup> A.D. 127. — ED.
- Ft<sup>951</sup> A.D. 185. — ED.
- Ft<sup>952</sup> “Certain decretal epistles.” The epistles of the earlier popes have been submitted to the conclusive examinations of David Blondell in his “Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes, seu editio et censura nova epistolarum, quas piissimis urbis Romae praesulibus a Clemente ad Sirlcium Isidorus Mercator supposuit, etc.,” Genevae, 1628. Upon this work Buddeus remarks, “Non tantum in Prolegomenis, argumentis

solidissimis epistolas hasce a Pseudo-Isidoro confictas esse demonstravit, et Turriani varias exceptiones dissipavit; sed et singulas deinceps epistolas exhibuit, easque sub examen revocavit, et incredibili diligencia auctores, e quorum centonibus consutae sunt, investigavit, indicavitque.” *Isagoge ad Theol. Univ. tom. 1. p. 678.* — ED.

**Ft953** “*Chronica Jo. Naucleri Propos. Tubingensis ad annum MCCCC.*” (Colon. 1579), p. 465. — ED.

**Ft954** *Anthropo. lib. 22.*

**Ft955** *Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 34.*

**Ft956** “*Otho Frisingensis.*” [Otho, bishop of Frisinghen in Bavaria, in 1138. He composed a chronological history from the creation of the world to his own time, published at Strasburg, 1515, and at Basil 1569, and in the 8th vol. of the “*Biblioth. Fratrum Cisterc.*” Dupin, vol. 10. p. 177, English trans. “*Scriptor candidus, gravis, fide dignus et a partium studio alienus.*” *Meuselii Biblioth. Hist. vol. 1. p. 75.* — ED.]

**ft957** James Philip Forest, of Bergamo, where he died, in 1518. He wrote “*Supplementa Chronicarum,*” of which Fabricius (*Biblioth. Mediae et Infimae, Lat. tom. 4. p. 16*), considers the edition at Venice, in 1503, to be the best. The passage referred to by Foxe appears on p. 157, edit. Brixiae, 1485; but see “*Basnagii Annales ad an. 119,*” Section 4. — ED.

**Ft958** “*Peter de Natalibus Episcopus Equilinus clarum nomen fecit Catalogo Sanctorum, qui excusus est Vincentiae, 1493, et deinde Lugduni, 1542.*” *Hallervordii specimen de Hist. Lat. in “Supplementa ad Vossium”* (Hamb. 1709), p. 770. — ED.

**Ft959** *Ex Platina in Vita Alexandri.*

**Ft960** *Per Matth. Westmonast. collecti, p. 56. edit. Francof. 1601.* — ED.

**Ft961** *Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 4.* — ED.

**Ft962** *Dist. 93, cap. “Diaconi.”*

**Ft963** In Blondel’s “*Epist. Decr. Examen,*” (Genevae 1635) p. 147; who remarks; “*haec non fuit mens Apostolorum, Act. 6. nec ullius patrum: fingit impostor pro more.*” The same judgment is passed, p. 166, upon the decree of Alex. quoted onwards. — ED.

**Ft964** *A.D. 451.* — ED.

- Ft965** Ex Dist. 70, cap. “Neminem.”
- Ft966** A.D. 1095. — ED.
- Ft967** Ibid. cap. “Sanctorum.”
- Ft968** A.D. 314. — ED.
- Ft969** Ex Dist. 93, cap. “Diaconi.”
- Ft970** “Aquam sale conspersam populis benedicimus, ut ea euncti aspersi sanctificentur et purificentur, quod omnibus sacerdotibus faciendum esse mandamus. Decreti 3. pars de Consecrat. dist. 3, [cap. 20. — ED.]
- ft971** Pliny’s Epistles, 10. 97, 98. A new translation of these two celebrated letters has been substituted for Foxe’s, which is loose and often obscure. — ED.
- Ft972** “Repeat together a set form of prayer:” this is Melmoth’s translation of “dicere secure invicem carmen.” — ED.
- Ft973** Apol. cap. 2. — ED.
- Ft974** Rather of Sinope in Pontus. See Baron. Annal. Eccles. ann. 114, Section 4. Basnage (Annales Politico-eccles.) has alluded to his martyrdom under ann. 130, Section 4. — ED.
- Ft975** Anton. (tit. 7. capitul. 3.) Equil. et Fascic. temporum.
- Ft976** Ex Supp. Chr. [p. 159, edit. 1485. See supra, p. 113, note 1. — ED.]
- ft977** Anton. (tit. 7. cap. 5, Section 6.) Hermannus Contractus “obiit anno 1054 conscripto Chronico clarus; (Hallervord. p. 728) genere et doctrina egregius, gente Suevus — chronicon scripsit de 6 mundi aetatibus ad annum 1054.” See “Meuselii Biblioth. Hist.” tom. 1. p. 69; who states that there was an edition of this writer in a collection of Chronicles by Sichardus, (Basil. 1529) and also in the “Rerum German. Scriptores veteres;” Francof. 1584, collected by Pistorius. — ED.
- Ft978** Antoninus (tit. 7. capit. 1, Section 7.) places their martyrdom under Domitian.
- Ft979** Lib. 4. cap. 26. Eusebius quotes from Melito, and adds (from Polycrates) lib. 5. c. 24, that he was a bishop, and suffered at Laodicea. — ED.
- Ft980** Ex Euseb. lib. 3. cap. 35, 36.

- Ft981** Ex Hier. in Catalogo Script. Eccles., whence Foxe's text is corrected. — ED
- ft982** A new translation from the Greek is substituted for Foxe's. — ED.
- Ft983** Haec Eusebius et Hieronym. [Cat. Scrip. Eccl. cap. 26]. "Annus decimus Trajani respondet anno Christi 107; atque ad illum annum quoque martyrium S. Ignatii referunt Usserius Tillemontius aliique V. D. Sed Joh. Malelam Antioch. si sequimur, non ante annum 18. Imperii Trajani accidit, Christi 115. quam sententiam argumentis gravissimis confirmarunt viri non minus praestantes Jo. Pearsonus in Dissertat. postuma de anno quo S. Ignatius condemnatus est, vulgata a T. Smitho in luculenta Epist. Ignatii editione quam notis Pearsonii suisque illustratam publicavit Oxon. 1709, et Guil. Lloydus Episc. Asaphensis in Diatriba ejusdem argumenti edita a Pagio in Crit. Baroniana ad an. 107, Section 4. Pro anno *decimo* Trajani, male quidam codices *undecimo*." Vid. Fabric. not. in "Biblioth. Eccles." (Hamb 1718) p. 78. Bp. Pearson's Dissertation is reprinted in the "Patres Apostolici." (Oxon. 1838) vol. 2. p. 504. — ED.
- Ft984** Cap. 29.
- Ft985** He is called Theodulus by Baronius, ann. 132, Section 1. — ED.
- Ft986** Baron. Martyr. Rom. July 9th. — ED.
- Ft987** Henricus de Hervordia and Bergomensis, lib. 8. [Henricus de Hervordia — ita dictus, quia ex urbe Hervordia in Westphalia oriundus fuit — scripsit "Chronicon Generale" ad an. 1355, quod "de factis memorabilibus" inscripsit. See Oudin. Comment. de Scrip. Eccles. tom. 3. col. 973. — ED.]
- ft988** Antoninus, archbishop of Florence, drew up a Chronicle of some value, entitled "Summa Historialis," which closes with the year 1459. It was published at Venice 1480; at Basle 1502; and is included in modern edition of his works, Florentiae, 1741. Meuselii Biblioth. Hist. 1. p. 92. The history in the text will be found at tit. 7. capit. 5, Section 4. — ED.
- Ft989** Vincentius was a monk of Beauvais, of the Dominican order, and wrote a huge historical work, under the title of "Speculum Historiale," to the year 1254, at the persuasion of Louis IX. An edition appeared in 4 vols. folio, at Strasburg, 1473, and the eighth at Douay, in 1624

Meusel. Biblioth. Hist. 1. p. 82. Foxe has used these Chronicles, apparently, through the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 2. cap. 3, col. 11 — 13. Antoninus himself (in the place cited in the last note) refers us to Vincentius, lib. 11. cap. 88. — ED.

**Ft990** Foxe here confounds the Zeno just mentioned with another Zeno, whose martyrdom is celebrated in Baronius's *Martyr. Roman.* on Sep. 5th. Baronius there states that he was one of a number of soldiers (1107 in all, others say 11,000), who, for professing Christ, were martyred at Melitine in Armenia. Mount Ararat (where the 10,000 were said to be crucified) being likewise in Armenia, a surmise has arisen whether the two stories are not founded on the same occurrence. This point is discussed in Tillemont's "*Memoires a l'Hist. Eccles.*" tom. 2. part 2. pp. 23 — 48. See *infra*, p. 146, note 2. — ED.

**Ft991** See *Anton.* tit. 7. capit. 5, Section 3. — ED.

**Ft992** Calocerus in Baronius, ann. 122, Section 2. — ED.

**Ft993** "Vere magnus Deus Christianorum."

**Ft994** Ex Antonino (tit. 7. capit. 6, Section 7) et Equilino. — ED.

**Ft995** Some say, of Messina. — ED.

**Ft996** Ex Niceph. (lib. 3. cap. 29. — ED.) et ex Onomast.

**Ft997** According to Baronius; ann. 122. Section 2 — ED.

**Ft998** Adonis Martyrologium, ad June 27th. Adonis Viennensis Archiep. breviarium *Chronic.* ad an. 1353, published (as so often the case with Foxe's authorities) Basileae, 1568; the Martyrologium was reprinted in "*Opera D. Georgii*," 2 tom. folio, Romae, 1745. — ED.

**Ft999** "Invisens Eleusina:" Hier. Cat. Scrip. Eccl. cap. 29. "Dicere debuerat, *invisens Eleusinia*, ut Jo. Scaliger probat animad, in Eusebii *Chronicon*." E. S. Cypriani not. apud Fabric. "*Biblioth. Eccles.*" p. 86. The Greek of Jerome is as follows: — ἐν Ἐλευσίῃνι γενόμενος καὶ πάντα σχεδὸν τὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος μυστήρια μνηθεὶς, δέδωκεν ἀφορμὴν, etc — whence Foxe's text has been somewhat improved.

**Ft1000** Vide Valesii. not. in Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 23. — ED.

**ft1001** Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 8.

**ft1002** A new translation is substituted for Foxe's. — ED

- ft1003 Some write that the place where Christ was crucified was taken into the walls.
- ft1004 Foxe's account of Justin is somewhat altered in this edition, in respect of arrangement, for the sake of greater clearness. — ED.
- ft1005 The ancient Shechem or Sichem, the modern Napolose or Nablous. — ED.
- ft1006 In the opening of his first Apology (Euseb. 4. c. 12.) — ED.
- ft1007 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 8.
- ft1008 The following narrative is from Justin's dialogue with Trypho, near the beginning of it, whence a few expressions of Foxe are altered. — ED.
- ft1009 Foxe numbers the Apologies of Justin as they stand in the printed editions. It has long, however, been decided by the learned, that Eusebius is right in making what is commonly called the First to be the Second Apology, and vice versa. This more correct numbering is adopted in the text. Valesius is strongly of opinion that both were presented during the lifetime of Antoninus Pius. See his Notes on Eusebius, lib. 4. cap. 17. Tillemont and Dupin, however, refer the Second to the following reign. — ED.
- ft1010 The Lord take away this spirit of fury, condemning innocents before they be convicted.
- ft1011 See infra
- ft1012 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 16.
- ft1013 A new translation. — ED.
- ft1014 It is much disputed among the learned, whether this edict is to be ascribed to Antoninus Pius, or his successor, Marcus Aurelius. The heading here given is according to Eusebius, and refers it to the first year of M. Aurelius, A.D. 161. But the same epistle is printed at the conclusion of Justin's Apology to Antoninus Pius, with the following heading, — Ἄυτοκράτωρ Καίσαρ Τιτος, Αἴλιος, Ἀδριανός, Ἀντωνίνος, Σεβαστός, Εὐσεβής, ἀρχιερεὺς Μέγιστος, δημοκρατικῆς ἔξουσίας [ ], ὑπάτος τὸ πδ'. Sylburgius inserts [το ιέ] or xv after the tribuneship, front Eusebius; and Tillemont would alter πδ' into δ'; thus making the epistle to have been issued by Antoninus

Pius, in the fifteenth year of his tribuneship and his fourth consulate, or A.D. 152. He further supposes some error to have crept into the copies of Eusebius, who would scarcely have ascribed to Antoninus Pius a letter bearing the name of his successor. See Appendix to this volume. — ED.

ft1015 Ex Supplem. See Note, Page 113. — ED.

ft1016 “Pudentiana,” in Baron. ann. 165, Section 3. — ED

ft1017 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 17. Just. Apol. II. cap. 2 — 4. — ED.

ft1018 On this passage, partly, Valesius grounds his opinion that this Apology was presented in the life-time of Antoninus Pius. But Dupin and Tillemont explain it as referring to Marcus Antoninus and Lucius Commodus, his son, or M. Antoninus and Lucius Verus. — ED.

ft1019 Vincent. lib. 10. cap. 108.

ft1020 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 16. Just. Apol. II. cap. 8. — ED.

ft1021 Foxe quotes also the Chronicle of Eusebius (as others have done) for the earlier of these two dated: but the passage in the Chronicle is quite ambiguous, and in reality speaks rather of the rise of Crescens at Rome; and what he adds about Justin’s martyrdom may be by anticipation. In his History Eusebius places it under Marcus Aurelius. Tatian, the pupil of Justin, says he died the sixth year of M. Aurelius, or A.D. 166. The Alexandrine Chronicle sets down his death under the consulate of Orphitus and Pudens, or A.D. 165. “Cum ergo Marco Veroque imperantibus perierit Justinus, multam veri speciem habet Chronici Alexandrini, sententia, quae S. Justini martyrium huic anno (165) illigavit.” “Basnagii Annales Politico-eccles.” (Roter. 706), ad an. 165, Section 5. — ED.

ft1022 “Cum dignitate et laetus pro Christo pertulit.” [Bibliotheca, cod. 125, col. 306, Edit. 1612. — ED.]

ft1023 Hist. Eccl. lib. 4:cap. 15. The whole of the matter from hence to the bottom of Page 134, is from this chapter of Eusebius; a new translation however is substituted for Foxe’s, which is often loose and obscure. — ED.

ft1024 Eusebius has *κατὰ Πόντον*, a palpable error (as Valesius observes) for *κατὰ πάντα τόπον*.

- ft1025 Philomelium “urbs erat Majoris Phrygiae, celebris famae, cujus meminere Strabo, Stephanus, etc.” Smithi Annotat. p. 113, edit. Oxon. 1709. — ED.
- ft1026 Αἶρε τοὺς ἰδωλεῖς. “Christianos ita appellabant efferi hi idolartae, quia istorum fictitiis numinibus supplicare et sacrificare noluerint.” Smith’s note in “Eccles. Smyrnensis Epist. de Polycarpi Mart.” Section 3, which Mr. Jacobson confirms (“Partes Apostolici,” edit. Oxon. 1838) by referring to Justin Mart. Apol. 1. Section 6. — ED.
- ft1027 The original is ὀψὲ τῆς ὥρας, “late in the day.” — ED.
- ft1028 Τῷ εὐσταθεῖ τοῦ τρόπου, “the composure of his manner,” a reading which some MSS. present, seems preferable to the other τῷ εὐσταθεῖ τοῦ προσώπου, “the composure of his countenance.” Vide Vales. in Euseb. 4. 15. — ED.
- ft1029 Valesius considers this to have been a Saturday, on which the first day of unleavened bread happened to fall. Usher and Pagi consider that among Christians it could only mean the Saturday before Easter. Pagi shows that Saturday before Easter (according to Eastern computation) fell on March 26, in the year 169. See infra, p. 136, note 2. — ED.
- ft1030 “Irenarch” was an officer of the council, answering to our “Marshal,” or “Sergeant at Arms.” See Vales. not. in loc. — ED.
- ft1031 “Asiarch” was the chief-priest of the council: one of his duties was to superintend the games, which he often gave at his own expense. See Vales not. in locum. — ED.
- ft1032 “Confactor,” an officer whose business it was, in the Roman games, to dispatch any beast that was unruly or dangerous. — ED.
- ft1033 This is explained from Optatus, by Valesius, “offerre ad sepulchra martyrum;” but this does not imply relic “worship.” Vide Chemnitz “Examen Conc. Trident.” pars 3. loc. 4, sect. 5. Section 9; and pars 4. loc. 1, sect. 3. Section 5. — ED.
- ft1034 Alce, probably the christian woman who is spoken of with honor in Ignatius’s epistle to the Smyrnaeans.
- ft1035 “As many, I mean, as are elected to salvation:” this is Foxe’s translation of the word σωζομένων, rendered in the English Bible, more correctly, “such as should be saved,” Acts 2:47. “Servandorum”

is the translation in the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 2. col. 27, edit. 1624. — ED.

- ft1036 Mark what he saith; we love them, and worship them not.
- ft1037 Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3, as quoted by Eusebius. — ED.
- ft1038 Iren. *ibid.* Euseb. lib. 3. cap 36. — ED.
- ft1039 Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 20.
- ft1040 Jerom. De Viris Illust. cap. 27. — ED.
- ft1041 Ex Irenaeo, lib. 3. cap. 3; et Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1042 Niceph. lib. 4. cap. 39. [See rather Irenaeus, apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 24. — ED.]
- ft1043 Baronius places the martyrdom under the year 169: and the Alexandrine Chronicle (cited in the note of Pagi) fixes *the very day* (7 Cal. Ap. *i.e.* March 26), for those who delight in such exactitude. See Baron. “Annal Eccles.” tom. 2. p. 241, edit. Lucae, 1738; also *supra*, p. 132, note 3. — ED.
- Ft1044 Conrad a Lichtenaw, abbot of Ursperg, whose chronicle is often made use of by Foxe. He died in the thirteenth century; but the chronicle, though well spoken of by Meusel, (p. 77), is supposed to have little of his hand in it. — ED.
- Ft1045 The date is so described in the Chronicle of Eusebius, as translated into Latin by Jerome. A.D. 169, however, is really the *ninth* of Marcus Antoninus. — ED.
- Ft1046 *i.e.* February 23d, the day on which his martyrdom is commemorated in the Greek martyrology. It does not however at all follow (as Pagi observes) that this was the real day. See *supra*, note (2.) — ED.
- Ft1047 Hist. Tripart. lib. 9. cap. 38. — ED.
- Ft1048 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 15.
- Ft1049 Ex Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 15.
- Ft1050 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 15.
- Ft1051 Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 1.

- Ft1052** The translation of this letter in Milner's Church History (vol. 1. p. 224) being very superior to Foxe's, has been here substituted for it, with a few variations. — ED.
- Ft1053** Valesius thinks that the original **διεκρίνοντο** is a *vox athletica*, and should be translated — "Now after this the rest began to be *proved*." Vid. not. in loc. — ED.
- Ft1054** Ex Epistola Viennensium, etc.
- ft1055** Euseb..lib. 5. cap. 3.
- Ft1056** Ex Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 2.
- Ft1057** Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., lib. 4. cap. 26 — ED.
- Ft1058** The following are new translations. — ED.
- Ft1059** *i.e.* the Jews, as Valesius explains.
- Ft1060** **Σολόμωνος Παροιμίαι, ἢ καὶ Σοφία** Euseb. — ED.
- Ft1061** Foxe erroneously ascribes this expedition to both M. Antoninus and his brother. See p. 146, note 4. — ED.
- Ft1062** Ex Eusebio, lib. 5. cap. 5.
- Ft1063** The letter, attributed to Aurelius, may be seen in Greek, in Justin's Apolog. 1. Section 71; and, in Latin, in the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 2. cap. 3, col. 18, edit. 1624. "Plerique prodigii fidem probaturi provocarunt ad literas Imperatoris, quibus senatum populumque Romanum, non sine insigni Christianorum elogio, de re tanta certiores facit, quarum literarum **ἀπόγραφον** exstat ad calcem Apolog. post. Justini Mart. in quibus Christianorum innocentiae tam clementer prospexit, ut damnationem, gravissimasque paenas accusatoribus intenterit. Non desunt tamen, qui de tali edicto in Christianorum favorem, ea occasione, anno Marci XIV. (in quem refertur bellum Quadicum) sancito, valde dubitant, quia mox post Germanicam sitim tam mirabiliter depulsam, anno videlicet Marci XVII. innumera Christianorum multitudo quaestionibus atque suppliciis subjecta fuit, in Gallia cumprimis Lugdunensi, apud Euseb. H. E. lib. 5. c. 1. Quinimo ipsas literas, quae attextuntur Apologiae secundae Justini M. vel supposititias esse vel certe interpolatas, summa consensione docent eruditissimi viri, Scaliger, Salmasius, Blondellus, Huetius, Pagius, Witsius, et Fr. Spanhemius; in quorum sententiam ego eo lubentius

concedo, quo clariora **νοθείας** indicia in iis se produnt, sive ipsum argumentum, sive barbariem styli attendas, unde manifeste apparet, eas non ab ipso Imperatore Graece dictatas, aut ex Latino ipsius in Graecum. sermonem translatas; sed infra seculum Justiniani Imp. ab imperito rerum Romanarum Graeculo confictas esse.” — Vid. Sal. Deglingii *Observatt. Sac. pars secunda, Lipsiae, 1737, p. 596.*

**Ft1064** Rather “cohorts.” See Grabe’s note in loc. — ED.

**Ft1065** “Cum legionibus prima, decima, gemina, Euphratensique.” Any legion compounded of two others was called gemina, but especially the 13th, which had its head-quarters in Pannonia. The Euphrates legion is the same as the Cappadocian, or 12th, and was so called from its head-quarters being at Melitina, a region and city on the Euphrates, on the confines of Armenia and Cappadocia. Eusebius attributes this miracle to the legion of Melitina. He is mistaken, however, in representing it as called Fulminea from this event. See Brotier, *Not. et Emend. in Taciti Hist. 2. 6.* We have an allusion to Christian soldiers at Melitina, *supra p. 119, note 3*: see also under the tenth persecution, *infra p. 229. note (2).* — ED.

**Ft1066** The above translation is made from the Latin edict in the *Centuriators.* — ED.

**Ft1067** See Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 5, where the affair is ascribed to “M. Aurelius Caesar, brother to Antoninus,” on which Valesius remarks, “Graviter hic fallitur Eusebius, qui M. Aurelium fratrem fuisse ait Imp. Antonini, cum tamen unus idemque fuerit M. Aurelius Antoninus. Hujus autem adoptivus frater, non Marcus, sed Lucius AELIUS Verus dictus est.” No doubt Eusebius’s text has been corrupted; for in his *Chronicle* he sets down this victory to the fourteenth year of M. Antoninus, four years after his brother’s death. — ED.

**Ft1068** *Epitome Dionis. p. 819. Edit. Hanoviae, 1606.* Dion Cassius wrote a Roman History, in eight decads, which was epitomized by John Xiphilinus, patriarch of Constantinople. Dion died about A.D. 240, Xiphilinus A.D. 1080.

