

THE
ACTS AND MONUMENTS

BY
JOHN FOXE.

(1517-1587)

First published in

1563

Original woodcuts are excluded

FAMILY EDITION

Books IX – X

EDITED BY

REV. M. HOBART SEYMOUR, M.A.

1855

Source text:

http://www.archive.org/stream/actsmonumentsofcoofoxe/actsmonumentsofcoofoxe_djvu.txt

Formatted, corrected, modernized w/Am. spelling, and annotated ([in blue](#))

by **William H. Gross** www.onthewing.org April 23, 2012

Last updated 8/28/2025

Contents

BOOK IX.....	1399
An account of the acts and events of the reign of King Edward VI.	1399
<i>Book of Common Prayer – 1549.....</i>	<i>1410</i>
<i>Disloyalty in Cornwall and Devonshire.....</i>	<i>1416</i>
<i>Proceedings Against Bishop Bonner.</i>	<i>1424</i>
<i>Reformation of Church Services.....</i>	<i>1442</i>
<i>Correspondence between Edward and Mary.....</i>	<i>1445</i>
<i>An Account of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.</i>	<i>1451</i>
<i>The History of Edward Seymour, Lord Protector.....</i>	<i>1455</i>
<i>Disputations at Cambridge about the Sacrament.....</i>	<i>1464</i>
<i>Disputations on “This is my body.”.....</i>	<i>1468</i>
<i>The Death of King Edward VI – July 1553.....</i>	<i>1478</i>
BOOK X.	1481
The entrance of Queen Mary to the crown, with the alteration of religion in the realm.	1481
<i>Lady Mary Proclaimed Queen.....</i>	<i>1484</i>
<i>Disputations at London about the Sacrament.....</i>	<i>1490</i>
<i>The Death of Lady Jane Grey.</i>	<i>1503</i>
<i>Queen Mary Assails the Reformation.....</i>	<i>1508</i>
<i>Archbishop Cranmer Disputes at Oxford.....</i>	<i>1514</i>
<i>Bishop Ridley Disputes at Oxford.....</i>	<i>1518</i>
<i>Master Hugh Latimer Disputes at Oxford.</i>	<i>1529</i>
<i>Queen Mary Purges Her Opponents.....</i>	<i>1538</i>
<i>Declaration by Bradford, et al, regarding Disputation at Cambridge.....</i>	<i>1548</