**Ft1069** Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 21. — ED.

**Ft1070** Called “Pontianus” in Baronius, *Ann 192, Section 2.* — ED.

- Ft1071 Ex Vincentio, lib. 10. cap, 119, 122, 123, et Chron Henrici de Erfordia. [Cited by the Cent. Magdeb. — ED.]
- ft1072 Ex Platina in Vita Sixti.
- Ft1073 Rather “in St. Peter’s, on the Vatican.” See Platina. — ED.
- Ft1074 Platini in vita Sixti.
- Ft1075 Vide Blondel’s “Epist. Decretal Examen.” (Genevae, 1635) p. 181; and upon the “Ordinances of Telesphorus,” soon after mentioned, p. 184. — ED.
- Ft1076 He died about A.D. 127. — ED.
- Ft1077 Ex Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 13.
- Ft1078 “Romani namque tres ante pascha septimanas praeter Sabbatum et Dominicam continuas jejunt.” Socrat Eccl. Hist. lib. 5. cap. 22. [Hence Passion Sunday was also called Dominica Mediana. — ED.]
- ft1079 Sozomen, lib. 7. cap. 19.
- Ft1080 Volateran. Anthrop, lib. 22.
- Ft1081 Unneth, “scarcely:” a word of Saxon origin. — ED.
- ft1082 See infra, p. 165, note (l), and Appendix. — ED
- Ft1083 **Vide Cent. Magdeburg. cap. 10, col. 168. The book entitled “Pontificale, sive de gestis summorum Pontificum” is incorrectly attributed to this pope; it belongs, more properly, to Anastasius Bibliothecarius. Antonio Biblioth. Hispana vetus, tom. 1. p. 190; Vossius “De Hist. Lat.” p. 200, edit. 1651. — Ed. <sup>a55</sup>**
- ft1084 “Hanc epistolam Pio suppositam indicant — 1. Styli barbaries; 2. Fabula de revelatione Herraie facta,” etc. Blondel “Epist. Decretal. Exam.” p. 196. — ED.
- Ft1085 Rather A.D. 172 — 185. — ED.
- Ft1086 Nauclerus, lib. Chronog. Gen.6. Nauclerus rather says, “Anno autem Domini 177,” etc. — ED.
- Ft1087 Niceph. lib. 4. cap. 4.
- Ft1088 Gildas, cited by the Magdeburg Cent. — ED.
- Ft1089 Acts 8:1, 4; 11:19. See Usserii Brit. Eccl. Ant. cap. 2. — ED.

- Ft1090 “Unde et Scotos, Christianos antiquiores Petrus Cluniacensis vocat.” (Epist. ad S. Bernardum.) See Cent. Magdeburg. 2. cap. 2, col. 7. edit. 1624. Petrus Mauricius, abbot of Clugni, died A.D. 1156. Cave. — ED.
- Ft1091 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 8, 22.
- Ft1092 Hegesippus “De Bello Judaico, et urbis Hierosolymitanae excidio.” Coloniae, 1559. See supra, p. 98, note 1, and p. 101, note 4. — ED.
- Ft1093 “Ne grave servandae castitatis onus necessario fratribus imponat, sed multorum sese imbecilitati attemperet.” Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 23.
- Ft1094 Thirteen objections are detailed by Rivet against these books, which no one now would, perhaps, undertake to assign to an apostolic age. “Eusebius, Hieronymus, et Sophronius nullam faciunt mentionem horum librorum, etsi veterum libros diligentissime collegerint et conquisierint. Neque alius admodum antiquus autor horum mentionem facit. Quod satis arguit, libros illos non ejus antiquitatis fuisse, cujus fuit Areopagita.” Rivet. *Crit. Sac.* lib. 1. cap. 9. ubi plura. — ED.
- Ft1095 Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 23.
- Ft1096 Hieronym. Catal. — ED.
- Ft1097 Eusebius and Jerome place Clemens Alexandrinus under Severus and Caracalla. He was a pupil of Pantaenus. — ED.
- Ft1098 *i.e.* the first Jewish month, Nisan. — ED.
- Ft1099 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 1.
- Ft1100 Tertul. ad Scapulam. [cap. 3. Scapula was procousul of Africa, and should be added to the list in the text. — ED.]
- ft1101 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 5.
- Ft1102 “Cave tibi, ne quid propter nos aliud, quam martyrii constanter faciendi, propositum cogites.” Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 2.
- Ft1103 **Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 2, 3; Antonin.; et Simoneta, [Johannes Simoneta, “De Rebus Gestis Francisci Sportiae.” Milan, 1479. — Ed.]<sup>a62</sup>**
- ft1104 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 16. In this way (as Eusebius observes) Origen composed his Hexapla; and Tetrapla. Aquila was a native of Sinope in Pontus, and lived during the reign of Adrian: his version was executed previous to the year 160. Much difference of opinion exists as to the

time when Symmachus flourished. Montfaucon places him about the year 200. Theodotion was a native of Ephesus, and was nearly contemporary with Aquila. See more, Horne's *Introduc.* vol. 2. p. 52. ed. 1825. London. — ED.

**Ft1105** Euseb. *ibid.* cap. 3, 23. — ED.

**Ft1106** Foxe, misapprehending a passage of the Centuriators, says, "by the account of Jerome," whereas they quote Jerome as rather impugning the opinion of Epiphanius and Ruffinus. Foxe also by mistake says "seven" thousand volumes. Dupin remarks, that "volume" must be here understood as applicable to any separate treatise, however small. — ED.

**Ft1107** This statement is most likely founded on a misconception of Eusebius, who says (*lib.* 6. cap. 3), that Origen sold all his *profane authors* to a person who engaged to supply him with 4 oboli (or 5 pence) per diem. — ED.

**Ft1108** Eusebius states (*lib.* 6:cap. 3), that "so great was the hostility of the infidels against him (because of the multitudes which resorted to him to be instructed in the faith), that they set soldiers to watch about the house in which he abode." *i e.* (as Valesius observes) to hinder the resort of hearers. Nicephorus has taken the same view of the passage as Foxe. See *infra*, p. 173. — ED.

**Ft1109** Eusebius (*ibid.* cap. 4) does not say that Serenus was brother to Plutarch, but in the preceding chapter he represents Heraclas, (brother of Plutarch, and afterward bishop of Antioch,) as the second of Origen's pupils. Foxe hastily assumed hence, that Heraclas and Serenus were the same individual. Heraclas "was no martyr." See *infra*, p. 174 — ED.

**Ft1110** Valesius would read ἡ ῥαίς as one word — Herais. — ED.

**Ft1111** Euseb, *lib.* 6. cap. 5.

**Ft1112** Euseb. *lib.* 6. cap. 9.

**Ft1113** *Ib.* cap. 11.

**Ft1114** *Ib.* Some expressions of Foxe are more conformed to the Greek. — ED.

**Ft1115** Euseb. *lib.* 6. cap. 20. — ED.

- Ft<sup>1116</sup> Lib. 11. cap. 6. ex Martyrologio [also Baron. ad ann. 205. Section 27. — ED.]
- ft<sup>1117</sup> Tillemont, Memoires a l’Hist. Eccles. tom. 3. part. 1. p. 63. Bruxelles. 1699. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1118</sup> Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 11. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1119</sup> Omnium Doctrinarum curiosissimum exploratorem. [Adv. Valent. cap. 5. — ED.]
- ft<sup>1120</sup> Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1121</sup> Tertullian Apol.
- Ft<sup>1122</sup> The occasion hereof, belike, came of the Jews worshipping the jaw of an ass, in the story of Sampson.
- Ft<sup>1123</sup> Tertullian. Apolog.
- Ft<sup>1124</sup> Idem, ad Scapulam.
- Ft<sup>1125</sup> Supplem. [Bergomensis] lib. 8.
- Ft<sup>1126</sup> “Nihilo tamen minus omnes illi pacem inter se retinuerunt et retinemus etiamnum, et jejunii dissonantia fidei concordiam commendat,” etc. — Euseb, lib. 5. cap. 24.
- Ft<sup>1127</sup> Ex Euseb. lib. 4. cap. 26.
- Ft<sup>1128</sup> See Stillingfleet, Answer to Cressy; Usserii Antiq. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1129</sup> See Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 23, and Valesius’s notes in locum. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1130</sup> Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1131</sup> Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 24. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1132</sup> Platina has been misunderstood here; he quite coincides with Damasus. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1133</sup> “Ligneum calicem usurpatum esse, expresse dicitur dist. 1. de consecrat. can. ‘vasa’ idemque aperte colligitur ex Concil. Triburiensi c. 18, ubi prohibentur sacerdotes *ne in ligneis vasculis ullo modo conficere praesumant*. Quia tamen propter fragilitatem vitri, usus vitrei calicis periculosus est, tandem circa tempora Caroli M., in concilio Remensi statutum est, *ut calix Domini cum patena, si non ex auro, omnino ex argento fiat*,” etc. Binius apud Labbe conc. tom. 1. col. 603. — ED.

- Ft1134 Teuver, near Mentz, A.D. 895. Labbe, Conc. tom. 9. col. 451. — ED.
- Ft1135 He died about A.D. 219. — ED.
- Ft1136 Foxe, it will be remarked, occasionally defers to indifferent or rather modern authority; in the present case, a reference to Tertull. de Anima, Section 55, and Augustin, tom. 6, col. 611, edit. Bened. would be better vouchers. See Tillemont Memoires, tom. 3. pt. 1, p. 240. — ED.
- Ft1137 The wall of Severus (or the "Pict's Wall") extended from Cousin's House, through Newcastle, to Boulness on the Solway Firth, 68 English and 74 Roman miles. Butler's Geog. — ED.
- Ft1138 This passage is from AELIUS Lampridius, Vit. Alexandri, Section 15. *Malum pupillum esse imperatorem*, etc.: for *pupillum*, Salmasius proposes to read "pop. villum," contracted for "populi villicum," and shows that Alexander was fond of the sentiment, that the emperor was the steward and dispenser, not the owner, of the public wealth. — ED.
- Ft1139 See supra, — ED.
- Ft1140 Platina in vita Pontiani.
- Ft1141 Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6. 21. — ED.
- Ft1142 Juvenal, sat. 1. 57. — ED.
- Ft1143 "Selecti viri, qui Romae operam navarunt in Gratiano emendando, Callixti primi epistolas rejecerunt." Anton. August. in Blondel, p. 265. — ED.
- Ft1144 Vincen. in Spec. Hist. lib. 11. cap. 24. — ED.
- Ft1145 Anton. tit. 7, cap. 6.
- Ft1146 "Anno sequenti 233 Urbanus Papa, cum sedisset annos 6, menses septem, et dies quatuor, martyrio functus est; licet Eusebius in Chron. cum sedisse dicat annos 9, et anno duodecimo Alexandri ponat successoris ingressum." Baronius ad ann. 233, Section 1. Pagi settles the time of his session, more exactly, at seven years, and some months and days. — ED.
- Ft1147 Ex Martyrologio Adonis.
- Ft1148 Ex Bergomens. lib. 8. [fol. 165, edit. Brixiae 1485. — ED.]
- ft1149 Henr. de Herfordia, lib. 6. cap. 29.
- Ft1150 Bergomensis, ibidem.

- Ft1151 In Chronico. — ED.
- Ft1152 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 29. — ED.
- Ft1153 Alias, Hippolytus. — ED.
- Ft1154 This doctrine seemeth derogatory to Christ, and blasphemous.
- Ft1155 Gel. contra Eutychen, tom. 5. “Biblioth. Patrum,” col. 477, Edit. Paris, 1575. — ED.
- Ft1156 “Caeterum absque aliqua ambiguitate eum fuisse Episcopum Portuensem, cum tabulae ecclesiasticae, tum ejus ac sociorum martyrii Acta significant; eodemque titulo Nicephorus (lib. 5. cap. 15) eundem nominat, et alii paene innumeri recentiores.” See Baron. ad an. 229, Section 5. Dupin prefers Le Moyne’s conjecture, that he was bishop of Portus Romanus (hod. Aden) in Arabia; as it would be easy for those who were unacquainted with this Arabian Portus to suppose, that he was called Portuensis from the bishopric at the mouth of the Tiber. — ED.
- Ft1157 “Quem tamen canit Prudentius, multo discrimine a nostro Hippolyto secernitur. Ille Presbyter, hic Episcopus. Ille Novatiano addictus, hic alienus ab ejus disciplina.” Basnagii “Tillemont’s Annal.” ad an. 222, Section 8. — ED.
- Ft1158 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 19. — ED.
- Ft1159 Ibid. cap. 31. — ED.
- Ft1160 Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 28. quoting (as appears from Valesius’s note) the “little labyrinth,” written by one Caius against the heresy of Artemon. — ED.
- Ft1161 Said to be the first who asserted that Christ was a mere man, and excommunicated for this opinion by Victor. Euseb. lib. 5. cap. 28. — ED.
- Ft1162 “In chronico Damasi legitur: Anteros mense uno, diebus decem. Dormit 3. Nonas Januarii, Maximino et Africano Coss. praesenti sc. anno. Ordinatus fuerat anno praecedenti die 21 mensis Novembris, et currenti e vivis excessit die tertio Januarii. Quare error irrepsit in praefatum locum, quemadmodum et in auctius chronicon veterum pontificum, in quo dicitur Anteros sedisse annos undecim, mensem unum, dies duodecim. Sedit enim mensem, et dies tredecim, die

emortuali excluso. Anastasius Antero etiam annum tribuit praeter illum mensem et dies; sed annus ille ut temere adjectus omnino expungendus.” “Pagii critice in annal, eccles. Baron.” an. 238, Section 1. — ED.

**Ft1163** “Errore gravissimo libri pontificalis afficitur chronologia, quae annos 12. mensem unum, dies 12. Antero vindicavit. Quem refellit et errorem Eusebius.” Basnagii “Annales” ad an. 235, Section 7; who supposes also that this bishop died a natural death: “Quippe si martyrem Euseb. Anterorem scivisset, illum ipsum non minus quam Fabianum tanto titulo exornasset. Neque verba Indiculi Bucheriani Anterorem martyrem sonant, “dormit 3. Nonas Januarii,” quae siccam magis, quam cruentam mortem indicant.” — ED.

**Ft1164** Baronius has a long argument (ad an. 246) to show the improbability of this alleged conversion of Philip having taken place, at this date at least; and Pagi, his commentator, endeavors to set it aside altogether: “Philippum Imperatorem Christianam religionem amplexum esse putavit Eusebius, lib. 6, cap. 34, **cujas** verba Baronius, Section 5, recitat. In Chronico vero: Primus omnium ex Rom. Imperatoribus [Constantinus] Christianus fuit. Et denique in vit. Constant. lib. 4, cap. 62. Solus ex omnibus qui unquam fuerunt Imperatoribus Constantinus, in Christi martyriis renatus et consummatus est, id est, in Ecclesiis, quia forte supponit Philippum **occulte** baptizatum fuisse. Quam opinionem de conversione Philippi ad fidem nostram ab Eusebio hauserunt Paulus Orosius et Vincentius Lirinensis, et ante illos D. Hieronymus lib. de Scrip. eccles. cum de Origene loquitur.” Pagi thinks that there is no evidence that Eusebius had *seen* the letters of Origen; that he was misled, etc.; and brings forward long proofs of Philip’s adhesion to gentle customs in after life. See “Annal. Baron.” tom 2. p. 558, edit. Lucae, 1738. If the reader cares to inquire farther into this contested point, he may consult the authors referred to in Heinecken’s note ad Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 34, vol. 2. p. 241, edit. Lips. 1828. — ED.

**Ft1165** “M. Anton. Sabellicus — maxime celebratur historia Enneadum 11. ab urbe condita usque ad annum MDIV. post quem annum triennio superfuit, teste Leandro.” Vid. Vossius de hist. Lat. p. 669. The “Enneades” were printed at Basle 1538; but Foxe, if we mistake not,

avails himself here of the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 3, cap. 3, col. 10, edit. 1624. — ED.

Ft1166 Bergom. lib. 8.

Ft1167 Euseb lib. 6. cap. 29.

Ft1168 See supra, p. 155, note (6). — ED.

Ft1169 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 39.

Ft1170 The whole of this story is doubted by some writers, and they are disposed to reject it, as supported only by the rather weak testimony of Epiphanius (Haeres, 64, Section 2): “Haec Epiphanius, Origeni haudquaquam amicus, in antiquiorum graviorumque auctorum, Eusebii atque Hieronymi, contemptum nugatur, ne Photio quidem assentiente. Solus Nicephorus (lib. 5. pp. 24 et 32) istius auctoris fabulam repetere non dubitat.” Vid. “De Schola quae Alexandria floruit commentatio, auct. H. E. F. Guerike,” p. 55, Hal. 1824. The subject is fully discussed in Tillemont’s “Memoires” tom. 3. part 3, pp. 354 — 360. — ED.

Ft1171 Suid. et Niceph. lib. 5. cap. 32.

Ft1172 Socrates, lib. 6. cap. 23.

Ft1173 Eusebius says “Gordian,” lib. 6. cap. 29: but compare cap. 26, and lib. 5. cap. 22. — ED.

Ft1174 Eusebius, cap. 35.

Ft1175 Ibid. cap. 29.

Ft1176 Hunc ego canonem et typum a beato Heracla Papa nostro accepi, etc.

ft1177 Ex Niceph. lib. 1. cap. 29.

ft1178 The last two names are substituted for “Secundianus, Verianus, and Marcellianus,” whom Vincent himself makes martyrs, infra, p. 183. Foxe was misled by the Magdeburg Centuriators, who misrepresent Vincent, century 3. col. 10, edit. 1624. — ED.

Ft1179 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 46.

Ft1180 Specu. Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 52

ft1181 “Daphne” was a famous grove near the city, on the river Orontes. — ED.

Ft1182 Chrysost. lib. contra Gentiles.

- Ft1183 Zonaras, tom 3. [His “Annales” were first published by Wolf in 3 tom. Basiliae, 1557. — ED.]
- ft1184 If the reader is desirous of settling these or any other difficulties connected with this martyr, he may consult Tillemont’s Memoires, tom. 3. pt. 2, pp. 459 — 65. — ED.
- Ft1185 Euseb lib 6. cap. 39.
- Ft1186 Niceph. lib. 5. cap. 25.
- Ft1187 Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 52.
- Ft1188 Tillemont. “Mem. Eccles.” tom. 3. pt. 2, p. 191 and 272. — ED.
- Ft1189 Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 46.
- Ft1190 Lib. eodem, cap. 49: but see note (9). — ED.
- Ft1191 Eodem, cap. 52.
- Ft1192 Cap. 89.
- Ft1193 Cap. 52.
- Ft1194 Cap. 52. Foxe has copied the Magdeburg Centuriators in his mention of these martyrs. “Extant horum acta” writes Baronius (Martyrol. Rom. April 15) “in Surio, tom. 4. ubi legitur hos passos esse Cordubae in Perside. Interdum suspicatus sum pro Corduba, Corduena restituendum. Est Corduena civitas in Perside, cujus meminit Ammian. Marcel. lib. 23. et lib. 24.” — ED.
- Ft1195 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 41, etc. A better translation of these extracts from Eusebius has been substituted for Foxe’s. — ED.
- Ft1196 Blessed or happy. — ED.
- Ft1197 Thieves were, in the old time, amongst the Romans burnt.
- Ft1198 Vid. Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 40. — ED.
- Ft1199 This Germanus was a bishop in that time, who charged Dionysius for his flying persecution, against whom he purgeth himself.
- Ft1200 Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 40; lib. 7. cap. 11. — ED.
- Ft1201 Niceph. lib. 5. cap. 27.
- Ft1202 The Church of Rome has nevertheless, it appears, made its use of St. Christopher. “Christophorus describitur ab autore historiae Lombardicae, cap. 95, et Petro de Natalibus, lib. 6. cap. 135. Passio

ejus placet Joh. Hessels. Eum negare non audent Baronius in notis ad Martyrolog. Jul. 25; sed acta in multis depravata fatetur. Cultum ejus in Papatu evincunt vota ipsi facta, statuæ passim erectæ, et in processionibus solemniter circumductæ. Audiantur modo versus, quos non sine pudore suo fatetur Molanus (de picturis sacris, cap. 27) statuis adscriptos:

*Christophore sancte, virtutes sunt tibi tantæ,  
Qui te mane vident, nocturno tempore rident.  
Christophori sancti speciem quicumque tuetur;  
Ista nempe die non morte mala morietur.*

Item: —

*Christophorum videas, postea tutus eris.*

Officium Christophori celebrare concessum fait a SS. rit. Congreg. 17 Maii 1600, teste Barbosa in Collectaneis Bullarii, etc. Cameraci reliquias ejus coli, os scil. magnum testis est Arm. Raisse, p. 334." Voetii Disputat. Theolog. pars 3. p. 504. — ED.

**Ft1203** Probably in "Historiarum de Sanctis V. et N. Test. celebr." lib. 2. Basileæ 1577; or in "Vitæ Patrum per Rom. Eccles. in divorum relat. numerum," Moguntiae 1546. Ruggerus, monk of Fulde, drew up an elaborate hagiography about the year 1156. Vid. "Vossius de Hist. Lat." p. 431. — ED.

**Ft1204** In this he is supported by Tillemont, tom. 3. part 2. p. 628. — ED.

**Ft1205** Ex Bergomens. lib. 8; et ex Martyrologio Adonis.

**Ft1206** See Baron. Mart. Rom. Nov. 10. — ED.

**Ft1207** Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 45. Niceph. lib. 5. cap. 27, and lib. 14. cap. 45. — ED.

**Ft1208** Foxe (copying the Centuriators) erroneously calls this youth a soldier: see Hieron. in vita Pauli Eremitæ. — ED.

**Ft1209** Ambr. lib. 2. De Virginibus, cap. 4. — ED.

**Ft1210** Ambros. et Ado. The narrative in the text is a translation of Ado's martyrology, April 28. — ED.

**Ft1211** Basnage has placed them under Diocletian, an. 304, Section 6, and supposes Ambrose to have miscalculated the time, and mistaken the place, Antioch, instead of Alexandria. — ED.

Ft1212 *Henr. de Erford.*

Ft1213 “Nous avons l’histoire des SS. Abdon et Sennen dans la premiere partie des actes de S. Laurent, qui est si insoutenable et si fabuleuse, que Baronius l’abandonne absolument.” Tillemont, tom. 3. pt. 2, p. 406, edit. 12mo. 1699. For “Corduba,” we should, according to Baronius (*Mart. Rom.* April 22), read “Corduena” or “Cordubenna.” — ED.

Ft1214 *Bergomensis et Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 49, 91.*

Ft1215 Now called *Civita Vecchia*, bordering upon the *Campagna di Roma*. — ED.

Ft1216 *Vincent. lib. 11. c. 51.*

Ft1217 It is an advantage, perhaps, that no more have been catalogued, for there is doubtless much truth in Spanheim’s remark: “*Actis innumeris Martyrum, quales fervente hac Deciana persecutione memorantur, et tanquam ex Hieronymo, Greg. Nysseno, Beda, Adone, Usuardo, et veteribus Menologiis asseruntur, nulla fides.*” See “*Spanheim Hist. Christ.*” saec. 3. col. 764, edit. 1701. — ED.

Ft1218 *Bede de Temporibus, citante Henrico de Erfordia.* [Foxe is here copying the *Magdeburg Centuriators*. The reference to Bede is to his smaller treatise “*De Temporibus, seu Chronicon de Sex Mundi AEtatibus.*” No such list, however, occurs in the printed copies of that work; but it will be found with some variation in the “*Chronicon de Sex Mundi AEtatibus*” of *Hermannus Contractus*, p. 142, in the “*Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores*,” tom. 1. edit. Ratisb. 1726, and in the *Chronicle of Regino*; and a part of it in “*Mariani Scoti Chronicon*,” and *Rolwink’s* “*Fasciculus Temporum*,” quoted by Foxe under the tenth persecution. From these sources, with the aid also of *Bede’s Martyrology*, Aug. 13, Sep. 17, Dec. 23, Jan. 24, Feb. 28, Feb. 4, Feb. 17, Feb. 26, April 22, April 30, March 2, Dec. 4, Jan. 21, and March 3; *Baronius’s* “*Martyrologium Romanum*,” *Adonis Martyrologium*; and *Tillemont’s* “*Memoires a l’Histoire Eccles.*,” it has been attempted to correct the list, which is extremely corrupt as it stands in the *Centuriators* and in Foxe. The *exact list*, as it stands in Foxe (edit. 1583, p. 64), will be found in the Appendix. Some of these martyrs

seem to have suffered under subsequent emperors, but there is an acknowledged difficulty and confusion concerning them. — ED.]

- ft1219** See “Fasciculus Temporum;” and Bede’s and Ado’s Martyrologies, October 18th. — ED.
- Ft1220** See Regino, and Ado’s Martyrology, Feb. 17; also April 21, where he calls St. Simeon bishop of Seleucia and Ctesiphon, Seleucia being the same as Babylonia. — ED.
- Ft1221** See Ado’s Martyrology, April 22; and supra, p. 177, note 9. — ED.
- Ft1222** See Gallia Christiana. — ED.
- Ft1223** Herman Contract ends the list with the words “Theodorus, cognomento Gregorius, episcopus Ponti.” To these we should prefix “Nazanzo,” from the middle of Foxe’s list; Regino adds “virtutum gloria claret;” i.e. he flourished then at Nazianzum, not suffered: in fact he retired from the persecution. See Baron. Annal. Eccles. an. 253, Section 129. — ED.
- Ft1224** Vincent. lib. 11. c. 52.
- Ft1225** Also Baron Mart. Rom. Junii 3. — ED.
- Ft1226** Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 44. This story is alluded to **infra, vol. 7. p. 662.** — ED.
- Ft1227** Note here the sacrament to be called the Eucharist, and not the body of Christ.
- Ft1228** Haec Dionys. ex Euseb.; whence some expressions in Foxe’s text have been changed. — ED.
- Ft1229** Ex Henr. de Erford.
- Ft1230** S. Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 8. Evaristus and Nicostratus were adherents of Novatian at Rome, and accompanied Novatus on his return from Rome to Carthage. — ED.
- Ft1231** Cyprian. lib. De Mortalitate. [Tract. p. 163. Edit. Oxon, 1682. — ED.]
- ft1232** “Commeatum sibi precabatur.” Commeatus, “a soldier’s furlough,” i.e. here, “leave of longer absence from the Lord.” — ED.
- Ft1233** “Pati timetis, exire non vultis, quid faciam vobis?”
- ft1234** Cyprian. lib. 2. epist. 8.

- Ft1235** Cornelii Epist. ad Fabium; Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43. Both Eusebius and Foxe are slightly inaccurate here: the anti-bishop was Novatian, a priest of Rome, whom Novatus seduced to his party: but the two names are often confounded. See Heinecke, not. in Euseb. lib. 6. 43. — ED.
- Ft1236** As appeareth, lib. 4. epist. 2. “De Simplicitat. Praelat.,” Item, lib. 3. epist. 11, etc.
- ft1237** “Itaque vindex ille evangelii ignoravit unum esse debere episcopum in catholica ecclesia.” Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43.
- Ft1238** Note here the sacrament of the body to be called bread. Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43. Nicephor. lib. 6. cap. 3. — ED.
- Ft1239** [He was bishop of Chichester in the reign of queen Mary; a learned man, and according to Godwin (“De Praesulibus Angliae,” p. 513. edit. Cantab. 1743) “multa Eusebii et Philonis e Graeco in Lat. sermonem fidelissime transtulit.” This may consist with occasional oversights; see the last note of Valois upon Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 10. Baronius, it is stated by Ittigius, has been led into mistakes by his partiality for Christopherson’s translation: “Dum Baronius linguae Graecae minus peritus in annalibus suis (Christoph.) sequitur, haud raro caecus a caeco in erroris foveam abripitur, ut monet Pet. Halloixius Jesuita, tom. 2. Script. orient, p. 730. Fuitque haec versio Baronio tanto gravior, quanto est dogmatibus Romanae ecclesiae accommodatior, quod exemplis nonnullis Dallaeus ‘de usu Patrum,’ cap. 5. p. 124, demonstravit.” Ittigii de biblioth, et catenis Patrum tractatus, (Lips. 1707,)p. 736. — ED.]
- ft1240** Cyprian, lib. 3. epist. 3.
- Ft1241** Lib. 2. epist. 4.
- Ft1242** Bishops were chosen then not without the voice of the people.
- Ft1243** Blondel has quoted refutation sufficient of these tales from Baronius, and to him we may leave it. Epist. Decret. Examen, pp. 310 — 314. — ED.
- Ft1244** Cyprian, lib. 1. epist. 1.
- Ft1245** “Damasus and Sabellicus, his followers” (Foxe means his *copyists*), “affirm,” etc. This statement it appears from Baronius, is not strictly

correct. “Error inde a Scriptoribus sumptus videtur quod passim ferretur Cornelius in persecutione Decii martyrio insignitus; deceptus (quisquis fuerit) auctor ille, dum, quod in *persecutione* Decii factum esset, sub *ipso* Decio contigisse putavit; sicque et quod sub Volusiano gestum esset, sub Decio actitatum, inconsulte correxit.” See “Annales Eccles.” an. 255, Section 55. The story given by Foxe is taken (as he supposes) from Damasus, or Anastasius “De Vitis Rom. Pontiff.” (Mogunt. 1602,) p. 10. In the 12th volume of Mansi’s edition of Baronius, pp. 671, 672, there are some critical remarks upon this compilation, as from the strange inequalities of style noticed by Holstenius, it may well be entitled. The various readings are very numerous: vide Riveti “Critici Sacri,” lib. 3. cap. 14; and Pagi on Baronius, tom. 3. p. 17: Lucae, 1738. — ED.

Ft1246 Civita Vecchia, see supra p. 183, note (3). — ED.

Ft1247 Either clubs loaded with lead, or thongs (see Ducange’s Glossary). Upon the *place* of martyrdom, Basnage (“Annales Politico-Eccles.” tom. 2. p. 368: Roterod. 1706) remarks: — “ Ut autem vera sint, quae de *plumbatis* Cornelii vultui admotis, etc. praedicantur, Romae beato martyri mors afferri debuit.” — ED.

Ft1248 Lib. 2. epist. 5 et 6.

Ft1249 “Videbis cras agonem.”

Ft1250 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 1.

Ft1251 Orosius, lib. 4. cap. 14.

Ft1252 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 21, 22. — ED.

Ft1253 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 21. The men from forty to seventy years of age were called *ὁμογέροντες* at Alexandria, and were registered to receive a public distribution of corn. Vales. and Heinecke. ad locum. — ED.

Ft1254 That is, in the passion of him that died on the tree.

Ft1255 This, and the subsequent extracts from Cyprian’s writings are given more accurately and fully than they appear in Foxe. — ED.

Ft1256 Cyprian, lib. 3. Epist. ult.

Ft1257 Cyprian, lib. 4. epist. 1. [This portion of Cyprian’s writings is, in the earlier editions (namely, that of Antwerp, 1542, and that of Rome, 1563), divided into books. In the former of these (Page 162.) we find

this epistle addressed to Seagrius; but later editions read *Sergius*. — ED.]

**ft1258** Cyprian, lib. 3. epist. 6.

**Ft1259** Lib. 3. epist. 1.

**Ft1260** See Appendix — ED.

**Ft1261** Dist. 81, “ministri.” Also, Labbei Conc. Gen. tom. 1. cols. 721, 725, 727. — ED.

**Ft1262** Basnage is disposed to agree with Eusebius as to the duration of Lucius’ *episcopate*. On the time of his *death* he remarks: “Passum esse IV. Nonas Martii anno 253, probabilius existimamus. In errore versantur Martyrologia, Auctoresque, quibus placet *Lucium* extinctum esse imperante Valeriano, quorum sententiam refellit Dionys. Alexandrinus.” Basnagii “Annales Politico Eccles.” ad an. 252, Section 13. — ED.

**Ft1263** “Hoc ipso anno (260) quarto Nonas Augusti, Stephanus Martyrio coronatur, cum sedisset annos tres, menses tres, et dies viginti-duos.” Pagi assents to the accuracy of this reckoning, with the verification of which we do not trouble the reader: the “Acta passionis Stephani” are printed by Baronius from MSS. Section 3. — ED.

**Ft1264** Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43.

**Ft1265** See Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 43. — ED.

**Ft1266** Euseb. lib. 7. cap. I. — ED.

**Ft1267** Dionysius here states, that there were (and always had been) persons among the Christians, capable by their presence and aspect, by blowing upon, or by speaking, of dissipating the machinations of the demons. — ED.

**Ft1268** Dionys in Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 10, et Niceph. lib. 6. cap. 10. — ED.

**Ft1269** **These two names appear to have been borrowed from the times of Commodus, a.d. 184, when these persons filled the office of Prefects of the Praetorian guards: see Basnage (ut supra) ad an. 184. Section 2. — Ed.** <sup>a77</sup>

**ft1270** Cypr. lib. 4. Epist. 4.

**Ft1271** “Petite et impetrabitis.”

- Ft<sup>1272</sup> Nec venissent fratribus haec mala, si in unum fraternitas fuisset animata.
- Ft<sup>1273</sup> Cypr, lib. 4. Epist. 4.
- Ft<sup>1274</sup> Hostanes, a philosopher belonging to the Eastern Magi, contemporary with Xerxes. Plin. lib. 30. cap. 1. See also Minutius Felix, Section 26. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1275</sup> “Famem majorem facit rapacitas quam siccitas.”
- Ft<sup>1276</sup> Cyprian. “De Vanitate Idolorum,” Section 1, 4. “Ad Demetrianum,” Section 2, 3, 5. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1277</sup> Nearly the whole of the following account of Cyprian is from the Centuriators, Cent. 3. cap. 10, whence several corrections are made in the text. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1278</sup> Our author qualifies this last assertion respecting Cyprian, *infra*, p. 205. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1279</sup> Hieronymi Comment. in Ionam, cap. 3. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1280</sup> “Springal,” a young man, or stripling. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1281</sup> Hieron. “Catal. Script. Eccl.” de Tertull. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1282</sup> *Curubis*: — a city, about ten or twelve leagues from Carthage. Dupin. “Locus exilio destinatus erat *Curubis*, ut testantur Pontius, Acta passionis, et S. Augustinus: erat autem *Curubis* in Zeugitana provincia sub jurisdictione proconsulis posita.” Pagius in Baron. “Annal. Eccles.” an. 260, Section 33; also Tillemont, “Mem. Eccles.” tom. 4. pt. 1. p. 279. edit. 12mo. 1706. Dupin states this second banishment to have been August 30th, 257, and his martyrdom to have happened September 14th, 258. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1283</sup> Hieron. in Catal. Script. Eccles. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1284</sup> Aug. contra Crescon. lib. 2. cap. 32. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1285</sup> John Laziardus Coelestinus lived at the beginning of the 16th century, and wrote “Hist. Univ. Epitome” (Paris, 1521), of no great value. (Vossius.) Upon the “divers books bearing the title of Cyprian,” see Rivet’s “Critic. Sac.” lib. 2. cap. 15; and “Tillemont’s Memoires,” tom. 4. pt. 1, p. 318. — ED.
- Ft<sup>1286</sup> Ex Vincent. lib. 12. cap. 63.

- Ft1287 Ne dormiat in thesauris tuis, quod pauperi prodesse potest.
- Ft1288 Duo nunquam veterascunt in homine: cot semper novas cogitationes machinando: lingua cordis vanas conceptiones proferendo.
- Ft1289 Quod aliquando de necessitate amittendum est, sponte pro divina remuneratione distribuendum est.
- ft1290 Disciplina est morum praesentium ordinata correctio, et malorum praeteritorum regularis observatio.
- Ft1291 Integritas ibi nulla esse potest, ubi, qui improbos damnent, desunt: et soli, qui damnentur, occurrunt.
- Ft1292 Avari ad hoc tantum possident quae habent; — ut ne alteri possidere liceat.
- Ft1293 Sericum et purpuram indutae Christum induere non possunt.
- Ft1294 Foeminae crines suos inficiunt malo praesagio: capillos enim sibi flammeos auspicari non metuunt.
- Ft1295 Qui se pingunt in hoc seculo, aliter quam creavit Deus; metuant, ne cum resurrectionis venerit dies, artifex creaturam suam non recognoscat.
- Ft1296 Qui pauperi eleemosynam dat, Deo suavitatis odorem sacrificat.
- Ft1297 Contemnenda est omnis injuria praesentium malorum, fiducia futurorum bonorum.
- Ft1298 Nihil prodest verbis proferre virtutem, et factis destruere.
- Ft1299 Quo plures domi sunt tibi liberi, hoc plus tibi non recondendum, sed erogandum est, quia multorum jam delicta redimenda sunt, multorum purgandae conscientiae. [Many of these sentences are not verbatim.] — ED.
- Ft1300 Ex Cypr. lib. 4. epist. 2. ‘Quia scriptum est, ‘Eleemosyna ab [omni peccato et] morte liberat,’ Tob. 4., non utique ab illa morte, quam semel Christi sanguis extinxit, et a qua nos salutaris baptismi et Redemptoris nostri gratia liberavit, sed ab ea quae per delicta postmodum serpit,’ etc.
- ft1301 1. Sapiens sine operibus. — 2. Senex sine religione. — 3. Adolescens sine obedientia. — 4. Dives sine eleemosyna. — 5. Foemina sine pudicitia. — 6. Dominus sine virtute. — 7. Christianus contenti osus.

— 8. Pauper superbus. — 9. Rex iniquus. — 10. Episcopus negligens.  
— 11. Plebs sine disciplina. — 12. Populus sine lege.

Ft1302 Ignat. Epist. ad Philippenses. — ED.

Ft1303 A Millenarian; from *Χιλιᾶς* — ED.

Ft1304 Lib. De Habitu Mulierum.

Ft1305 “Unum matrimonium novimus, sicut unum Deum.” Lib. De Monogam.

Ft1306 See Gregorii Nazianz. 18. The history of Cyprian of Antioch is given by Vincentius, Antoninus, Jacobus de Viragine, Henry of Herford, and Volateran: see Centuriators. It does not appear, however, that he was *bishop* Antioch (as Foxe asserts), either from the historians above named, or from the catalogue of bishops of Antioch given in “L Art de Verifier des Dates;” the Centuriators, however, assert it in one place, and Foxe probably derived it thence. Joseph Asseman thinks he was bishop of Damascus. Foxe twice mentions him again as “bishop of Antioch” under the tenth persecution. See supra, p. 199, note (5), and infra, p. 268, note (1), p. 275, note (3).

Ft1307 Dist. 10, “Quoniam.” [This name, and the compilation cited, occur so often, particularly in the earlier pages of this volume, that a short notice of both may not be unsuitable. “Gratianus de Clusio, Tusciae civitate, monachus S. Felicis Bononiensis, ord. S. Benedict. A C. 1151, tempore Eugenii III. papae, in illo monasterio absolvit opus jam ab anno 1127 caeptum, quod Innocentius III. ‘corpus Decretorum’ vocat, auctor ipse ‘Concordantiam discordantium Canonum’ inscripsit. Dividitur illud in *Distinctiones* 101 (quarum singulae suis iterum distinguuntur capitulis) et *Causas* 36 (quae suis iterum *Questionibus*, quaestiones capitulis subdividuntur) et traetationem ‘de Consecratione,’ quinque distinctionibus absolutam.” See “Fabricii Biblioth. mediae Latinitat.” lib. 7. vol 3. p. 82, edit. Patavii, 1754.] — ED.

Ft1308 Haec Glossa.

Ft1309 “In MSS. omnibus, excepto undecimo Vaticano, abest dictio *Imperatori*, quemadmodum et apud Ivonem. Nonum autem habet *Juliano episcopo*: aliud pervetustum Jubiano.” See “Corr. B, Rom.” in loc. p. 9, edit. Paris, 1687. — ED.

- Ft1310** Ex Ambros. lib. 1. offic. cap. 41; et ex Prudentio. lib. "De Coronis."
- Ft1311** Some say that this tyrant was Decius the emperor, but that cannot be, except Gallien or some other judge was now called by the name of Decius. "Turpiter errat Ado in Martyrologio, qui et Sixtum et Laurentium passos esse tradit, *sub Decio Imper. Valeriano Praefecto.*" See Basnagii "Annales Politico-Eccles." ad an. 258, Section 9. — ED.
- Ft1312** Henr. de Erfordia.
- Ft1313** Lib. 7. cap. 11. — ED.
- Ft1314** This is said in reference to a charge of Germanus against Dionysius. — ED.
- Ft1315** Ex Dionysii Epist. ad Germanum, apud Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 11. — ED.
- Ft1316** The events here referred to are stated supra, p. 180. — ED.
- Ft1317** Probably the plague mentioned supra, p. 190, 191, 196. — ED.
- Ft1318** Ex Dionysii Epist. ad Domitium et Didymum, apud Euseb. *ibid.* Valesius and Dupin consider this epistle as relating wholly to the Decian persecution. — ED.
- Ft1319** Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 12. — ED.
- Ft1320** Rather, "Historical Mirror." *Speculum Historiale Vincentii*, lib. 11. cap. 83. — ED.
- Ft1321** Vincent. (*Ibid.* — ED.) Erford.
- Ft1322** *Ibid.*
- ft1323** Foxe, missing Vincentius's meaning, says "Italy." This town, now in ruins, was near Nice. See Tillemont's "Mem. Eccles." tom. 4. pt. 1, p. 26. It is perhaps the modern Cimies, which has formed the scene of one of Mrs. Sherwood's instructive narratives. — ED.
- Ft1324** Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 78, 79. See also *infra*, pp. 215, 216. — ED.
- Ft1325** *Ibid.* cap. 83.
- Ft1326** Bergomen. lib. 8. Erford, lib. 6. cap. 17. — ED.
- Ft1327** Baronius agrees with Foxe in the succession, excluding only Philip. Vid. "Annal. Eccles." ad an. 266, Section 12; and an. 285, Section 15. — ED.
- Ft1328** Ex Antonin. tit. 7. cap. 6. Section 12. — ED.

- Ft1329** Foxe by mistake says “Hierapolis,” but Antoninus, and Baron. Annal. Eccles. ad an. 188, Section 2, say “Heliopolis:” he was really bishop of Tarsus, see p. 214. — ED.
- Ft1330** Vincent. lib. 11. cap. 76, 77. Anton. Bergom. Ado. [Foxe has done well in leaving the reader to believe as much as he thinks proper of these narratives. See “Tillemont’s Memoires,” tom. 4. pt. 1, pp 20 and 329, edit. 12mo. 1706. — ED.]
- ft1331** Ex Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 5. — ED.
- Ft1332** Cent, Magd. cent. 3. cap. 10. — ED.
- Ft1333** **Ex Isuardo, [or “Usuardus,” a monk of Fulde, of the Benedictine order. Charlemagne instructed him to draw up a Martyrology, which exists, says Vossius (De Hist. Lat. p. 295), “non exiguo sane historiae Ecclesiasticae bono.” There are editions of Louvain 1568, of Antwerp 1714, and of Paris 1718. “Martyrologium Usuardi, Monachi Paris., prodiit Lovanii 1568, item 1573 — recusum delude cum annotatt. et addit. Joh. Molani, Antv. 1583. Verum in edit. Ant. 1583, ommissa sunt ea, quae Pontificiis in priori minus placebant.” N.P. Sibbern schediasma de libris Latinorum eccles. Viteb. 1706, p. 101. — Ed.]<sup>a87</sup>**
- ft1334** Aurelius Prudentius, Ado, Equilinus.
- Ft1335** Pollio, Section 5. — ED.
- Ft1336** Also Lactantius, “De Mort. Persecut.” cap. 5. — ED.
- Ft1337** Epitome, cap. 32, Section 5. — ED.
- Ft1338** “Sed et tu, Valeriane, quoniam eandem homicidiorum saevitiam erga subditos Dei exercuisti, justum Dei iudicium declarasti, dum captivus ac vinctus una cum ipsa purpura ac reliquo imperatorio ornatu abductus ac tandem a Sapore Persarum rege excoriari iussus saeque conditus, perpetuum infelicitatis tuae trophaeum erexisti,” etc. Ex Euseb in Sermone ad Conventum sanctorum, cap. 24. — ED.
- Ft1339** Tillemont takes the same view as Foxe, “Memoires,” tom. 4. pt. 1, pp. 39 — 41. — ED.
- Ft1340** Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 13. — ED.
- Ft1341** Ἀποξωρήσωσι, *i.e.* desist from molesting. — ED.

- Ft1342 *i.e.* the burial grounds. — ED.
- Ft1343 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 15. — ED.
- Ft1344 Otherwise called “Theoctistus.” Ibid. cap. 5. — ED.
- Ft1345 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 15. — ED.
- Ft1346 Ibid. cap. 16. — ED.
- Ft1347 Ibid. cap. 17. — ED.
- Ft1348 Ibid. cap. 18. — ED.
- Ft1349 See Pagi, Crit. in Baron. Ann. Eccl., ad an. 272, Section 8. — ED.
- Ft1350 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 30. — ED.
- Ft1351 Oros. lib. 7. c. 23, 27. See Appendix. — ED.
- Ft1352 Ex Eutropio et Victore, cap. 36. — ED.
- Ft1353 Ἐν τῇ κατ’ Ἀλεξάνδρειαν τοῦ Πυρουχείου πολιορκίᾳ. Euseb. Foxe had misunderstood Πυρουχείου to be the name of the Roman general. Pyrchium still remains in the text of Eusebius; but Valesius has shown from Ammianus Marcellinus (lib. 22) and the chronicle of Eusebius, etc. that *Pruchium* is the correct reading. Ὡκει δὲ τῷ Προυχίῳ περὶ τὸν δρόμον, ἐν τόπῳ οὕτῳ καλουμένῳ περὶ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν. Apollonii Dyscoli Vita, quoted by Vales. in Euseb. 7. 32. — ED.
- Ft1354 Euseb. lib. 7. cap. 32. — ED.
- Ft1355 Eutrop. [lib. 9. Section 11.] — ED.
- Ft1356 Ex editione Frobeniana. It bears the title “Eutropii insigne volumen, quo Rom. historia universa describitur ex divers. auc. etc. collecta, edente Sigis. Gelenio;” Basileae, 1532; and again in 1569: and Foxe might easily discover in *it*, what was not supplied by other and more genuine editions, this of Frobenius being the History of Eutropius as interpolated by Paul, deacon of Aquileia (who lived at the end of the eighth century), and is entitled “Historia Miscella; quae Eutropii historiam (says Tzschucke, his last editor) non solum iisdem verbis, etsi alia multa assuat vel intertextat, reddit, sed et ab initio auget et ad ulteriora tempora prosequitur. — Decuplo major exhibetur Eutropius in edit. Basil, 1532.” This will satisfactorily account for Foxe’s discovery. — ED.

**Ft1357** Ex Chroni. Urspergen. [Eutrop. lib. 9. Section 5. — ED]

**ft1358** Euseb. lib. 8. cap. 1. — ED.

### THE TENTH PERSECUTION

**ft1359** Psalm 89:39, etc. These passages are translated exactly from Eusebtus's text. — ED.

**Ft1360** Eutrop. lib. 9 sect. 16; Vopisc. Namer. sect. 13, 15. — ED.

**Ft1361** Vopiscus, vita Numeriani, whence Foxe's text has been a little altered. — ED.

**Ft1362** This is a disputed point. "Helenam mulierem vilissimam, Duciae Nayso, ut conjectura est, ortam, vel uxorem habuit, vel concubinam. Qua de re variant auctores." Basnagii Annales Historico-Polit, ad an. 292, sect. 3; who gives references to Zosimus, lib. it. cap. 8, Aurelius Victor; Stephanus De Urbibus, etc. — ED.

**Ft1363** Eusebius, in his Chronicle, also says "March," "in diebus Paschae;" but in the history of the Martyrs of Palestine, he says it was in April. Lactantius states, that the destruction of the churches and the burning of the Scriptures began February 23, being the Roman Terminalia; and that next day the edict was published for depriving Christians of office. {"De Mort.Persec." cap. 13.) Easter day fell in A.D. 303 on April 18. — ED.

**Ft1364** Eusebius lib. 8, cap. 2, whence several corrections have been made in the text; also Basnagii annales ad an. 303, sect. 5, and Lactant. de M.P. sect. 12. — ED.

**Ft1365** Ibid. cap. 2, 3. Nicephorus, lib. 7, cap. 3, 4. Zonaras, tom. 2. — ED.

**Ft1366** Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 5. See infra, p. 232. — ED.

**Ft1367** **Στρατοπεδάρχης**, Eusebius; who in his Chronicle says that this man's name was Veturius. Foxe renders the word "Marshal of the field," but see infra, p. 241, note (3.) — ED.

**Ft1368** Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 4. — ED.

**ft1369** Ibid. cap. 6. — ED.

**ft1370** Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 7. — ED.

- Ft1371 The mines of Phaeno were near Petra in Idumea. Hoffman's Lex. — ED.
- ft1372 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 13. — ED.
- ft1373 "De Martyr. Palaestin." cap. 11. — ED.
- ft1374 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 12. — ED.
- ft1375 The "Acta Proconsularia," first printed by Baronius (an. 290, sect. 2), respecting these martyrs, are better authority. — ED.
- Ft1376 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 12. — ED.
- Ft1377 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 6. — ED.
- Ft1378 Ibid. cap. 6, 13. — ED.
- Ft1379 Cited by the Magdeburg Centuriators (cent. 4. cap. 3); and again (cap. 13), somewhat disparagingly, as author of "De Floribus Temporum." He was named "Gigas," no doubt, to distinguish him from Herman, "Contract." — ED.
- Ft1380 A very doubtful story, unless, according to Tillemont (Memoires, tom. 4 pt. 3, p. 1361), Prisca, the queen, is meant: still she is not considered a martyr. This subject is discussed in Cuper's Notes on "Lactantius, De Morte Persecut." cap. 50. Basnage considers that the work of Lactantius, "De Morte Persecutorum," has, both in this and several other instances, supplied much better than the current information: "Serenam Augustam Caesarum throno pellit (Lactant.), ut in eo Priscam, veram Diocletiani conjugem, collocet." "Annales Politico-Eccles." ad an. 303, sect. 10. — ED.
- Ft1381 The place is supplied from the Martyrologies. — ED.
- Ft1382 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1383 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 6. Nicephorus says **δισμυρίους**, 20,000, which seems enormous. — ED.
- Ft1384 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 12. — ED.
- Ft1385 **Στρατηγός** sheriff. See infra, p. 241, note (3). — ED.
- Ft1386 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 11. What Foxe adds about the bishops of Meletina is a misconception of Eusebius's meaning. — ED.

- Ft1387 The district seems to be called Orbaliaena. Compare” Martyrol. Rom.” by Baronius, p. 544 (Antverpiae, 1589), and Tillemont, “Mem. Eccles.” tom. 5 pt. 1, pp. 280, 281. — ED.
- Ft1388 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1389 Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 77. — ED.
- Ft1390 A city near the Mendesian, or Western, mouth of the Nile. — ED.
- Ft1391 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 13. — ED.
- Ft1392 The following quotation from Basnage’s “Annales Politico-Eccles.” (ad an. 301, sect. 4) has corrected several mistakes in the text. “Harum Legionum unam, quae tota Christianorum erst, in auxilium Maximiano ab Orientis pattibus accitam venisse fertur. Eorum natale Sept. XXII illigatur. Seduni in Gallia in loco Agauno, natalis SS. Mart. Thebaeorum, Mauritiï,” etc. Foxe mentions these martyrs again infra, p. 234, more at large. — ED.
- Ft1393 Vincentius in Speculo, lib. 12 cap. 2. — ED.
- Ft1394 Vincentins in Speculo, lib. 12 cap. 50. — ED.
- Ft1395 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 6.
- Ft1396 “Lesbos” is introduced from the Centuriators, who refer to Sabellicus, Ennead, 7 lib. 8. See also Baron. Martyrol. April 5th. This entire sentence is from the Centuriators. — ED.
- Ft1397 So say the Centuriators, without naming the Chronicle: Foxe adds “Martini,” but Martin is silent on the subject. Foxe alters Samos into: “Sammium.” The Chronicles of Regino and Herman Contract both mention “Sirmium,” which perhaps misled him. See Bar. Mart. Feb. 23. — ED.
- Ft1398 Henr. de Errordia. See Baron. Martyrol. Feb. 21st. — ED.
- Ft1399 Tillemont, Mem. tom. 5 pt. 2, p. 220. — ED.
- Ft1400 Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 49. — ED.
- Ft1401 Ibid. cap. 58. — ED.
- Ft1402 Basnagii Annales, ad an. 303, sect. 15. — ED.
- Ft1403 Basnage has produced evidence to the contrary. “Purum commentum esse, quae Baluzius habet de multis Christianis in Gallia ethnico furore caesis) indicio est veterum silentium.” Ad an. 303, sect. 17. — ED.

- Ft1404** Antonin. et Vincent, lib. 12 cap. 7. Foxe (copying the Centuriators) says Victor suffered at Milan. Vincent mentions two martyrs of that name, one at Milan, the other at Marseilles (loco citato) the latter of whom should here be mentioned, as our author is speaking of French martyrs. — ED.
- Ft1405** Ib. cap. 136.
- Ft1406** Ibidem. Vincentins (lib. 10 cap. 25) places the martyrdom of Lucian of Beauvais under Decius; and he only refers here to his former preaching, as one cause of there being now so many excellent Christians in those parts. — ED.
- Ft1407** Regino, Abbas Prumiensis, floruit circa A.D. 904—chronicon condidit a nativitate Christi ad an. 908, quod primus luci exposnit Seb. de Rotenhan, Maguntiae, 1521. “Hallervord de Hist. Lat. in Supplem. ad Vossium,” (Hamb. 1709,) p. 779. It was afterwards reprinted with Lainbert of Aschaffenburg at Frankfort, 1566. — ED.
- Ft1408** Baron. Martyrol. Oct. 27th. — ED.
- Ft1409** Baron. Ann. 303, sect. 139. — ED.
- Ft1410** Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 123, 124, 129, 130, 134. — ED.
- Ft1411** Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 136. — ED.
- Ft1412** Chron. Regin. — ED.
- Ft1413** Polonus, col. 66, edit. Basileae, 159. Martin Strempus was made grand penitentiary by pope Nicolaus III. in 1277, and soon after archbishop of Gnesen in Poland. “Nihil celebrius ejus chronico” are the words of Fabricius (Biblioth. med. et inf. Lat. tom. 5 p. 42, edit, 1754). An accurate edition was published, Colonaie, 1616. — ED.
- Ft1414** “The Nosegay of Time,” by which is meant the “Fasciculus Temporum,” written by Wernerus Rolwink, and of which the editions in the fifteenth century are numerous; in a copy before us (fol. 47), “in Anglia pene tota fides extincta est hoc tempore a Maximiano.” — ED.
- Ft1415** Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 3-6. — ED.
- Ft1416** Ibid. cap. 7, 8. — ED.
- Ft1417** Ibid. cap. 9. — ED.
- Ft1418** Ibid. cap. 12. See the Centuriators, whom Foxe copies. — ED.

- Ft1419 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 10.
- Ft1420 “Pelle nudatus.” Sabell. et Plat. — ED.
- Ft1421 Sabellic. Ennead. 7 lib. 8. See supra, p. 226. — ED.
- Ft1422 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 3. — ED.
- Ft1423 Socrates, lib. 1 cap. 6. — ED.
- Ft1424 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 9. — ED.
- Ft1425 “At Cologne the walls of St. Gereon are to be seen full of the bones of the martyred Roman legion.” Christian Observer. 1840, p. 29. And yet, notwithstanding the use which is made of cathedrals on the continent, in upholding superstition, and making money thereby, we have writers in protestant publications in England rejoicing that the cathedral at Cologne is being now completed according to the original design, apparently just because it is a *cathedral!*—a place too where, we presume, the three kings (so called) are still exhibited! — ED.
- Ft1426 “Rem quod attinet, Mauritio, Exuperio, Candido, Victori martyrii quidem laudem non invidemus, cum cruentis edictis Diocletiani compluribus de militum grege lucem ereptam fuisse non ignoremus. Quod veto tota legio et Christianis constiterit et Martyribus, ut ex 6666 militibus nullus pusillanimus fuerit, omnesque intrepide sanguinem pro Christo fuderint, vix habet fidem. Multos Maximiani Diocletianique in exercitu Christianos militasse scimus, at variis in legionibus dispersos, non vero in una legione collocatos. Neque probabiliem adhuc causam invenimus, cur sex mille sexcentique Christiani uni eidemque legioni includerentur. Dubitationem adjuvat, quod de tanto numero ne vel unus quidem a certamine sese segregarit.” See “Basnagii, Annales Politico-Eccles.” ad an. 301, sect. 6, who then adduces a variety of other objections from the omission of any mention of this slaughter by former and older historians, the anachronisms of the story, etc.; tom. 2: — ED.
- Ft1427 **Lib. 3 cap. 45. A few lines from the Acta quoted by Baronius will explain, and in a measure rectify, this strange statement of Otho’s: “Haec dum agerentur, cohors ilia, quae beatum Victoem comitabatur, ad locum cui destinata est properaris pervenit ad oppidum Francorum, quod ex majorum suorum aedibus Trojam**

**nuncupabant.” Baronii “Annales Eccles.” an. 297, sect. 21. — ED.**  
a98

- ft1428 As there is no necessity for Foxe (according to the silly notion of some erudite scribblers) to Rake martyrs, it may be here remarked that this account of the martyrs of the Theban legion has excited much controversy. See “Moshemii de rebus Christtanorum ante Constantinum Commen-tarii” (Helmsradii, 1753), pp. 566-570; or, translated by Vidal (Lond. 1835), vol. 3 pp. 190-195. — ED.
- Ft1429 The supposed body of this captain was made an object of devotion, it appears, at Turin, so ate as the beginning of the 18th century. “Dici vix potest quantus cultus fabulosis hisce Sanctis Augustae Taurinorum hodienu[m] tribuatur, tum a plebe, tum ab Aula magistratuque, eo imprimis tempore, ex quo Car. Emanuel I. Sabaudiae Dux, cadaver Mauritii, qui legioni Thebaeae praefuisse creditur, Augustam Taurinorum perferri curavit. Conf. Act. Erudit. Lips. 1706, p. 308.” Dey-lingii “Observatt. Saer. pars prima,” Lipsiae. 1735, p. 146.
- Ft1430 Martigny in the Valais. — ED.
- Ft1431 S. Mauritz in Switzerland. Hoffman’s Lex. — ED.
- Ft1432 See Tillemont, 4:2. p. 834. — ED.
- Ft1433 From Ado’s Martyrology, Sep. 22. — ED
- ft1434 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 16. — ED.
- Ft1435 Ib. cap. 17. — ED.
- Ft1436 This event, according to later chronologers, should be dated 305; under which year, however, Marianus Scotus had already placed it. See more in the Appendix. — ED.
- Ft1437 “Errore Graecis auctt. familiari Maximinus loco Maximiani scribitur. See more in Pagi, ad an. 304, p. 379, tom. 3 edit. Lucae, 1738. — ED.
- Ft1438 Foxe has followed the Magdeburg Centuriators, apparently (Cent. 4 c. 3, col. 23, edit. 1624); but: the original is rather vague in its phraseology. — ED.
- Ft1439 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 13. — ED.
- Ft1440 Sozomen, lib. 1 cap. 6. — ED.

- Ft1441 Eusebius de Vita Constant. lib. 1 cap. 15, 16. Sozomen lib. 1 cap. 6. — ED.
- Ft1442 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1443 Id. lib. 9 cap. 11. These were ministers of Maximin, not of Maximian. — ED.
- Ft1444 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 16. — ED.
- Ft1445 Ib. cap. 17. The above is a new translation. — ED.
- Ft1446 **Λογισταὶ**, receivers-general. — ED.
- Ft1447 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 1. A new translation. — ED.
- Ft1448 Ibid.
- ft1449 Id. lib. 1 cap. 9; lib. 9 cap. 4. — ED.
- Ft1450 **Στρατοπεδάρχης**, Eusebius “the lieutenant.” The chief magistrates in the emperor’s provinces exercised both the civil and military functions (see Adam’s Romans Ant.), and bore military titles. The “magistrates” at Alexandria, mentioned supra, p. 210, also 240, are called: **Στρατήγοι** in the Greek, and answered to our “sheriffs.” (See Valesius’s notes on that passage.) It is evident, however, that the chief magistrate of the province, or “lieutenant,” is here meant. See infra, p. 256, note 1. — ED.
- Ft1451 Eusebius lib. 9 cap 5,7 . — ED.
- Ft1452 “Crediderunt veteres certis diebus deos in quasdam urbes ipsi acceptas commeare, casque **ἐπιδημίας θεῶν** appellabant. Sic apud Delios et Milesios adventus Apollinis colebatur, apud Argivos Dianae, ut scribit Menander Rhetor in cap. de hymnis **ἀποπεμπτικοῖς**” Vales. not. in Eusebius 9:7, ubi plura. Something of this kind seems to be meant by Callimachus; (hym. in Apol. 9) **Ὠπόλλων οὐ παντὶ φαίνεται, ἀλλ’ ὅτις ἔσθλός.**—ED.
- Ft1453 The like argument of weather and corn, and plenty, made the unfaithful Jews, and also makes now our faithless Papists.
- Ft1454 Eusebius lib. 9 cap.7, whence the above translation is made. — ED.
- ft1455 Ibid. cap. 6, 7. — ED.
- ft1456 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 44. — ED.

- ft1457 See Mart. Rein., by Baronins, p. 267, edit. 1589. — ED.
- ft1458 Chron. Eusebius. — ED.
- ft1459 The following list is somewhat corrected. It is taken from various chronicles, “Fasciculi temporum,” (Cent. Magd.) See supra, p. 183, note 6. — ED.
- ft1460 See Baron. an. 310, sect. 24. — ED.
- ft1461 Spanheim has examined her history, which must rank, apparently, amongst the fabulous: ‘Hist. Christ, saec.’ 4, col. 819. — ED.
- ft1462 See Appendix. — ED.
- ft1463 Tillemont’s Memoires, tom. 5 pt. 1 p. 253. — ED.
- ft1464 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 14, and “De Laudibus Const.” cap. 7. — ED.
- ft1465 See Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 6. — ED.
- ft1466 Eusebius, lib. 9 cap. 8. The medimnus, or measure, contained six modii, or a little more than six pecks. Four Attic drachms were equal to about half-a-crown. — ED.
- ft1467 “Let your light so shine among men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.”
- ft1468 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 8; whence a few expressions in the text have been changed. — ED.
- ft1469 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 14. “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap 33-36. — ED.
- ft1470 Laetus expressly states, that the husband, for fear of being put to death, consented that his wife should be carried off. Eusebius makes the same statement, and also that he was prefect of Rome at the time. (Hist. lib. 8 cap. 14. Vit. Const. lib. 1 cap. 34.) Ruffinus says her name was Sophronia. — ED.
- ft1471 Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 14. — ED.
- ft1472 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 9. “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap. 26, 37. — ED.
- ft1473 Ἐπισημασθῆναι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἡμέρας ἀποκλινοῦσης (Eusebius “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap. 28): literally, “About the meridian hours of the sun, when the day was now declining.” Valesius supposes the event to have happened about three o’clock in the afternoon; and Lactantius (“De Morte Persec.”cap. 44) states it to have been October 27th, the anniversary of Maxentius’s

accession, which took place six years before, October 27th, A.D. 306. See Pagii Crit. in Baron. Ann. ad A.D. 306 et A.D. 312. — ED.

- ft1474 Eusebius “de Vita Constant.” lib. 1 cap. 28; Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 29; Eutrop. lib. 11; Sozom. lib. 1 cap. 3; Socrat. lib. 1 cap. 2; Urspergensis Chronic.; Paul. Diacon. lib. 11. — ED.
- ft1475 Eusebius “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap. 28, 29. — ED.
- ft1476 Eusebius “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap. 30. — ED.
- ft1477 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 9. “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 38. — ED.
- ft1478 “Hoc salutari signo, veraci fortitudinis indicio, civitatem nostrum jugo tyranni ereptam liberavi.” Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 9. “De Vita Const.” lib. 1 cap. 39, 40. — ED.
- ft1479 Note well these thousand years, and then read the twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse, “Satan was bound up for a thousand years,” etc.

### THE COPY OF THE IMPERIAL CONSTITUTION

- ft1480 This constitution, with the exception of the opening clause, is found in the original Latin, in Lactantius, “De Mort. Persecut.” cap. 48, which was first published by Baluze, in his “Miscellanea:” tom. 2 Paris, 1679. its publication is there stated to have taken place “die Iduum Juniarum Const atque Licin. ter consuiibus,” i.e. June 13, A.D. 313.
- Ft1481 Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 5. The following is a new translation. — ED.
- ft1482 Toward the close of A.D. 312. Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 9. — ED.
- ft1483 A town in Dalmatia, Dioclesian’s birth-place, near the modern Spalatro. — ED.
- Ft1484 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 9. — ED.
- ft1485 The following is a new translation. — ED.
- ft1486 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 10. — ED.
- ft1487 Eutropius, Laetus, Egnatius; Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 13.
- ft1488 Eusebius lib. 9 cap. 9. — ED.
- ft1489 Τοὺς κατὰ πόλιν ατρατιώτας ἐκκρινέσθαι καὶ ἀποβαλλέσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς τιμῆς ἀξιώματος, Eusebius “yeomen of the guard.” Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 8, and “De Vit. Const.” lib. 1 cap. 54. — ED.

- ft1490 Eusebius ibidem, and “De Vita Const.” lib. 1[cap. 51, 53, 54. — ED.]
- ft1491 Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 8. “De Vit. Const.” lib. 2 cap. 1, 2. Sozomen. lib. 1 cap. 7. — ED.
- ft1492 Eusebius “De Vita Constantini,” lib. 1 cap. 55.
- ft1493 Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 8.
- Ft1494 See Baron. on the Mart. Romans Nov. 9. — ED.
- ft1495 He was called “the Apostle of Armenia,” and “the Enlightener.” — ED.
- Ft1496 **Τῶν ἐκείνου ὑπασπιστῶν**, Niceph. Foxe renders the word “sheriff;” but Nicephorus calls Lysias (supra, p. 229) **ὁ τῆς ἕως ἡγεμὼν**, “governor or lieutenant in the East ;” and represents Agricolaus as executing the same functions as Lysias in a different city; and here he designates them by the same term. See supra, p. 241, note (3) and infra, p. 265, note (I). — ED.
- Ft1497 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 44; lib. 8 cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1498 Lib. 9 cap. 2. — ED.
- Ft1499 See Appendix.
- Ft1500 “Eliso et fracto superbissimo gutture, vitam detestabilem turpi et ignominiosa morte finivit; (Lact. de morte Persecut. cap. 30) idque Massiliae, ut Eusebius in Chronico, Victor in Epitome, et Orosius in Historia docent.” Paggi crit. in Baron. an. 307. sect. 10. — ED.

## MARTYRS OF THE TENTH PERSECUTION

- ft1501 Foxe had good ground for doubting this portion of St. Alban’s history. “Hieronymus (epist 128, ad Fab.) et Eucherius (Instruct. lib. 2. c. 10) Ephod indumentum Sacerdotale ita describentes. ut in modum caracalloe fuisse dicant, sed sine cucullo, caracallas fuisse paenulas cucullatas satis indicant: indeque diminutivum **Καρακάλλιον** in Glossario Graeo-latino, Cyrillo ascripto, Cuculla exponitur. Sed amphibali vocabulum (quod huic ipsi vestimento magis quam illius possessori convenire, suo loco sumus ostensuri) ex Britannica Galfridi Monemuthensis historia (lib. 5 c. 5) acceptum esse, ne ipsi quidem monachi dissimulant.” (Usher, Britt. Ecclesiastes Antiq. p. 78, edit. Lond. 1687) “Amphibalum vestis externae genus esse quoddam, qua

clerici et monachi olim utebantur, ex Sulpicio Severo in vita Martini et Remigio Remensi episcopo in Testamento suo et Adamnano in vita Columbae manifeste deprehenditur. Ut ex minus intellecto Gildae loco, et Amphibali martyris nomen a Galfrido primum effictum, et Wintoniensi ecclesiae deinde affictum fuisse, aliqua fortasse hinc commoveri possit suspicio.” Id. ib. p. 281. See also Fuller’s Church History., century 4, sect. 6. — ED.

- Ft1502 In the portions quoted from Prudentius in this narrative, Foxe has often altered the descriptive form into the direct. It is also much abridged. — ED.
- Ft1503 Prudentius, 5:460. — ED.
- Ft1504 Prudentius, 5:562. — ED.
- Ft1505 Ib. 5:663. — ED.
- Ft1506 See Prudentius, 5:810. — ED.
- Ft1507 Prudentius, 5:833. See infra, p. 270, note 1. — ED.
- Ft1508 These verses are rather an inadequate representation of vv. 839, 840; which are themselves a version of Psalm cxvi. 14—16.  
*“Pretiosa sancti mors sub aspectu Dei,  
 Tuus ille servus, proles ancillae tuae.”*
- Ft1509 Prudentius, in Hymnis [10] de Coronis Martyrum. [Eusebius de Mart. Pal. cap. 2. — ED.]
- ft1510 Ex Basil. in Sermone in Gordium militem Caesariensem, [whence a few expressions are corrected. — ED.]
- ft1511 Simeon Metaphrast. [apud Surium] tom. 5.
- Ft1512 Ex Basil. in Serm. de 40 Martyribus. — ED.
- Ft1513 Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 44. Sozom. lib. 9 cap, 2. — ED.
- Ft1514 Tillemont, tom. 5 part 3, p. 158. — ED.
- Ft1515 This history writeth Simeon Metaphrastes.
- Ft1516 “Primae cohortis,” by which seems meant the “Praetoria cohors,” or life-guards. — ED.
- Ft1517 Ambros. in Exhortatione ad Virgines.

- Ft1518** So says Prudentius, who perhaps uses it poetice for “deacon,” as Ado terms him. — ED.
- Ft1519** See Baronius’s and Ado’s Martyrologies, Jan. 22d. Another Vincentius, a Levite, is commemorated in the Martyrologies, June 9th, as having suffered at Agen in France. — ED.
- Ft1520** Prud. “De Coronis,” Hymn 4 v. 97, 90. 5 v. 30, 40. — ED.
- Ft1521** Ex August. in Sermone [in Append. tom. 5 col. 315]. — ED.
- Ft1522** Eusebius lib. 8 cap. 9; Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 9.
- Ft1523** **Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 15.** <sup>a106</sup>
- ft1524** Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 15.
- Ft1525** Bergom. Supplem. lib. 8:
- ft1526** Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 93.
- Ft1527** Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 5.
- Ft1528** Petr. De Natal. lib. 9 cap. 49.
- Ft1529** It is doubtful whether there were ever such martyrs. See Basnagii Annal. ad an. 293, sect. 2. — ED.
- Ft1530** This name is spelt sometimes “Gallenicus ;” but see Baronius’s Note on Jan. 28. “Mart. Rom.” p. 53, Antverp. 1589. — ED.
- Ft1531** Vincent. lib. 12 cap. 120-122.
- Ft1532** Tillemont, tom. 5:pt. I; Mart. Romans a Baronio, April 26). — ED.
- Ft1533** Sabel. Ennead, 7 lib. 8.
- Ft1534** It is difficult to say over what place he presided, but certainly not in Apulia. See Tillemont, “Memoires Eccles.” tom. 5:pt. 2:p. 360, edit. in 12too, 1707. His episcopate seems to have been Thibara, or Tizzaca, in Africa: see note in Baron. Martyrol. Oct. 24th). — ED.
- Ft1535** This name is sometimes read, Audactus, and Audax). — ED.
- Ft1536** A different place, Aquileia, is assigned as the place of these martyrdoms by Baronins (ad an. 303, sect. 123), and the same may be remarked of many preceding). — ED.
- Ft1537** Bergom. lib. 8 [p. 176, Ed. Brixiae, 1485). — ED.]

- ft1538 Ex Aurel. Prudent. lib. "De Coron." [hymn 9. This story has been translated rather paraphrastically: there is nothing in the original answering to the second stanza). — ED.]
- ft1539 Forum Cornelii, hodie, Imola). — ED.
- Ft1540 "AEdituus consultus, ait," is the original). — ED.
- Ft1541 There is nothing in the original answering to this. Londin. Valpy, tom. 1 p. 298). — ED.
- Ft1542 The same remark applies to this and the preceding line; from line 70 to 76, and 96 and 97. — ED.
- Ft1543 There is an allusion here in the original (not sufficiently retained perhaps in the translation) to the shape of the stylus, or ancient pen, one end of which was sharp, the other flattened, to smooth the wax if needful. See Adam's Roman Antiquities, by Boyd, p. 440. — ED.
- Ft1544 It may be proper here to add a remark from Rivet. "Poetis in more positum est, quid versus potius, quam pietas postulat, saepe considerare, et elegantias poeticas multo magis, quam accuratam Scripturarum disciplinam consecrari. Id cum ad *Prudentii* nonnulla dicta respondisset Campiano doctiss. Whittakerus, [ad rat. Campiani reports, x.] quid? air Duraeus, *quia Poeta fuit, se esse Christianum oblitus est?* Id quaerat a suo Bellarmino, qui lib. 2:de Purgat. cap. 18, respondens ad argumentum, quo ex Prudentio objiciebatur, *esse sub Styge ferias spiritibus nocentibus*, 'nihil' (inquit) 'aliud dico, nisi more poerico lusisse Prudentium.'" Tract. de Patrum Autori. cap. 11, sect. 3, prefixed to his Criticus Sacer. This remark may be extended to the practice of praying to the departed saints, of which there are, as it will be perceived, some traces both in this hymn and the hymn upon Romanus (v. 833, supra, p. 262). Cellarius pointed out these and other deviations from sound doctrine, in his edition of Prudentius (Halae Sax. 1703); and various similar passages are collected by Chemnitz (Exam. Conc. Trid. pars 3, he. 4, de Invoc. Sanct. sect. 57). See also Forbesii Instruct. Historico-Theol. lib. 7 c. 5, sect. 11. Some portions of these verses, particularly the closing stanzas, are not precisely as Foxe gave them, but are made to accord with the original. — ED
- ft1545 Ex Aurel. Prudentio, lib. "De Coronis." [Hymn, 3.]
- ft1546 Foxc's text has been corrected here. — ED.

- Ft1547 Ex Pruden. etc.
- ft1548 “Greese,” a stair or step. — ED.
- Ft1549 Ex Pruden. Lib. de Coronis, [hymn 14.]
- ft1550 Petrus de Natalibus, lib. 10.
- Ft1551 See Appendix.
- Ft1552 Anton. tit. 8 capit. I sect. 38. — ED.
- Ft1553 Ex Basil. in Ser.
- Ft1554 Metaph. *ibid.*
- ft1555 See *supra*, p. 205, note (1). According to Dowling’s “Notitia Scriptorum SS. Patrum. Oxon. 1839,” p. 217, the works of Cyprian of Antioch are included in Francis Oberthurs “SS. Patrum Latinorum opera omnia, Wirceburgi 1780-91;” but see Basnage, *an.* 248, sect. 7. — ED.
- Ft1556 Eusebius de Mart. Pal. cap. 3. — ED.
- Ft1557 Platin. in Vita Carl; [but Agatha suffered under Decius: see Mart. Romans Feb. 5. — ED.]
- ft1558 St. Dionysius, St. Felix, and St. Eutychian, intervened. — ED.
- Ft1559 Ex lib. Concilior. et Platina.
- Ft1560 This story is taken from the “Pontificale” of Damasus, and is, in Basnage’s opinion (*Annales*, ad *an.* 308, sect. 5,) fabulous. His main objection is that the episcopate of Marcellus is thus made to occupy five years, whereas he sat but one year, seven months, and twenty days. — ED.
- Ft1561 Eusebius in Chron. “Mira confusio” (remarks Pagi) “ut animadvertit Constantius, p. 318, in veteribus libris, in designundo quando, et quamdiu sederit S. Eusebius.” A brief session seems most probable; if the reader wishes for more information upon the question, he may consult “Paggi Crit. in Baron.” *an.* 311, p. 493, edit. Lucae, 1748. “Errore immani,” says Basnage (ad *an.* 310, sect. 6). Six months, he considers, are as much as can be allowed to the episcopate of Eusebius. — ED.
- Ft1562 Foxe is correct about the chronology: “Qui tamen in antiquis ecclesiasticis monumentis reperitur titrio Martyris consignatus, more

majorum, quod qui persecutionis tempore perpressus pro Christi fide tormenta, licet superstes in fide quieverit, martyr appellari ejusmodi consueverit.” Baron. Annul. an. 313, sect. 47. Constantine’s letter is in Eusebius Hist. Eccl 10:cap. 5. — ED.

**Ft1563** Ex Sabel. Ennead. 7 lib. 8. — ED.

**Ft1564** For this and the subsequent quotation, see Labbe’s Collection of the Councils, tom. 1 col. 943. — ED.

**Ft1565** The Romanists seem puzzled whether to reject or to advocate the existence of such a council. see Howel’s “Synopsis Canonum Ecclesiastes Latinae,” (Lond. 1710) pp. 34-36, and” Concil. Generall. Studio Labbei,” tom. 1 col. 944; Dupin’s “History of Ecclesiastes Writers,” vol. 2 p. 241. The seat of the supposed council is now called Sezza. “Hoc Concilium videtur supposititium esse; nam licet convocatum dicatur anno 303, ejus tamen nec meminit Eusebius, nec Ruffinus, nec Hieronymus, nee Socrates, nee Theodoretus, nee Sozomenus, nee Eutropius, nec Damasuz, nec Beda, nee quisquam alius saeculo tertio, 4 aut 5, aut 6, aut septimo. Nicolaus Papa primus ejus nominis, qui vixit circa 860, primus extitit qui illius meminit.” Censura quorundam Scriptorum auct. R. Coco; p. 441, edit. Helmst. 1683. — ED.

**Ft1566** “Subscripserunt igitur in ejus damnationem et damnaverunt eum extra civitatem.”

**Ft1567** About eighty-five names of witnesses are given in Labbe, tom. 1 col. 939; but in col. 940, “seventy-two” is mentioned as the number. The number is also expressed in a peculiar manner as “Occidua Libra testium,” i.e. a western pound, which Baronius (Eccl. Ann. A.D. 302), says, contained 72 solidi, and represented the number 72: he also adds that the best copies mention seventy-two names. Foxe erroneously says “forty-two.” — ED.

**Ft1568** “Falsum esse de thurificatione Marcellini rumorem, docet antiquum Damasi Chronicum. Lapsus Marcellini ante Augustum mensera an. 303, cntigisse dicitur, utpote Episcopatu moti X. Kal Sept. Diocletiano VIII. et Maximiano VII. Coss. Atqui teste Chronico Pontificatum Marcellinus etiamnum retinebat, anno 304, Diocletiano IX. et Maxim. VIII. Coss. Denique Sinues-sanum Concilium, quod lapsui Marcellini

fundamento est, omnino subditum est.” Basnagii Annai. ad an. 296, sect. 5. — ED.

- Ft1569** Blondel agrees with Foxe as to the patching up of this epistle: “Centonem ex Innocentii, Leonis et Vigiliii Epistolis, et Impp. rescriptis consutum jam docui.” Epist. Decretal. examen (Genevae, 1635) p. 384; in Labbe’s Concill. General. tom. 1 col. 926. — ED.
- Ft1570** [Decret. pars 2. causa] 24 quaest. 1. [sect. 15]. “Rogamus vos fratres.” — ED.
- Ft1571** In what chapter or leaf of all the Bible doth the Lord command the see of Peter to be translated from Antioch to Rome?
- Ft1572** The above translation has been revised from the copy in Labbe, Conc. Gert. tom, 1 col. 948. — ED.
- Ft1573** This letter is dated “xvi. Kal. Feb. Maxentio et Maximo V. C. Coss.” Quae vel una sub-scriptio impostoris fraudes detegit, cum in Fastis horum par Consulum nusquam appareat gentium. Annus 309, qui Marcello supremus fuit, Coss. habuit Maxentium Augustum et Romulum.” Basnagii. “Annales Politico-Eccles.” an. 308, sect. 6. — ED.
- Ft1574** “Quod semper majores causae, sicut sunt Episcoporum, et potiorum curae negotiorum, ad unam beati principis apostolorum Petri sedem confiuerent.”
- Ft1575** Ex Epist. Decretal. Melchiades. [Apud Blondel Examen Epist. Decret. (Genevae 1635), p. 427. — ED.
- Ft1576** Page 417 in Blondel’s Examen. — ED.
- Ft1577** This martyrdom is placed by Baronius under the fifth year of Aurelian, anno 275, sect. 11. — ED.
- Ft1578** Metaphrast.
- Ft1579** Niceph. lib. 7 cap. 44; or Baron. anno 316, sect. 47. See supra, p. 255. — ED.
- Ft1580** Or Milesius; see Mart. Romans a Baron. Ap. 22; and Sozom. H. E. lib. 2 cap. 14.
- Ft1581** The kings of Persia were commonly called by the name of Sapor.

- Ft1582 Upon these names, which Metaphrastes has inserted suitably enough in his lists, Tillemont remarks, “Les noms de ces martyrs sont tous Grecs, et non pas Persans,” tom. 7 pt. 1, p. 153. — ED.
- Ft1583 Ex Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 9, 10. — ED.
- Ft1584 Ex Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 11. — ED.
- Ft1585 Ex Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 12. — ED.
- Ft1586 Adiabeni was the same as Mesopotamia, and preserves its name in the modern Diarbek. — ED.
- Ft1587 Ex Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 13. — ED.
- Ft1588 He is called Joseph by Nicephorus. — ED.
- Ft1589 This archi-magus and magi (as Xenophon saith) was an order of religion among the Persians, which had the greatest stroke in the land next to the king.
- Ft1590 Ex Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 13. Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 37. — ED.
- Ft1591 Sozom. lib. 2:cap. 13. — ED.
- Ft1592 Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 37. — ED.
- Ft1593 Tillemont, tom. 7 pt. 1, p. 156. — ED.
- Ft1594 Sozom. lib. 2 cap. 14. — ED.
- Ft1595 Theodoret, lib. 1 cap. 25. Eusebius de Vita Constantini, lib. 4 cap. 9-13. — ED.
- Ft1596 See the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 4, col. 47, edit. 1624. Foxe gives the “contents” and “effect,” not a translation, of Constantine’s epistle to Sapor. The part marked with inverted commas is, however, a translation of its conclusion. — ED.
- ft1597 Isdegerdes I. reigned A.D. 399-420, his son Vororanes IV. A.D. 420-440. Theodosius the Younger was emperor A.D. 408-450. L’Art de Verifier des Dates. — ED.
- ft1598 Tillemont, tom. 7 p. 158. — ED.
- ft1599 Ex Theodor. lib. 5 cap. 39. — ED.
- ft1600 Ibidem. — ED.
- ft1601 Ibidem. — ED.
- ft1602 He was emperor A.D. 361-363. — ED.

- ft1603 Ruff 5, cap. 26. Theod. lib. 3 cap. 11. Sozom. lib. 5 cap. 10, 20. — ED.
- ft1604 Theod. lib. 3 cap. 18. Niceph. lib. 10, cap. 11. — ED.
- ft1605 Sozom. lib. 5 cap. 9. — ED.
- ft1606 Ibid. cap. 11. — ED.
- ft1607 Ibid. cap. 10. — ED.
- ft1608 Tillemont, vol. 7 pt. 2, p. 640. — ED.
- ft1609 See Theod. (lot. citat.), whence a few expressions are changed. — ED.
- ft1610 Hieron. in Habac. cap. 1.
- ft1611 Ποιῆσαι μ. τ. καὶ δ. i.e. “continuing.” Revelation 13:5. See Acts 18:23; James 4:13. Gr. See also *infra*, p. 291, note (2). — ED.
- ft1612 Our author should rather have said Licinius, as *infra*, pp. 291,292. — ED.
- ft1613 Our author assigns a less period, *sup.* pp. 250, 280. See also last note. — ED.
- ft1614 See note (2) in last page. — ED.

### APOCALYPSE NUMBERS OPENED

- ft1615 Our author has scarcely expressed himself intelligibly in this place: perhaps he means “Let the hours of these three days and a half (which be forty-two) he reckoned at the rate of every ,seek for a sabbath of years, or else every day of twelve hours for a year, or else every hour for month; and so these three days and a half come to months forty-two.” — ED.
- Ft1616 Our author resumes these computations and expositions *infra*, vol. 2 p. 724, and vol. 4 p. 107. — ED.
- Ft1617 Lib. 10 cap. 2.
- Ft1618 Eusebius De Vita Constantini, lib. 4 cap. 61, 62. — ED.
- Ft1619 “Ea similitudine notabat malos homines, qui emendari nequeunt,” adds Pomponius Laetum. — ED.
- Ft1620 “Imperatorem esse, fortuna est.” .Ael. Lamp. — ED.
- ft1621 August. contra Crescon. lib. 3 cap. 82; and Epist. 49, 50.

- ft1622 July 25, A.D. 306, is the true date. — ED.
- Ft1623 Eusebius, De Vit. Constant. lib. 2 cap. 48-60. The following is a new and more accurate translation than Foxe's. — ED.
- ft1624 **Κατὰ φύσιν** is the Greek, and is obscure: Heinecken thinks it equivalent to **κατὰ περιποίησης**; vid. not. in Eusebius V. C. 2. cap. 56. The phrase may perhaps be illustrated in Le Clerc's Art. crit. part 2, sect. 1, cap. 7, 5, though he is upon such topics, generally, a very unsafe guide. — ED.
- ft1625 Eusebius lib. 10 cap. 5. — ED.
- ft1626 Ibid. cap. 7. — ED.
- ft1627 Eusebius lib. 10 cap 5. — ED.
- ft1628 Ibid. — ED.
- ft1629 Ibid. cap. 6. — ED.
- Ft1630 Eusebius De Vita Constant. lib. 2 cap. 24-43. — ED.
- Ft1631 Ex Eusebius De Vita Constant. lib. 2 [cap. 46].
- Ft1632 Ibid. lib. 3 cap. 4-14. — ED.
- Ft1633 Ibid. lib. 2 cap 71. — ED.
- Ft1634 Eusebius De Vita Constant. lib. 2 cap. 64-72. — ED.
- Ft1635 Sozom. lib. 1 cap. 8, 9. — ED.
- Ft1636 Sozom. lib. 1. cap. 8, 9. Eusebius V. C. 4.25. — ED.
- Ft1637 The text has been somewhat corrected from Sozomen, lib. 1 cap. 9. — ED.
- Ft1638 See Eusebius "Vit. Constant." 3. sect. 55. It might be more correct, perhaps, to say "in Coelesyria;" but this region was variously named of old: vide "Plinii Hist. Nat." lib. 5 cap. 12, or Cellarii "Geogr. Plen." tom. 2 p. 266, edit. 1706.
- Ft1639 "Te solum novimus Deum, to regem cognoscimus, to adjutorem invocamus, abs te victorias referimus, per te victorias inimicorum constituimus, tibi praesentium bonorum gratiam acceptam ferimus, et per te futura quoque speramus, tibi supplices sumus omnes: imperatorem nostrum Constantinum, ac pientissimos ejus filios, in

longissima vita incolumes nobis ac victores custodire supplices oramus.” Eusebius lib. 4 De Vita Const. [c. 20.]

**ft1640** “Medicos, grammaticos, et alios professores literarum, et doctores legum, cum uxoribus et liberis,” etc.

**ft1641** About Constantine’s time, several provinces were placed under one **καθολικὸς**, and called a “diocese;” and the **καθολικὸς** was the deputy of the praefectus praetorio, who had several “dioceses” under him. See Vales. not. in Eusebius loc. cit. — ED.

**Ft1642** Eusebius De Vita Constant. lib. 4 cap. 36, whence Foxe’s text has been corrected in two or three points. — ED.

**Ft1643** Eusebius De Vita Constant. lib. 4 cap. 28. — ED.

**Ft1644** The following arguments against the Donation of Constantine are probably an abridgment of those given by Illyricus Flacius, “Catalogus testium, cura Goularti, Genevae, 1608,” cols. 284-290; whence several inaccuracies in Foxe’s text have been detected and corrected. They will also be found in the Magdeburg Centuriators, cent. 4 cap. 7, col. 319, 320, edit. Basil, 1624. The Donation of Constantine was forged between 755 and 776: for in 776 pope Adrian avails himself of it in an exhortation to Charlemagne. But in 755 Stephen II. had also an opening to make use of it; but as he neither mentions it nor refers to it in any way, it follows that it was unknown to him as it had been to all his predecessors. The president Henault thinks it took its rise from Constantine’s allowing the churches from the year 321 to acquire landed property, and individuals to enrich them by legacies. This donation preserved its credit so long, that in 1478 some Christians were burned at Strasburg for daring to question its authenticity. Laurence Valla having demonstrated its falsity towards the middle of the 15th century, the best writers of the 16th, even those of Italy, treated it with contempt. Ariosto places it among the chimeras which Astolphus meets with in the moon. Orl. Fur. chap. 14, stanza 8. — ED.

**Ft1645** That portion of the canon law, which was drawn up by Gratian, is at present entitled Decretum; but from the remarks of Mastricht (sect. 305), it will easily bear a plural interpretation. Some general reflections

upon Gratian's compilation from the same writer may not be unsuitably subjoined:

“Nec meo judicio integrum opus Gratiani penitus abolendum aut omni utilitate carere censeo. Sunt in eo multa, quae historiam, ut supra dictum, ejus et anteriorum temporum juvant. Sunt multa, quae erroribus pontificiorum contraria sunt, et multa ipsam pontificis majestatem oppugnant et convellunt, etiamsi contra intentionem forte scribentis, qui in promovenda monarchia pontificia multum momenti attulit; quod solide et accurate demonstravit magnus juris-consultus Innocentius Gentilet Delphinus in Apologia pro ecclesia Reformatis; in qua controversias quae inter Protestantes et pontificios agitari solent, solidissime et feliciter satis decedit.—Quae sola ratio studiosos, interque eos etiam potissimum theologos, excitare debet ad studium juris canonici, ex quo, tanquam armamentario arma sufficienter contra adversarios promere, eosque proprio gladio conficere possunt.” Ger. Von Mastricht *historia juris eccles., et Pontificii, Halae, 1719, p. 350.* — ED.

**Ft1646** Lib. 4 cap. 3. — ED.

**Ft1647** See Appendix. — ED.

**Ft1648** Lib. 7 cap. 33, 35, 37. — ED.

**Ft1649** Niceph. lib. 8 cap. 4. Constantine began his reign July 25, A.D. 306, so that the building of Constantinople commenced (according to Nicephorus) in A.D. 315; whereas Licinius did not receive his final overthrow till A.D. 324. Nicephorus seems to have misunderstood an expression of the emperor Julian, that Constantine built his city “infra decem annos.” The more correct opinion probably is, that the building commenced the latter end of A.D. 325 (being the twentieth year of Constantine), that the dedication took place on Monday, May 11, 330, and that it was completed “infra decem annos” A.D. 334, which was the twenty-eighth of his reign. See Pagii Crit. in Baron. Annal. ad an. 324, num. xix an. 330, num. 4. — ED.

**Ft1650** “Nullo plane argumento probari posse quae de lepra et baptizato a. 324 per Sylvestrum Constantino M. jactantur—dudum demonstraverunt propter Valesium ad Eusebium etc. Tillemont Hist. des Empereurs; tom. 4 p. 422—et prae reliquis Tentzel. Examen fabulae Romanae de duplici

baptismo Constant. M. (Viteb. 1683) etc. etc. Heinecken excursus V. ad Eusebius de Vita Constant. 4 61, Lipsiae, 1830. — ED.

**Ft1651** Eusebius lib. 4. De Vita Constantini. Hieronym. in Chron. Ruffin. lib. 2 cap. 11. Socrat. lib. 1 cap. 39. Theod. lib 1 cap. 32. Sozomen. lib. 2 cap. 34.

**Ft1652** The “Defensor Pacis” of Marsilius of Padua is mentioned again by our author, *infra*, vol. 2 p. 705: it is included in Goldasti’s “De Monarchia S. Romani Imperil,” tom. 2 p. 154. It was translated into English by W. Marshall, and printed by Robert Wyer, in 1555. See Herbert’s edition of Ames’ *Typographical Antiquities*, vol. 1 p. 371; or Dibdin’s, vol. 3 p. 178. — ED.

**Ft1653** He was a canon of Barcelona, and chamberlain to Alexander VI. His opinion is quoted by Cooke, vicar of Leeds, in his “*Censura quorundam Scriptorum*,” (Helmstad. 1683) p. 178. In a remark subjoined to the “*Biblioth. Hisp. Vetus*” of Antonio (tom. 2 p. 340, edit. 1788) he is characterised as “notissimus;” but it is doubtful in what sense exactly this epithet is to be understood, Antonio having neglected to record any particulars of his life. — ED.

**Ft1654** The above paragraph has been corrected in several particulars from Illyricus; who, in penning it, seems to have had before him the “*Fasciculus rerum Expetendarum et Fugiendarum*” of Orthuinus Gratus; who, at folio 62 gives the Latin “*Donatio Constantini*,” translated by Bartholomaeus Picernus de Monte Arduo from a small Greek book, which he himself says he found in the library of pope Julius II., to whom he dedicates the translation: this is followed in the *Fasciculus* by Laurence Valla’s “*Declamatio in Donationem Constantini*,” by a passage from Nicolas of Cusan on the same subject (*De Concordantia Catholica*, lib. 3 cap. 2), containing an allusion to Aeneas Sylvius’s *Dialogus*; by an extract from the history of Antoninus (tit. 8 cap. 2, sect. 8); by an extract from Raphael Volateran (*Vit. Constant.*); and by another from Hieronymus Catalanus (*Practica Cancellaria Apostolica*). — ED.

**Ft1655** Note, that the oration “*Ad Conventum Sanctorum*,” is wrongly ascribed to Eusebius, which indeed is the oration of Constantine.

**Ft1656** Eusebius de Vita Constantini, lib. 4 [cap. 32. — ED.]

## END OF BOOK THE FIRST

### BOOK II

- ft1657 Edition 1570, p. 145; edition 1576, p. 107; edition 1584, p. 106; edition 1596, p. 95; edition 1684, vol. 1 p. 117. — ED.
- ft1658 Gildas, Hist. Brit. sect. 6. “Gildas cognomento Sapiens, et Badonicus dictus, natus anno 520, ob praelium Badonicum claro (inde ei nomen) Iltuti discipulus, ob. 570.” Cave. — ED.
- ft1659 Gildas, Lib de Victoria Aurehi Ambrosii. See supra, p. 152. [It appears from Usher, p. 12, that there is no book extant bearing this title. **See Appendix for more on this subject. — ED.** <sup>a112</sup>
- ft1660 Tertul “Contra Judaeos.” [sect. 7. — ED.]
- ft1661 Ex Origen. Hom. 4. in Ezech.
- ft1662 Ex Beda, Hist. Ecel. Angl. lib. 5 cap. 23. — ED.
- ft1663 Ex Niceph. lib. 2 c. 40. — ED.
- ft1664 Pet. Cluniacensis ad Bernardurn. [Epist. 229, sect. 9. — ED.]
- ft1665 Ex Epist. Eleutherii ad Lucium.
- ft1666 [Decret. pars 3] De Consecr. Dist. 2. [sect. 19. — ED.]
- ft1667 Fabian, pt. 5, cap. 119 and 130. [pp. 96, 112, edit. Loud. 1811. Bede, Ecc. Hist. Gent. Angl. lib. 2 cap. 16. — ED.]
- ft1668 “Potrues,” (or “Portuse,” supra, p. 27S,) a corruption of “Porthors,” a word in French romance, sigtifying “a breviary” or portable prayer-book. See a full account of the word, and the various forms under which it occurs, in archdeacon Nares’s Glossary. — ED.
- ft1669 Ex Monumetensi et Mils.
- ft1670 **See Appendix, and supra, p. 151, note (6). — ED.** <sup>a113</sup>
- ft1671 Herford’s only mistake is in saying A.D. 169, instead of 179; for the emperor Verus completed the 19th year of his reign, March 17, 180, and died ten days after. L’Art de Ver. des Dates. — ED.
- ft1672 “Some pretend to give a more punctual and exact account of the settling of our church government here; and for this, besides the rabble of our monkish historians, who swallow Geoffry of Monmouth whole

without chewing, I find two of my predecessors, men considerable in their times, produced for the same purpose, viz. Radulphus de Diceto, and Rad. Baddock; so that setting aside the name of Flamins and Archflamins, for which there is no foundation at all, yet the thing itself hath no such absurdity or improbability in it." Stillingfleet's "Antiq. of British Churches," chap. 2; see also Usher, "Antiq. Brit. Eccles." cap. 5. — ED.

**ft1673** Caerleon. See *infra*, p. 338, note (1). — ED.

**ft1674** **Ex vetusto codice regum antiquorum.** [There are serious objections to the genuineness of this epistle, which is exhibited more at length, and the subject fully discussed, in Mason's "Vindication of the Church of England, and of the lawful Ministry thereof;" (Lond. 1728) book 2 ch. 3. Bp. Stillingfleet's (p. 66) general view of the circumstances is probably correct. See also Cressy's "Church History of Brittany," b. 4 c. 4, sect. 7. See more in the Appendix to this Volume. Eleutherius was pope, A.D. 177—192. L'Art de Ver. des Dates. — ED.] <sup>a114</sup>

**ft1675** **There is an error here; the reader may consult the Appendix to this volume; also Stillingfleet's "Antiquities of the British Churches," p. 59, edit. 1685; and Usher's "Britan. Ecclesiastes Antiquitates," cap. 6, p. 54, edit. 1687. — ED.** <sup>a115</sup>

**ft1676** "Dues judicium tuum Regi da," etc.

**ft1677** *Henr. Huntingd. lib. 1.*

**Ft1678** *M. Westin. sub a 201. Fabian, pt. 3, sub finem. — ED.*

**Ft1679** King Lucius has been confounded with a German monk of that name. The authors, who have mentioned the missionary journey of the former, are cited in Usher's "Brit. Ecclesiastes Antiq." pp. 17, 18; see also Fuller, cent. 2, sect. 14. — ED.

**Ft1680** Rather he so dates Lucius's endowment of churches. — ED.

**Ft1681** *Ex Beds. Polychron. Monumetensi.*

**Ft1682** This Helena, being the daughter of Coel, and married to Constantius, father of Constantine, is said to have first made the walls of London, also of Colchester, much about the year of our Lord 305, and to have been born in Britain.

- Ft1683** “To rule and guyde this land of Briteyn in his (Constantine’s) absense, he ordeyned a man of might called Octavius, which was then king of Wales and duke of Gwiscop, which some expound to be Westsex, some Cornewall and some Wynsore.” Grafton’s Chronicle, vol. 1 p. 69, edit. Lond. 1809. — ED.
- Ft1684** Fabian (p. 51, edit. 1811): “Of the martyrdom of these maydens, dyvers auctours wryte dyversly. Wherefore I remyte them that wyll have farther understandyng in this matter unto the Legende of Seyntes, radde yerely in the churche; where they maye be suffyciently taughte and enfourmed.” Archbishop Usher has examined the fable with his customary erudition. “Brit. Ecclesiastical Antiq.” pp. 334-42, edit. 1687. The history of the eleven thousand virgins is supposed by Sirmond to have arisen from a mistake of this kind. The first reporters, having found in manuscript martyrologies, *SS. Ursula et Undecimilla V M.* (i.e. *Sanctee Ursula et Undecirnilla Virgines Martyres*) supposed that *Undecimilla*, with *V* and *M* following, was an abridgement of *Undecim Millia Virgurn Martyrum* (Valesiana, p. 49.) Encycl. Metrop. Hist. vol. 3 p. 96. — ED.
- Ft1685** Ex Chronico Monumetensi. [“Galfrid. Hist. Brit.” lib. 6 cap. 3. See Usher, p. 199. Also Fabian, p. 53, edit. 1811. — ED.]
- ft1686** This is briefly alluded to by Fabian, pp. 69, 75. — ED.
- Ft1687** In Grafton’s Chronicle (vol. 1 p. 78) the words are “Nempnith your sexes,” that is, draw your knyfes; and “Nemet eour saxes” in Usher Brit. Ecclesiastes Antiq. p. 227, in a quotation from Ninius. — ED.

### THE SAXONS (P. 314)

- ft1688** Ex Galfrido, in suo Britannico, [lib. 8 cap. 3, 4. See Usher, “Brit. Ecclesiastes Antiq.” p. 240, 241. — ED.]
- ft1689** Ex Polychron, lib. 5 cap. 4; whence a slight correction is made in Foxe’s text. — ED.
- Ft1690** Foxe having sometimes failed to make different kings synchronize as they should do in the following table, the dates A.D. of the accession of the kings are added, chiefly from Mr. Sharon Turner’s table, Foxe’s account of the length of their reigns being left to stand. — ED.

- Ft1691** According to William of Malsbry (p. 10), “Eisc” would be more correct; or “Esc,” as Henry of Huntingdon has it (p. 312. edit. Francof. 1601) Eosa was kinsman to Eisc, and was slain with him in battle by Uther; see *infra*, p. 322. See Usher, p. 241. — ED.
- Ft1692** This Ethelbert, first of all the Saxons received the faith, and subdued all the other six kings, except only the king of Northumberland.
- Ft1693** Ercombert commanded Lent first to be fasted in his dominion.
- Ft1694** Egbert killed two sons of his uncle.
- Ft1695** Unto the time of Edrick, all the bishops of Canterbury were Italians.
- Ft1696** Some chronicles do place these two, Nidred and Wilhard, after Edriek, and give to them seven years; some again do omit them.
- ft1697** Between the reigns of Alriek and Cuthred, some stories do insert the reign of Eadbert, which reigned two years.
- ft1698** Of this Cissa came Cicester, which he builded, and where he reigned.
- ft1699** This Nathanleod seemeth, by some old stories, to be a Briton, and the chief marshal of king Uther, whom Porth the Saxon slew.
- ft1700** This Porth, a Saxon, came in at the haven, which now is called of him Portsmouth.
- ft1701** Because I find but little mention of these two, I think it rather like to be the same Ethelwold, or Ethelwald, which after followeth.
- ft1702** Of Condebert and Ethelred I find no mention but in one table only, and suppose, therefore, that the true names of these were Ercombert, and Egbert, which were kings of Kent the same time, and peradventure might then rule in Sussex.
- ft1703** This Adelwold was the first king of Sussex christened, and, as Fabian saith, the fourth king of the South Saxons; as others say the seventh; so uncertain be the histories of this kingdom.
- ft1704** This kingdom contained Somersetshire, Berkshire, Dorsetshire, Devonshire, Cornwall, etc.
- ft1705** This Kinigilsus, the first king christened in that province, was converted by Berinus, and after made monk.
- Ft1706** Cadwalla went to Rome, and there was christened, and died.

- Ft1707** Ina also went to Rome, and was made monk. [Repeatedly called Ive by Foxe and Fabian. — ED.]
- ft1708** Sigebert, for his pride and cruelty, was deposed of his people. And as he had killed before one of his faithful council, giving him wholesome counsel; so after was he slain of the same councillor's swineherd, as he hid himself in a wood.
- Ft1709** This Egbert was first expelled by Brithric, who after (returning again and reigning) was much derided and scorned with mocking rhymes, for a coward, of Bernulf king of Mercia. At length the said Egbert subdued him first, then all the rest to his kingdom: causing the whole land to be called no more Britain, but Anglia. Concerning the other kings after him in that lordship, hereafter followeth.
- Ft1710** This Ida of his wife had six children, Adda, Elricus, Osmerus, Theodledus; of concubines other six.
- Ft1711** This Alle was the son of Isse, and reigned in Deira; [*i. e.* between the Humber and the Tyne. — ED.]
- ft1712** Some chronicles set under Adda, to reign in Bernicia [*i. e.* between the Tyne and the Firth of Forth. — ED.], these kings, Glappa or Claspa, Theonulf, or Hussa, or Theowain, Frihulf, Theodoric.
- Ft1713** This Alfricus was the son of Ida, and reigned five years.
- Ft1714** This Ethelfrid was he that slew the monks of Bangor, to the number of 1200, which came to pray for the good success of the Britons; and by his wife Acca, the daughter of Elle, he had seven sons, Eaufrid, Oswald, Oswy, Oslac, Osmund, Osa, Offa.—Flor. Histor.
- Ft1715** This Edwin was the first of the Northumberland kings which was converted: he was christened by Paulinus bishop of London.
- Ft1716** These two are put out of the race of kings, because they revolted from the Christian faith. and were both slain miserably by Cedwalla a Briton, who then reigned in Northumberland and in Mercia.
- ft30** This Oswald, called St. Oswald, fought with Cedwalla and Penda with a small army, and by strength of prayer vanquished them in the field. He sent for Aidan out of Scotland to preach in his country, and as he preached in Scottish, the king expounded in English. He was a great giver of alms to the poor. Of his other acts more appeareth hereafter.

- Ft1718** This Oswy, fighting against Penda, vowed to make his daughter Elfred a nun, giving with her twelve lordships to build twelve monasteries; six in Bernicia, six in Deira. The same Oswy, in the beginning of his reign, took one Oswin the son of Edwin to be his partner over the country of Deira. Afterward, causing him to be killed, took to him another called Edelwald, the son of Oswald.
- Ft1719** Of this Oswin more followeth hereafter to be declared.
- Ft1720** This Egfrid married Etbeldrida, who, being twelve years married to him, could after by no means be allured to lie with him; but, obtaining of him license, was made nun, and then abbess of Ely. She made but one meal a day. and never wore linen. At last the same Egfrid, fighting against the Scots, was slain in the field by a train of the Scots feigning themselves to fly.
- Ft1721** Of this Alfred Bede in his history testifieth, that he was exactly and perfectly seen in the holy Scriptures, and recovered much that his predecessors had lost before. Some say, he reigned not eighteen years.
- Ft1722** Osred began his reign being but eight years old, and reigned the space of ten years.
- Ft1723** Some affirm that Osric reigned but eleven years.
- Ft1724** This Celulf, after he had reigned eight years, was made a monk. To him Bede wrote his history. “Gloriosissimo Regi Ceolvvlfho Beda famulus Christi et Presbyter.” See the Dedication to Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of Britain. — ED.
- Ft1725** Mollo by the subtle train of Alcred was made away, which Alcred also himself, after he had reigned ten years, was expelled by his own people.
- Ft1726** In some chronicles this Alcred reigned but eight years.
- Ft1727** Penda slew in battle Edwin and Oswald kings of Northumberland. Also Sigebert, Edrick, and Anna, kings of the East Angles.
- Ft1728** Under Peda and Ulferus Christ’s faith was received in those parts, they being converted by Finian, bishop. The same Peda reigned in a part of Mercia, with his brother Ulfer, who were both the sons of Penda.

- Ft1729** This Ulfer by his wife Erneburg, had three daughters; Milburg, Mildrith, and Mildgith, holy virgins. Also he drove out Kenwalkius, king Of the West Saxons. See p. 348.
- Ft1730** This Adelred, or Ethelred, was monk of Bardney, whose sisters were Kinedrid and Kinswith, holy virgins.
- Ft1731** In the time of this Ceolred was Guthlake, otherwise called St. Guthlake, the popish hermit of Crowland.
- ft1732** Under Ethelbald died Bede. Ethelbald gave, that all churches, should be free from all exactions and public charges.
- ft1733** This Bernred, for his pride and stoutness toward his people, was by them deposed; and the same year, by the Just judgment of God, burned. — Histor. Cariens.
- ft1734** Offa, causing or consenting to the death of good Ethelbert, king of the East Angles, peaceably coming to marry his daughter, for repentance caused the Peter-pence first to be given to Rome, and there did his penance.
- ft1735** This Kenelm, being seven years of age, was wickedly slain, after he had reigned six months.
- ft1736** This Ludecane after the second year of his reign, was slain of Egbert, king of the West Saxons. by whom the rest of the Saxons were also subdued.
- ft1737** This Sebert, nephew to Ethelbert king of Kent, among these kings was first christened by Mellitus: he also made the church of Paul's.
- ft1738** Sexred, Seward and Sigebert expelled Mellitus the bishop, because he would not minister to them the sacramental bread, they being not baptized. They were slain of Kinegils and Quicheline his brother, by the just judgment of God, for they revolted again from their faith, and expelled Mellitus bishop of London.
- ft1739** This Sigebert the Good, or Sibert, much resorting to Oswy king of Northumberland, by his persuasion was brought to christian baptism, baptized of Finian, bishop, to whom also was sent Cedde with other ministers to preach and to baptize in his country. At last he was slain of his men about him, using too much to spare his enemies, and to forgive their injuries that repented. · — Flor. Hist.

- ft1740 This Sigherius and Sebbi first fell to idolatry; then, through the means of Ulfer or Wolfer king of Mercia, were reduced, and at last Sebbi became a monk.
- ft1741 Offa, after he had reigned a while, became a monk at Rome.
- ft1742 Malmesb. de Vitis Pont.
- ft1743 Malmesbury's words are, "propemodum nihil efficere visas est." — ED.
- ft1744 Of this Uffa, the people of Norfolk were then called Uskins [or" Uffings." Higden. — ED.]
- ft1745 Redwald first was converted in Kent. Afterward through the wicked persuasions of his wife and others, he joined idolatry with Christianity. Notwithstanding his son Erpwald through the means of Edwin king of Northumberland, was brought to the perfect faith of Christ, and therein faithfully did continue.
- ft1746 This Sigebert made himself a monk, and afterward brought out to fight against Penda with a white stick in his hand, was slain in the field.
- ft1747 The daughters of Anna were Sexburga, Ethelberta, and St. Etheldreda.
- ft1748 This Ethelbert for his holiness and godly virtues is counted for a saint; he, innocently coming to Offa king of Mercia, to marry with Althrid his daughter, by the sinister suspicion of Offa, and wicked counsel of Kineswina his wife, was cruelly put to death in the house of Offa. For the which cause Offa. afterward repenting, went to Rome, where he made himself a monk.
- ft1749 This Dunwich lieth upon the sea side, in Suffolk.
- ft1750 North Elmham, in Norfolk. — ED.
- ft1751 So says Hardyrig in his Chronicle: Hector Boethius says, "cure numerosa classe navium :." but M. Westm. and Fordun say, "*cum tribus millibus armatorum sibi sociatis.*" — ED.
- ft1752 "*Upon the playne of Ambrii, now called Salesbury.*" Fabian, pp. 66, edit. 1811. — ED.
- ft1753 Matthew Westmonast. p. 84, edit. Francof. 1601. — ED.
- ft1754 Armories, called Little Britain and Bretagne from the settlement there of the British refugees. — ED.

- ft1755 At the battle of Aylesford, A.D. 455. — ED.
- ft1756 York, according to some chronicles. — ED.
- ft1757 Ex Herin. Huntingtonensi, Galfrido, et Chronico quodam Cariensi. [Math. Westmonast. p. 92, edit. Francof. 1601. — ED.]
- ft1758 Bed. Ecc. Hist. lib. 1:cap. 16. — ED.
- ft1759 Ex Historia Cariana. [See Usher, Antiq. p. 241. — ED.]
- ft1760 Foxe here reads Octa; but as he means the same person whom he calls Osca, at p. 314, that reading is here introduced. — ED.
- ft1761 Flor. Hist. [M. Westmonast. pp. 96, 97, edit. 1601. — ED.]
- ft1762 M. Westin. ad ann. 586. — ED.
- ft1763 See supra, p. 312. — Era
- ft1764 Nobiliores totius regni praedictos duces sequi fuerunt, et ignobiles remanebant, qui cum vicem nobilium obtinere coepissent, extulerunt se ultra quod dignitas expetebat. Et ob affluen-tism divitiarum superbi coeperunt tali et tantae fornicationi indulgere, qualis neo inter gentes audita est. Et, ut Gildas historicus [sect. 21] testatur, non solum hoc vitium, sed omnia quae humanae naturae accidere solent, et praecipue quod totins boni evertit statum, odium veritatis, amor mendacii, susceptio mali pro bono, veneratio nequitiae pro benignitate, exceptatio Sathanae pro angelo lucis: ungebantur reges, non propter Dominum (“Dominium” is Foxe’s reading, “Deum” Geoffrey’s), sed qui caeteris crudeliores essent. Si quis nero eorum mitior, et veritati aliquatenus propior videretur, in hunc quasi Britanniae subversorem omnia odia telaque torquebantur. Omnia quae Deo placebant et displicebant aequali lance inter eos pendebantur. Et non solum hoc seculares viri, sed et ipse grex Domini, ejusque pastores, sine discretione faciebant. Non igitur admirandum est degeneres tales patriam illam amittere, quam praedicto modo maculabant. Ex Historia quadam Cariensi. [Biblioth. Patrum (Paris, 1576), tom. in. col. 585. Gildas, p. 2?, edit. Lond. 1818; also Gulfrid. Monumet. lib. 12:cap. 6. — ED.]
- ft1765 This Berda, or Bertha, being a Christian, was married unto Ethelbert upon the condition that she should be suffered to enjoy her religion. [He was the first’ *Christian* ‘king in Kent.’ — ED.]

- <sup>ft1766</sup> Page 162, edit. 1601. “Matthaeus, *Florilegus* dictus, Westmonasteriensis Monachus ord. Bened., claruic a. 1371. Scripsit ‘Historiarum Flores,’ sen Annales ab orbe condito ad ann. 1307, ex Matthaeo Paris. quoad partem priorem fere descriptos.” Cave. — ED.
- <sup>ft1767</sup> This is the famous Danish sea-king Ragnar Lodbrog, whose true history Mr. Sharon Turner says was better understood by the Frankish than by the British chroniclers. He in reality perished at the hands of Ella, king of Northumberland, whose dominions he had invaded, between 862 and 867. This story is repeated *infra*, vol. 2:page 14. This falconer’s name was *Bern*. — ED.
- <sup>ft1768</sup> See Usher’s “*Antiq. Eccles. Brit.*” pp. 79, 80, edit. 1687. — ED.
- <sup>ft1769</sup> This name is altogether omitted in some accounts, which differ much as to his age and country; some assigning him a large kingdom in Ireland, etc. See Usher “*Ecclesiastes Brit. Antiq.*” pp. 296, 297. — ED.
- <sup>ft1770</sup> This Gormund, as some stories record, leaving his kingdom at home to his brother, said, he would possess no kingdom but which he should win with his sword.
- <sup>ft1771</sup> Foxe, at pp. 320, 323, 327, 328, assigns the dates A.D. 510, 568, 550, 580, for this event; the last (being that adopted by M. Westin.) is in each case adopted in the text. — ED.
- <sup>ft1772</sup> Foxe says 589 in the text, and 595 in the margin; probably the 589 should have occupied the place of the 550, and 595 that of the 589 The year A. D. 595 was the year of Augustine’s first commission, and the alarm felt by him and his companions confirms the idea that Christianity was then under persecution in Britain. — ED.
- <sup>ft1773</sup> [These are Fabian’s expressions.wED.] King Lucius died 395 years before the coming of Augustine [i.e. if he died A.D. 201, as stated *supra* p. 311.]
- <sup>ft1774</sup> It is not easy to make out more than *ten*, consistently with Foxe’s own computations. It has been found necessary to alter some of his numbers in the remainder of this paragraph, they were so plainly incorrect.wED.

- <sup>ft1775</sup> Beda. Polychron. lib. 1:cap. 8. Malmesburiens. de Regib. [p. 17, edit. Francof. 1601.] Henr. Hunt. lib. in. [p. 320]. Fabian, p. 5, cap. 119, liber Bibliothecae Jornalensis.
- <sup>ft1776</sup> Bede, lib. 2:cap. 1:sect. 90. — ED.
- <sup>ft1777</sup> Given by Bede, lib. 1:cap. 24. — Era
- <sup>ft1778</sup> Bede, lib. 1:cap. 23. — ED.
- <sup>ft1779</sup> Gregorius servus servorum Dei, servis Domini nostri. Quia melius fuerat bona non incipere, quam ab iis quae coepta sunt cogitatione retrorsum redire, etc. Ex Henr. Hunting. lib. in.
- <sup>ft1780</sup> Bede places Maurice's accession A.D. 582. See Art. Gregory I. Milner's Hist. — ED.
- <sup>ft1781</sup> Daughter of Cherebert, king of Paris. Mezerai dates this marriage A.D. 470. — ED.
- <sup>ft1782</sup> Deprecamur to, Domine, in omni misericordia tua, ut auferatur furor tuus et ira tua civitate ista et de domo sancta tua, quoniam peccavimus; Allelujah !" Bede, lib. 1:cap. 26. — ED
- <sup>ft1783</sup> Bede, lib. 1:cap. 25. — ED.
- <sup>ft1784</sup> His name was *Virilius*. See Mr. Stevenson's note on Bede, lib. 1:cap. 24. — ED.
- <sup>ft1785</sup> Ex decreto Gregorii primi; lib. concil, tom. 2:[Bede, "Eccles. Hist." lib. 1:cap. 27, whence the following translation has been in a few places improved. — ED.]
- <sup>ft1786</sup> Foxe's *second* question and answer appear in the printed copies of Bede as a portion of the *first*; his second question, moreover, is rather an explanation of the original, which reads thus in the printed copies — "and how the bishop is to act in the church." Foxe's *third*, however, is quoted as "the third" by Parker in his "Antiqu. Brit." His *sixth* and *seventh* appear as *the fifth* in the printed copies; and after his *seventh* question and answer, the following appear as the *sixth* in the printed copies : — Augustine's Sixth Question. "Whether a bishop may be ordained without other bishops being present, in case there be so great a distance between them that they cannot easily come together." Gregory answers, — "As for the church of England, in which you are as yet the only bishop, you can no otherwise ordain a bishop than in

the absence of other bishops; for when do any bishops ever come from France, that they may be present as witnesses to you in ordaining a bishop? But we would have you, my brother, to ordain bishops in such a manner, that the said bishops may not be far asunder, to the end that, when a new bishop is to be ordained, there be no difficulty, but that the other bishops whose presence is necessary, may easily come together. Thus when, by the help of God, bishops shall be so constituted in places every where near to one another, no ordination of a bishop is to be performed without assembling three or four bishops. For even in spiritual affairs, we may take example by the temporal, that they may be wisely and discreetly conducted. It is certain, that when marriages are celebrated in the world, some married persons are assembled, that those who went before in the way of matrimony, may also partake in the joy of the succeeding couple. Why then, at this spiritual ordination, wherein by means of the sacred ministry man is joined to God, should not such persons be assembled, as may either rejoice in the advancement of the new bishop, or jointly pour forth their prayers to Almighty God for his preservation ?” — ED.

<sup>ft1787</sup> The gloss upon the [Decreti 2 pars; causal 12; quaest.i.; [cap. 8]; parag. 1:”Si qui,” saith, that this now holdeth not;; and allegeth the Extra. “de cler. conjug.” [See Decret. Gregor. 9:lib. in. tit. & cap. 1, “Si qui ;” et cap. 7, “*Johannes.*” — ED.] Whereby note how the pope’s decrees be repugnant to themselves.

<sup>ft1788</sup> By this rule the marriage of king Henry with queen Katherine dowager was unlawful.

<sup>ft1789</sup> [Decreti pars 2; causa.] 25; quaest. 2; cap. 3, “in Galliarum.”

<sup>ft1790</sup> The following is the commencement of the ninth answer in the printed copies : — “ I do not doubt but that these questions have been put to you, my brother, and I think I have already answered you therein. But I believe you would wish the opinion which you yourself might give to be confirmed by mine also.” — ED.

<sup>ft1791</sup> The following words are here added in the printed copies : — “ For it is very foolish to imagine that a gift of grace opposes that mystery in which all sin is blotted out.” — ED.

<sup>ft1792</sup> He speaketh here after the custom of the time.

ft1793 “In the Decretals collected, or at least published by the appointment of Gregory IX. in the beginning of the twelfth century, the world is abundantly furnished with accounts of the nature, virtue, necessity of the *pall*, and of the time, manner, and circumstances of using it; where it is decreed, that an archbishop, till he had received his *pall* from the bishop of *Rome*, could not call a council, bless the chrism, consecrate churches, ordain a clerk, or consecrate a bishop; and that before any archbishop received his *pall*, he should swear fidelity to the bishop of *Rome*. (Decretal, lib. 1:tit. 6, cap. 4 and tit. 8.) “*And whilst it was required, that on the translation of an archbishop, he should not carry his pale away with him, but demand a new one, by another canon it was determined that his successor should make no use of the pall he left behind; and by another, that every archbishop should be buried in his pall.* :By these ways the church of *Rome* did, in time, raise a mighty revenue.” — Inett’s *History of the English Church*, vol. 1:p. 165. Fuller has some characteristic remarks upon this customary adjunct to *Rome*’s empty *baubles* — *nugas dabit, accipit aurum*. Fuller’s *Church History*, cent. 7, sect. 38; Rivet, *Jesuits Vapulans*, cap. 10:sect. 2. — :ED ]

ft1794 “*Reverendissimo et sanctissimo fratri Augustino coepiscopo, Gregorius servus servorum Del. Cum certum sit, pro omnipotente Deo laborantibus ineffabilia aeterni regis praemia reservari, nobis tamen els necesse est honorum beneficia tribuere, ut in spiritualis operis studio ex remuneratione valeant multiplicius insudare,*” &c. An entire Latin copy of the epistle may be found in Foxe’s edition of 1563, p. 17. See also Bede’s *Eccles. Hist.* lib. 1:cap. 29, whence the above is revised. — ED.

ft1795 Bede’s *Ecclesiastes Hist.* lib. 1:cap. 30. — ED.

ft1796 *Id.* cap. 31. — ED.

ft1797 Lib. 3, [p. 323. Edit. Francof. 1601; and in Bede, “*Hist. Eccles.*”lib. 1:cap. 32. — ED.]

ft1798 *Polychron.* lib. 5:cap. 9. Fabian. part 5, cap. 119.

ft1799 Lib. 2:cap. 2. — ED.

ft1800 The following notices of these English chroniclers (much quoted by Foxe) are taken from Cave’s *Historia Literaria*. Ranulphus Higdenus,

Anglus, monachus Cestriensis ord. Benedict., claruit anno 1357. Historiam universalem ex aliorum chronicis contexit, quam a creatione mundi exorsus ad sua tempora deduxit, eamque *Polychronicon* appellavit. Henricus Huntindoniensis, Anglus, Nicolai presbyteri conjugati filius, Albini Andegavii canonici Lincolniensis discipulus, ipse etiam canonicus Lincolniensis, ac demum ab Alexandro episcopo Lincolniensi, quem Romam usque comitatus fuerat, archidiscipulus Huntindoniensis factus; claruit an. 1150. Scripsit ad Alexandrum *Lincolniensem*, “Historia Anglorum ab ipsis gentis primordiis usque ad Stephani regis mortem, ann. 1154,” quam libris duodecim absolvit. Johannes Brompton, Anglus, monachus Cisterciensis, deinde caenobii Jornallensis (rectius Jorvallensis) in agro Eboracensi abbas; claruisse videtur circa annum 1198. Extat sub illius nomine chronicon ab anno 588 ad annum 1198. — ED.

ft1801 Ex libro Jornalensi, Fabiano, et aliis.

ft1802 Bede’s words are, — “to the city of Legions, which by the English is called Legacester, but by the Britons more rightly Carlegion;” it was the station of the second Auguetan legion. It was called “Carlegion ar Usk,” to distinguish it from “Carlegion ar Dour-dwy” (hod. Chester): it was often called “Chester,” as here, and infra vol. 2:p. 5, 25, 37; sometimes “Chester in South Wales,” as infra vol. 2:p. 28. To avoid confusion, “Caerleon” has been appropriated to the one, “Chester” to the other city. See Usher, Brit. Eccl. Ant. cap. 5. — ED.

ft1803 Galfridus Monumeten.; Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 10. Liber Bibliothecae Jornalensis. Gull. *Malmesburiensis*, lib. [i. de Reg. p. 18] Fabian, p. 5, cap. 119, 120. [Bede, lib. 2:cap 2. — ED.] [Hen. Hunting. p. 325, edit. 1601; Bede, lib. 2:c. 2. — ED.]

ft1804 Bede names this abbot “Dinooth.” — ED.

ft1805 Nennius, the British historian, was one of these fifty. — ED.

ft1806 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 12. Polychron. The date 610 refers to the slaughter of the monks. — ED.

ft1807 This more probably took place in *Kent*. “When we find in Camden that the Medway, falling into the Thames, is divided by the isle of Sheppey into two great branches, of which one is called East Swale, and the other West Swale, I see no reason why we should look

elsewhere for that river Swale.” Heylin, quoted in Fuller’s” Appeal to Injured Innocence,” p. 394 (edit. Lond. 1840) who himself assents to the conjecture. — ED.

ft1808 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 4. — ED.

ft1809 St. David in Wales, otherwise called Dewie.

ft1810 As this author, Geoffrey, archdeacon of Monmouth, is often mentioned by Foxe, we may remark that the opinions as to his fidelity very much vary, and that the fables which abound in his work: are not of his own fabrication, but were adopted from Walter, archdeacon of Oxford. “Scripsit de origine et rebus gestis regum Britanniae, 12:libros, qui una cum allis Heidelbergse, 1587, prodierunt.” Vid. Vossius “de hist. Lat.” p. 419, edit. 1651; and “Supplementa ad Vos.” (Hamb. 1709) p. 711. Arehb. Usher has made great use of him. See also Godwin “de Praesu-libus,” p. 633. edit. Cantabr. 1743. — ED.

ft1811 Polychron. lib. 5:c. 10. He was surnamed “Eleemosynarius,” “the Almoner.” — ED.

ft1812 This John was so bountiful in giving, that he essayed to strive in a manner with the Lord; whether the Lord should give more, or he should distribute more of that which was given.

ft1813 Supra, p. 40: where, however, Foxe promises to give the said correspondence in this place. — ED.

ft1814 Baronins relates from *Sigebert*, that Gregory appeared to Sabinian “*per visum*” three times, and chode him “*pro culpa tenaciae et hujus derogationis ;*” and at his fourth appearance “*horri-biliter increpans, et comminane in capite percussit: quo ille dolore vexatus, non multo post mortem obiit*” — a story, which Pagi says Baronins should not have credited. It appears however to be just as worthy of reception as numbers of others proposed and urged upon the belief of the Roman catholic laity. Baron. “Annul.” an. 605, sect. 8. — ED.

ft1815 Fabian, part 5:cap. 120.

ft1816 Malmesburiensis lib. de Pontific. [lib. 2:p. 235]. H. Hunting. lib. in. [p. 324, edit. 1601. — ED.]

ft1817 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 3. — ED.

ft1818 This Edward was the third of that name before the conquest.

- ft1819 Sylvester Giraldus, flourished in the court of Henry II. — ED.
- ft1820 W. Malmesburiensis, lib. de reg. [p. 18. — ED.]
- ft1821 This queen was Ethelburga, daughter to king Ethelbert, the christened king of Kent.
- ft1822 Sometimes called Quichelm or Cwichelm. — ED.
- ft1823 Sometimes called Cynigils. — ED.
- ft1824 Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 12. Henr. Hunt. lib. in.
- ft1825 So says Fabian; but Bede calls it “Doruvention, the regal city,” which Camden says was on the site of a village called “Auldby,” (i. e. old habitation), six miles from York. — ED.
- ft1826 Fabian. pt. 5:[cap. 130; Bede, lib. 2:cap. 9. — ED.]
- ft1827 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 9. — ED.
- ft1828 Ibid. cap. 10,11. — ED.
- ft1829 Bede, lib. ii. cap. 12. — ED.
- ft1830 He was baptized in St. Peter’s church at York, which he first caused to be made of wood; which after, by St. Oswald, was builded of stone.
- ft1831 “Coifi” was the title of the chief of the Druids. See Palgrave’s “Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth,” vol. i.p. 155. — ED.
- ft1832 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 13.men.
- ft1833 In Fabian it is “Gwevy,” p. 112; in H. Hunting. p. 328, “Gleni,” sometimes “Glen.” — ED.
- ft1834 Note, Paulinus christened in rivers.
- ft1835 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 14, 16. — ED.
- ft1836 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 9,16,18. — ED.
- ft1837 Bede (lib. 2:cap. 16) says, “with a new-born babe.” — ED.
- ft1838 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 20. H. Hunting. p. 329; Matthew West. p. 114, edit. Francof. 1601. — ED
- ft1839 Ex Flor. Hist. Bede, lib. ii cap. 20; lib. in. cap. 14. [Matthew West. p. 114. — ED.]
- ft1840 Bede. Ibid. Hunting. lib. 2:[p. 336.]
- ft1841 Bede, lib. 2:cap. 15. — ED.

- ft1842 Supposed by some to be Devilston, or Dilston, in Cumberland. — ED.
- ft1843 From the prayers offered before the action, as Bede says. — ED.
- ft1844 Galfridus [lib. 12:cap. 14], Malmesburiensis, Polychron., *Historia Jornalensis*, Fabian. .Foxe's text has been corrected from Fabian in this last sentence. M. West. and Fabian make Cadwalla to be succeeded by his son Cadwallus or Cadwalinus, and him (after a reign of 48 years) by Cadwallader, A.D. 683. See *infra*, p. 357. — ED.
- ft1845 *Historia Jornalensis*; Polychronicon. lib. 5:cap. 12.
- ft1846 Now a village, nine miles S.E. of Oxford, whence the see was moved to Lincoln by Remigius, A.D 1078. — ED.
- ft1847 “Guido de Columns, Siculus, Edvardi I. a sacra expeditione reducis in regnum comes, auctor Chronici libb. 36; item *Historiae de Regibus Angliae*, A.D. 1257.” Hoffman. Fabian often quotes him; in this case, however, he refers to “the auctor of the floure of hystories.” See Appendix. — ED.
- ft1848 Bede, lib. in. cap. 7; Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 13; Fabian, part 5:cap. 133, 134. All the English chroniclers represent Kinegils, and not Quiceline, as the person who founded and endowed the two bishoprics, and as Kenwalcus's father; so does Foxe himself at pp. 344, 380. See Appendix. — ED.
- ft1849 Willelmus, Anglus, Somersetensis, coenobii Malmsburiensis monachus, ordinis Benedict., bbliothecarius, et praecntor, claruit circa ann. 1130; obiit anno 1143. De eo haec nobilias. Savilius, quo nemo melius judiicare. poterat. ., “Inter vetustissimos. . rerum nostrarum, autores, et narrationis fide et judicii matuntate principem locum tenet Guilelmus Malmsburiensis, homo, ut erant ilia tempora, literate doctus, qui septingentorum plus minus annorum res tanta fide et dili-gentia; pertexult, ut e nostris prope solus historici munus explevisse videtux.” Cave, *Hist. Lit.*
- ft1850 Malmesburiens. lib. de Pontif. Angl.; Cestrensis, lib. 5:;; *Hist. Jornalensis*.
- ft1851 *Hunting*. lib. in.
- ft1852 Supposed to be Oswestry. — ED.

- ft1853 Fabian, part 5:chap. 134. *Weds* is more correctly called *Peda* by Foxe, pp. 317, 383; *Peada* by Mat. Westmon. p. 120; and also in the Saxon Chronicle, by Ingram. (Lond. 1823.) A.D. 655. — ED.
- ft1854 This and the preceding sentence contain a confused mixture of three different pieces of history: see Appendix. See also *infra*, p. 354, for the correct statement of the matter. — ED.
- ft1855 Note the worthy liberality in the king; and no less in the bishop.
- ft1856 Bedae Hist. Ecclesiastes Anglor. lib. in. cap. 14. — ED.
- ft1857 Rather, “Alfrid.” — ED.
- ft1858 Fabian, part 5:chap. 184.
- ft1859 St. Chad. — ED.
- ft1860 Beda, lib. 4:cap. 5; Polychron.; Jornalensis; Fabian.
- ft1861 Rather, “Alfrid.” — ED.
- ft1862 A word which Bede states, means “The Bay of the Lighthouse;” now Whitby in York\* shire. Fuller’s Church History; cent. 7:book 2, *sect.* 90; Ingram’s Sax. Chron. p. 443. — ED.
- ft1863 Ex Beda, lib. in. cap. 25; 4:23. — ED.
- ft1864 This and the following speeches have been corrected in some places from the original. — ED.
- ft1865 Agilbert; was a Frenchman. — ED.
- ft1866 In the council of Nice no such matter appeareth.
- ft1867 Yea, air, “Suffragia ecclesiae non numeranda sunt, sed ponderanda.” — Aug.
- ft1868 Bede, lib. in. cap. 25.
- ft1869 Malmesburien. [pp. 263, 266 ]; Hunting. [p. 336, edit. Franc. 1601,] Fab. cap. 135, [p. 121, edit. 1811.]
- ft1870 Agatho was pope, A.D. 679 — 682. L’Art de V. des Dates. — ED.
- ft1871 See above, p. 348. — ED.
- ft1872 Brompton mentions Birinus as having officiated on this occasion. — ED,

- ft1873 There is no authority for this: Wolfer became "*patrinus*" to Ethelwold, but no more: possibly our author was thinking of the baptism of Kinigils, supra pp. 347, 348. — ED.
- ft1874 H. Hunting. lib. in. p. 334. — ED.
- ft1875 Bede, lib. 4:13; whence several words wanting in the text are supplied, to make the sense clear. — ED.
- ft1876 Called "Cedema" in Fabian, p 122.. "Lindeseia apud Sideneiam ;" Sidnacester apud Lin-colnlenses olim celebrem. (Wilkins, Conell. Magnae Brit. tom. 1:p. 51.) "About this time (678) Ecgfride founded another bishopric at Sydnacester in Lincolnshire, near the Humber." — Inett's History of the English Church, vol. i.p. 90. — ED.
- ft1877 Mahomet himself died A.D. 632. — ED.
- ft1878 Ex Polychron.; Giraldo Cambriensi; Stephano Cantuariensi.
- ft1879 "Quid autem acciderit, ut Theodorus sanctise, archiepiscopus (me superstite in sede, quam licet indignus dispensabam) absque consensu cujuslibet episcopi ex sua authoritate (mea humiitate non acquiescente) ordinaverit tres episcopos: omittere magis quam urgere, pro ejusdem viri reverentia, condecet. Quem quidem, pro eo quod ab hac apostolicae sedis summitate directus est, accusare non audeo," etc. Gull Malmesburiensis, lib. 1:de gestis pontif. Angierum. [p. 196, edit. 1601. — ED.]
- ft1880 The cause of an archb, of York's death, according to the metrical relation In that rare volume, the "Missale ad usum Ecclesiastes *Eboracensis*," (Parisiis, 1533) is remarkable on several accounts. We give it as prosaically printed, but without the contractions, and without being answerable for some offenses against grammar, intelligibility, etc. — "Eboracum praesul redit, pontis casus nullum laedit de tot turbae millibus. In octavia Penthe-coates quidam malignantur hostes in eum pacifice. Et ut ipsum privent vita celebrantes achonita propinant in calice Toxicatura prophanis ille potus ille panis, per quem perit toxicum. Ambo praesul amplexerat ut per unum moriatur et vivat per reliquum. Vivit moriturque quidem; sod non agunt circa idem fermentum et azima. Corpus obit prae fermento, azimorum alimento vege-tatur anima. Virus bibit nocuum, risumque perpetuum brevi mercans lachryma. Mortem subit optimum dum

sacrando victimam, fit et ipse victima. O Wilhelme, martyr Christi, per eundem quem bibisti salutaris calicem, fer solamen mundo tristi, et quem tibi placuisti nobis placa judicem.” As the volume, from which this extract is made, is so rare that Sir H. Nicholas (p. 94) doubts whether any perfect copy exists, but in the library of St. John’s Colossians Cambridge, its introduction may be excused. The 8th of June is the day dedicated to the archbishop’s memory, and his troubles seem to have had much in common with those of Wilfrid. — ED.

ft1881 Bede, lib. 5:c. 20.

ft1882 “Ubi videri et doleri potest humana miseria, quod videlicet quantumlibet quis sanctitate polleat, non ad plenum pervicaces mores exuat,” etc. Gull Malines. de gestis pontif. Anglorum lib.; Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 19.

ft1883 “Hertford,” according to Bede, ‘who has “Herudford.” The exact words in the first canon, as given by Bede, and Mat. West. (p. 122, edit. 1601) are, “dominica post decimam quartam lunam primi mensis.” Both these writers give “Herudford” or “Hertford,” anno 673, as the seat of this council; though *Thetford* is very briefly mentioned by Hen. Hunting. p. 318. Mr. Soames, “*Hist. of the Anglo-Saxon Church*,” thinks Hertford was decidedly the place. — ED.

ft1884 Bede, lib. 4:cap. 5.

ft1885 i.e. on the Sunday after the fourteenth moon of the first month. — ED.

ft1886 “Bishops and clergymen, when travelling.” Bede. — ED.

ft1887 Altered to once a year, on the calends of August, at Clovesho. — ED.

ft1888 This canon was thrown out. — ED.

ft1889 Rather, in the year following the council of Hatfield; see p. 354. — ED

ft1890 Some think this a mistake, arising from the circumstance of two different councils having been held much about the same time; namely, this at Constantinople, and another at Hedtfeld (see Bede, lib. 4:c. 17) under the presidency of Theodore of Canterbury, and upon the same subject — the heresy of Eutyches. There were several Asiatic bishops of the name of Theodorus present at the Constantinopolitan council,

and some deputies from *England*, among whom, in 681, *this* Theodore might have been present. (See Dupin's Rec. Ecclesiastes Hist. vol. 6:p. 66.) Malmesbury states of pope Agatho, that he assembled a council of fifty bishops, etc. "*in basilica Salvatoris, quae appellatur Constantiana,*" p. 263, edit. 1; rancor. 1601. According to Labbe, Concill. (tom. 6:c. 579 a council was held at Rome in the Basilica Constantiniana in 680, under Agatho, having reference to disputes with England. For the subsequent remark about the permission of marriage, the 13th canon of the Quinisext council (A.D. 691) is probably alluded to. "*Labbe. Concill.*" tom. 6:col. 1147. — ED.

ft1891 The English historians distinguish between Cadwallader, the last king of the Britons, and Ceadwalla, king of the West-Saxons, whom they state to have been a lineal descendant of Cerdic. See *supra*, p. 346, note. — ED.

ft1892 Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 21.

ft1893 Repton in Derbyshire. — ED.

ft1894 Ingulphi Hist. p. 872, edit. Franc. 1601; and Matthew West p. 135. — ED.

ft1895 What strange sights this Brithwald or Drithelme did see after his death, read the ninth book of Henry Huntingdon. [Huntingdon's History was written in twelve books. "*Quatuor posteriores in duobus codicibus MSS. Bibliothecae Lambethanae asservantur. Nempe Nouns agit 'de Sanctis Angliae eorumque miraculis,' ad verbum fete ex Bedae historia translatus.*" Cave. — ED.]

ft1896 Guli. Malmesb. lib. 5:de Pontif. [Foxe must have obtained this from MSS. as the fifth hook does not appear in the later edition of this writer. It will be found in Gale's collection, tom. in. and a strong eulogium upon Aldhelm in the secular part of Malmesbury's history, p. 13. See also Fabian, pt. 6:p. 159. — ED.]

ft1897 "Declare" obsolete for "to clear, to free from obscurity," Johnson: it seems to be used here sensu forensi; for "declarator" (according to Jacob's Law Dict.) is an action, whereby we pray something to be declared *in our favor*. Malmesbury says — "*Infantem allatum, vix dum novem a matre dierum, baptismi lavacro prius innovavit [Adelinus], sciscitatus est deinde publice, utrum vulgi opinio conveniret veritati de*

patre. Pusiolus in vocem absohtissimam conatus, nodum du-bietatis abruptit, sanctum et immaculatum esse Sergium, nunquam illum mulieri communicasse.” Fabian says, “the childe answered unto certain questions and clered the bishop of Rome of that crime.” — ED.

ft1898 Bede says A. D. 721, lib. 5:cap. 2 — 6.

ft1899 Ex Historia Jornalensi” de Regibus Northumb.”

ft1900 Fabian, part 6:c. 141, has “Wykcies,” but Palgrave has “Huiccas.” See “Hist. Anglo-Sax.’ p. 83. — ED.

ft1901 Ranulphus in Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 23 [citing Malmesbury, p. 284. — ED.]

ft1902 Bede, lib. 5:cap. 21, de Gestis Angl.; Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 22.

ft1903 This rule of Easter seemeth to be taken out of the book of Numbers. And they going out of Ramisse the fifteenth day of the first month, the next day after held their Easter, etc.

ft1904 See supra, p. 1, note. — ED.

ft1905 Ingram’s Sax. Chron. A.D. 716. — ED

ft1906 Maims. p. 22. — ED.

ft1907 Bede de Gest. lib. 5:cap. 21. — ED.

ft1908 The following translation has been revised from the original. — ED,

ft1909 How proveth he that the apostles Job and Joseph were shaven ?

ft1910 See how these shavelings would father their shaving upon Peter, which is neither found in Scripture, nor any approved story, but only in painted clothes.

ft1911 How doth the sight of the cross defend churches from evil spirits, when it cannot keep them from evil priests ?

ft1912 If shaving of the crown doth teach men patience in suffering, how cometh it that we see none more waspish and ireful than these shorn generations of monkish vipers !

ft1913 There is but one Mediator between God and man, Christ Jesus.

ft1914 Icombkill or Iona. — ED.

ft1915 If Peter shall let the elect of God into heaven, Christ then serveth in little stead.

ft1916 Bede, *ibid.* — ED

ft1917 Fabian, part 5:cap. 141; Gull. Malmesb. de Reg. p. 15. — ED.

ft1918 Matthew West. pp. 131, 149; the Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 1095. — ED.

ft1919 See *infra*, vol. 2:p. 89. — ED.

ft1920 Maims. p. 21, edit. 1601. Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England is addressed "Glorio-sissimo Regi Ceolwulpho." — ED.

ft1921 These were in reality two monasteries, the former at the place now called Monks-Wearmouth, on the river Wear, opposite Sunderland; the latter a little below Gateshead, on the river Tyne, at a place afterward called Jarrow. They were both of the Benedictine order, which produced such harmony between them, that they were called one monastery. This led W. Malmesbury into the error of saying that they were opposite to each other, on the banks of the Wire. The above information is taken from Dr. Giles's *Life of Bede*, prefixed to his translation of Bede. — ED.

ft1922 The venerable Bede was born near Durham, in a village now called Jarrow, near the mouth of the Tyne. "About a mile to the west of Jarrow there is a well called Bede's well, to which, as late as the year 1740, it was a prevailing custom to bring children troubled with any disease or infirmity; a crooked pin was put in, and the well laved dry between each dipping. My informant has seen twenty children brought together on a Sunday to be dipped in this well; at which, also, on Midsummer-eve, there was a great resort of neighboring people" Brand's *Pop. Antiq. Lond* 1813, vol. 2:p. 270, quoted in Dr. Giles's *Life of Bede*. — ED.

ft1923 *Supra*, p. 349. This Benedict, master to Bede, was the first that brought in the use of glass windows into England. Also, the said Benedict brought from Rome with him John, the arch-chanter, who first taught in England to sing in the choir after the manner of Rome.

ft1924 "An Beda Romam profectus sit, ut Sergius Papa per literas petiit, quas refert Malmesburi-ensis in lib. 1:de Reg. Angl. cap. 3, Ceolfrido Abbati scriptas, et ex eo Baronius, recte arbitratur Card. Doctiss. Bedam illuc se non contulisse: cure in fine suae Epitome cunctum ab infantia tern-pus vitro suae in sui monasterii habitatione peractum a se

affirmet. Mabillonius (saeculo III. Benedict. parte 1, in elogio historico Bede) ait nonnihil suspicionis esse in ea epistola, quod vix Beda presbyter ordinatus sit ante morrem Sergii, et quia libris scribendis vacare coepit a tempore suscepti presbyteratus, quibus factum est, ut fama ipsius ad posteros spargeretur. Henschenius vero ad diem 27 mensis Maii in vita venerabilis Bedae dieit, totam illam epistolam supposititiam apparere. Existimo tamen eam ab aliquo Sergii Papae successore datam qui cum paulo post demortuus fuerit, Ceolfridus Bedam Romam mittendum esse non existimavit." Pagii Crit. in Baron. an. 701, sect. 2. Mr. Stevenson, in his Introduction to the recent edition of Bede (Lond. 1838), supposes that Bede's name has been introduced into the letter by Malmesbury (whereas, the request of Sergius was general, that some one, "*quendam*," might be sent), and that hence arose the story of Bede's invitation and actual journey to Rome. — ED.

ft1925 G. Maims. p. 22. — ED.

ft1926 The year *before*, according to M. Westmon. p. 139; and the Saxon Chron. A.D. 734. — ED.

ft1927 This is hardly correct, *Farne* being the largest of the group of islands, now denominated from it the *Farne Islands*, upon the coast of Northumberland, and at no great distance from Lindisfarne. Raine's "St. Cuthbert. with an account of the state in which his remains were found," etc. (Durham, 1828), p. 21. Bede represents it in the same way; Hist. Ecclesiastes 4:27. Hegge, in allusion to the dietary change which Ceolwolf introduced, remarks, "A welcome man you may be sure to that monastery!" "Legend of St. Cuthbert," by Robert Hegg. See also Hoveden, "Annall." p. 418, edit. 1601. — ED.

ft1928 "Clovesho" is supposed by some to be Cliff, near Gravesend, in Kent. Fuller's Church History, cent. alii. b. 2, sect. 21; Wilkins, Concil Mag. Brit. tom. 1:pp. 94 — 100. But Johnson think3 that this must have been "Abbyndon in Berks, of old written Sheafs-ham, perhaps for Cleofs-ham" (See "Ind. Nora. Loc." at the end of "Chron. Sax."); and not Cliffe in Kent, on account of the insalubrity of the climate, etc. "Collection of Ecclesiastes Laws Canons," etc. vol. 1:an. 673, sect. 7. Bishop Gibson is of the same opinion, and argues from the book of Abbington, which says, that it was anciently written "Shovesham,"

probably a corrupt reading for” Clovesham ;” and adds, “Hic sedes regia: hic, cum de regni praecipuis et arduis tractaretur negotiis, concursus fiebat populi.” An annual synod was appointed to be held at this place on the Calends of August by the seventh canon of the council of Thetford, supra p. 356. It is no doubt of importance to remark, that Foxe has represented the decrees to be in number thirty-one, whereas, in Wilkins and in Labbe, tom. 6:col. 1573-85. the thirtieth finishes the list. Gull. Malmesb. has numbered them in the same way as Foxe, p. 197, edit. 1601. — ED.

ft1929 Ex Malmesb. lib. “De Gestis Pontif. Anglo.”

ft1930 The rogation-days had not then that superstition in them which they had afterward.

ft1931 At Crediton, in Devonshire, about A.D. 680. He was archbishop of Mentz A.D. 745 — 755. L’Art de Ver. des Dates. — ED.

ft1932 Hoveden, “Annales,” p. 408; Matth. West. p. 140; Sax. Chron. by Ingram, p. 67, Lond. 1823. — ED.

ft1933 Malmesbury, p. 28; and in Wilkins’ Concil. tom. 1:pp. 87-90, more at length. — ED.

ft1934 In Maimes. “Winedi ;” in Wilkins “et apud Persas.” — ED.

ft1935 Boniface was first patronized and sent forth by Gregory II.; again by Gregory III., who made him a titular bishop, gave him the metropolitan’s pall, and appointed him legate of the holy see: he was made archbishop of Mentz by pope Zachary. L’Art de Ver. des Dates. — ED.

ft1936 A.D. 744.. Centuriatores Magdeb. cent. 8:cap. 10. coil. 448 and 485, edit. Basil, 1624. — ED.

ft1937 Baronius, as quoted by Labbe, (Concil. GED. tom. 6:col. 1493) will fully support this state-merit, and the passage would be worth citing for its lively style, had we room. See” Mariani Scoti Chronicon,” col 395, edit. 1559; and Bellarmin. “de Romans Pont.” lib. 2:cap. 17. — ED.

ft1938 In 727 Leo the Isaurian, surnamed Iconomachus, began to oppose the worship of images in the church: and a rupture commenced between this Greek emperor and the see of Rome, under pope Gregory II.,

which laid a foundation for the temporal power of the Roman prelate, which in a few years was effectually established. — ED.

<sup>ft1939</sup> Rather Gregory the *second*. “De Dialogis dubitatum est an Gregorii primi legitimus foetus essent; et sane *Chemnitius* animadvertit Italicis prodigiis plenos esse, nec in orationis genere, nec in rebus ipsis cum Gregorii reliquis scriptis congruere: et fortasse sunt Gregorii illius qui a Graecis “Dialogus” est cognominatus, quod cognomen (air Cedrenus ad an. Leonis 10) ob suas lucubrationes adeptus est; quas lucubrations, dialogos istos fuisse verosimile est. Is autem fuit *Gregorius* secundus, qui vivebat an. 726. Baronius et F. Ducaeus, qui ejus epistolas de imaginibus Graece et Latine ediderunt, annal, tom. 9:contendunt, Graecos, qui” Dialogi” nomen huic secundo tribuerunt, utrumque Gregorium 1 et 2 confudisse, et in eo fuisse deceptos; quod tamen nullo argumento vel levissimo probant. Fuisse opinionem quorundam virorum doctorum, autorem” Dialogorum” esse *Gregorium* 2, Possevinus etiam fatetur; quod firmatum videtur auctoritate Photii in biblioth. (cod. 252), qui “Zachariam Pontif. Romans Gregorii **διάδοχον** ait curasse, ut in linguam Graecam converterentur. At Zacharias fuit Greg. 2, immediatus **διάδοχος**.” Rivet. “Crit. Sac.” lib. 4, cap. 29. [Zachary, however, was the *immediate* successor of Gregory the *third*]. — ED.

<sup>ft1940</sup> The Dialogues attributed to Gregory I. seem to be his genuine production: vide Cudin, “Comment. de Scripp. Eccles.” tom. 1:col. 1506; and “Alex. Natalis Hist. Eccles.” vol. 10:p. 93, edit. 1787. See Clarke’s “Succession of Sacred Literature,” vol. 2:p. 360. — ED.

<sup>ft1941</sup> [Autorem citat Baronius Anastasium Bibliothecarium. (p. 93, edit. Mogunt. 1602.) Hoc primum est exemplum hujus submissionis, nondum injunctae, sed sponte delatae, ab illo Imperatore, quem *oeternum opprobrium domus suae* agnoscunt ipsi, qui hoc ejus factum laudant historici.” Riveti “*Jesuita vapulans*,” cap. 28, sect. 31. — ED.]

<sup>ft1942</sup> Roger Hoveden, p. 408, edit. 1601; and the Saxon Chron. A.D. 755. — ED.

<sup>ft1943</sup> “Cynewulf was desirous of expelling a prince called Cyneard, who was the brother of Sebright.” Saxon Chron.; Fabian, p. 139 — ED.

- ft1944 The archbishop had invited Charlemagne to invade Britain, and withstand Offa. A slight transposition has been made in this sentence. — ED.
- ft1945 Called to this day “Offa’s Dyke.” — Palgrave’s History of the Anglo-Saxons, p. 84. — ED.
- ft1946 This Alcuin is commended for his learning next to Aldelm and Bede above all Saxons [He died at Tours, A.D. 804. Cave. — ED.]
- ft1947 Ex Hist. Jornalensi et Malmesburiensi.
- ft1948 Foxe here confounds Offa, king of Mercia, with Offs, king of *Essex*, who nearly a century before turned monk and went to Rome (see supra, p. 318, note (10)), with Kenred, king of *Mercia* (see sup. p. 317, and infr. p. 376. 384). — ED.
- ft1949 Foxe has not inserted him in the list in p. 384. — ED.
- ft1950 “Non arbitror quod nobillissimus juvenis Egfertus propter peccata sua mortuus sit: sed quia pater suns, pro confirmatione regni ejus, multum sanguinem effudit,” etc. Alcuinus Osberto patricio; [in G. Malines. p. 33. — ED.]
- ft1951 Part 6:chap. 151. — ED.
- ft1952 P. 33. Mat. Westmon. p. 150, and the Saxon Chronicle, A. D. 794, call the released king “Eadbert.” — ED.
- ft1953 Anastasii de vitis Romans Pontiff. p. 126, edit. Mogunt. 1602; Labbe, tom. 6:coil. 1628. — ED.
- ft1954 Ex Polyc. lib. 5:cap. 25.
- ft1955 Anastasius de vit. Pontif. p. 131. — ED.
- ft1956 In a council held at Rome, April 12th, A. D. 769. — ED.
- ft1957 The council here referred to was held A. D. 754, under the auspices of Constantine Copronymus: it was attended by 338 bishops, who passed a strong sentence against image-worship: it was considered and called by the orthodox party the “Seventh General Council ;” but the Romish church rejects its claims to be so considered, and sets up instead the second Nicene Council, held in A.D. 787 in favor of image-worship, as the true “Seventh.” See Binii Not. in Labb. Cone, Genesis tom. vi col. 1661. — ED.

- ft1958 In “Epist. ad Car. M. pro Synodo Nic. II.” apud Labbe, tom. 7:col 960. This device is, however, much older than the times of Adrian, or even Augustine. See “Eusebii Praep. Evang.” lib. in. cap. 7. — ED.
- ft1959 Vide Martini Poloni Chron. col. 138, Basil, 1559; and the Lect. Vat. on p. 128, prefixed to “Anastasio Hist. de vitis Romani Pontificis,” edit. Mogunt. 1602. — ED.
- ft1960 Supra, p. 341. — ED.
- ft1961 Ex Durando [rationale Divin. Offic. lib. 5:cap. 2, sect. 5. — ED.] Nauclero [Chron. vol. 2:gen. 28, p. 705, edit. Colon. 1579. — ED.] Jacob de Voragine, in vita Greg.
- ft1962 Atqui tamen ipsis commentum placet. Terent. [Andr. I, 3, 20.]
- ft1963 See “Bel and the Dragon,” in the Apocrypha. — ED.
- ft1964 Austriae Civitas, or Cividada di Friuli, an ancient town of Italy, in the Venetian territory. — ED.
- ft1965 In G. Malmesb. p. 32. — ED.
- ft1966 This assertion seems incorrect ; but this portion of the history is rather perplexed. According to the statement of Anastasius, Desiderius, king of the Lombards, made the application to Adrian, “ut ipsos antefati Carolomanni filios reges ungeret ;” etc. (in Baron. Annul. an. 772, sect. 9) and the wife of Caroloman was Gilberga, not Bertha. (Pagii Crit. an. 770, sect. 7.) The mistake arose, apparently, from Bertha, the *mother* of Caroloman and Charlemagne, having traveled into Italy, her meeting Caroloman at Saluzzo, and effecting a reconciliation between the two brothers; but this occurred under the previous pontificate of Stephen III. The general statement of Pagi is: “Gravissimum fuit hoc anno Hadriano pupae cure Desiderio Longobardorum rege dissidium; hic enim, ut de Carolo Francorum rege, qui divortium cum filia ejus Desiderata fecerat, ultionem sumeret, Gilbergam Carolomanni regis conjugem, ejusque filios in fidem suscepit, eosque adversus Carolum regem per novum pontificem consecrari reges tentavit,” etc. Crit. ad an. 772, sect. 2 and 770, sect. 3. — ED.
- ft1967 Conrad duke of Franconia was chosen emperor A.D. 911, Otho duke of Saxony having declined the honor on account of his great age:

Conrad's authority, however, was not recognised in Italy. Conrad was succeeded in 919, by Henry I., son of Otho, just mentioned; and he was succeeded by his son Otho I., A.D. 936, who was crowned emperor at Rome by John XII. A.D. 962. *Otho* I. was evidently 'nepos,' i.e. *grandson* (not "nephew") to Otho, duke of Saxony, (not "Conrad.") See *infra*, vol. 2:pp. 43, 71. "Nephew," however, is often used for "grandson." See *supra*, p. 89, note (2.) — ED.

ft1968 "Anno 792 Carolus Rex Francorum misit synodalem librum ad Britanniam, sibi a Constan- tinopoli directum. In quo libro (heu pro dolor), multa inconvenientia et vers fidei contratia reperiuntur, maxime quod pene omnium orientalium doctorum non minus quam 300 vel eo amplius episcoporum unanimi assertione confirmatum sit, imagines adorari debere: quod omnino ecclesia Dei execratur. Contra quod scripsit Albinus epistolam ex autoritate divinarum scripturarum mirabiliter affirmatam, illamque cum eodem libro ex persona episcoporum ac principum nostrorum, regi Francorum attulit." Hoveden. [Page 405, edit. Francof. 1601. — ED.]

ft1969 This Albinus was Alcuin above mentioned.

ft1970- Winchester. — ED.

ft1971 Roger Hoveden, lib. contin, post Bedam. ["Rogerus de Hoveden, Eboracensis Henrici II. domesticus, postea primarius theol. prof. in Acad. Oxon.; claruit a. 1198. Scripsit "Annalium Anglicanorum libros 2," ab a. 731 (quo deslit Beda) usque ad a. 1202." Cave. — ED.]

ft1972 *Ethelred*, in the Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 774; which agrees better with what follows in the Latin quotations from William of Malmesbury. — ED.

ft1973 G. Malmesb., p. 26, according to the edit. 1601, says, "post discessum Sancti Paulini ;" which is the correct reading in both respects, Paulinus having left York, and died in Kent. Bede, "Hist. Ecclesiastes Angl." 2:20; Hi. 14. — ED.

ft1974 "Quid significat pluvia sanguinis, quam quadragesimali tempore in Eboraco civitate, quae caput est totius regni, in ecclesia beati principis apostolorum vidimus, de borealibus partibus domus sereno aere) de summitate minanter cadere? Nonne potest putari, a borealibus partibus venire sanguinem super terrain ?" Ex Historia Malmesburiensi. The text

of Foxe differs slightly From the edition of Malmesbury (p. 258) which we have before us; and he must indeed have consulted a MS. copy; the first printed edition not having appeared till 1590, some years after Foxo's death. — ED.

ft1975 Bertrio or Beortric. — ED.

ft1976 The first arrival of the Danes was in Wessex, A.D. 787, the third year of Brightric, and to this Foxo's account chiefly refers: the second was seven years after, in Northumberland, in the *tenth* year of Brighttic, A.D. 794. See Polychronicon (referred to by Fabian) and Chronicon Sax.; also infra, vol. 2:p. 5, margin. The words inserted in brackets make the text more correct. — ED.

ft1977 "Sceius plane exsercandum," observes Baronins (ad an. 790, sect. 8) "*nisi* (qnod multi excusant) justitiae eam zelus ad id faciendum excitasset, quo nomine eadem post haec meruit commendari." — ED.

ft1978 See Saxon Chronicle by Ingram, p. 86, and note 3. — ED.

ft1979 G. Malines. p. 88; and Fabian, p. 147. — ED.

ft1980 "Lightly," i.e. commonly. Todd's Johnson. — ED.

ft1981 Bede, 2:3; Saxon Chron. A.D 604. — ED.

ft1982 Heofonfeld. Bede, in. 2. — ED.

ft1983 Polychron. lib. 5:cap. 12. an, 635.

ft1984 Guliel. Maims. lib. De Gestis Pont. Ang. [lib. 2:p. 241, edit. 1601. "Tandem rex, qui Saxonum linguam tantum noverat, peraesus barbarae loquelae subintroduxit in provinciam alium suae linguae episcopum, vocabulo *Wini*, et ipsum in Gallia ordinatum." Bede Hist. Ecclesiastes Angl. lib. in. cap. 7. See supra, pp. 347, 348. — ED.]

ft1985 See supra, p, 345. — ED.

ft1986 Bede. [Fabian, part 5:chap. 120. — ED.]

ft1987 Bede Hist. Ecclesiastes in. 19. "Suffolciensium Burg-castell illud est." Usher. "Brit. eccles. Antiq." p. 501, edit. Lond. 1687. It is at this day called *Burgh-ca\*tell* in Suffolk, where the rivers Garien and Waveney mingle waters. "Cressy's Church-history of Brittany," book 15:chap. 6, sect. 1 I. — ED.

- ft1988 Higden calls him “Subregulus Merciorum :” he was nephew to Ethelred, king of Mercia, and his viceroy in those parts: probably he had much to do with superintending the building. See Tanner’s “Not. Mon.” Higden states that Kineburga was *Osric*’s sister, and was by him made the first abbess: Foxe himself follows this statement in page 384. — ED.
- ft1989 G. Malta. p. 27, edit. 1601. — ED.
- ft1990 Bede, lib. 4:cap. [23, and note. According to Capgrave, Begs, vulgarly S. Bees, was the nun’s name. Cressy’s “Church-history of Brittany,” book 15:ch. 21, sect. 1. At Hartlepoole. Tanner. — ED.]
- ft1991 Fabian, p. 119. — ED.
- ft1992 Lastingham, near Whitby. Tanner. Bede, in. 23. — ED.
- ft1993 This Hilda was first converted to the faith by Paulina, a godly and learned woman [Bede says by Paulinus, the bishop: lib. in. cap. 23. — ED.]: out of her monastery came five bishops.
- ft1994 Hackness, a place in Whitby-Strand, thirteen miles from Whitby (according to Bede), and three from Scarborough. See Tanner’s “Not. Mon.” — ED.
- ft1995 Fabian, p. 120, edit. 181 50:— ED.
- ft1996 Or “Icanhoe.” See “Saxon Chronicle,” A.D. 654. Supposed by some writers to be Boston, *i.e.* Botulph’s town: Cressy’s “Church-history of Brittany,” book 15:ch. 22, sect. 7. — ED.
- ft1997 Polych. lib. 5:cap. 16.
- ft1998 Foxe says” Ethelbald,” erroneously, as his own date shows: see Tanner. — ED.
- ft1999 M. Westmon, an. 720. — ED.
- ft2000 Matthew Westmon. p. 176, edit. 1601. — JED.
- ft2001 See supra, p. 381, note (12). — ED.
- ft2002 Ex chronicis Guliel. Malmesb. lib. 1:p. 29. Where the document slightly differs from that which Foxe here gives: some trifling emendations have therefore been made from Malmesbury.-Ed.]
- ft2003 Several inaccuracies have been corrected in the following list. — ED.
- ft2004 G. Malms. p. 89 Saxon Chron. p. 49. — ED.

- ft2005 Bede (lib. in. cap. 21, 24) calls these two daughters of Oswy respectively “Eanfleda” and “Alhfieda.” — ED.
- ft2006 Malmsb. and Higden; who also describe Merowald as brother to Wolfer and Ethelred. Hence Foxe is mistaken p. 317, note (10). — ED.
- ft2007 Rather “aunt.” See above, p. 381, note— ED.
- ft2008 Bede, Hist. Ecclesiastes Angl. lib. 4:cap. h. — ED.
- ft2009 The dates of the accession of the archbishops are taken from Richardson’s Godwin “De Praesulibus, etc.” — ED.
- ft2010 In his time the monastery of St. Martin was builded in Dorobernia, by Witred, and his brother, kings of Kent.
- ft2011 This Cuthbert after his death forbade all funeral exequies or lamentation for him to be made; William of Maim. de Vitis [Pontiff. Angl. p. 198. — ED.]
- ft2012 [He is named in Florence of Worcester “Iainbertus” (p. 574), and “Eanbert” in the Saxon Chronicle, A.D. 763. — ED.] In his time king Offa translated the metropolitan see from Canterbury to Lichfield by the grant of pope Adrian, being overcome with apostolical argument, as saith Flor. Historiar.; that is, with money. [The words in this historian are: “nam verisimilibus apost. sedem argumentis tam diu fatigaverat, sicut pro variis occupationibus de facili Romans Pontifices trahuntur ad *consensum*, obtinuit quod petebat,” etc. p. 143, edit. Francof. 1601. William of Malmsbury speaks more plainly, p. 198; and the account in Wilkins (Concill. Mag. Brit. tom. 1:p. 152) will fully support the interpretation of Foxe. — ED.]
- ft2013 This Ethelard by his epistles to pope Leo III., obtained the metropolitan see [to be restored] again to Canterbury. [Ethelard also went in person to Rome. — ED.]
- ft2014 Flor. Wigornien. p. 681. — ED.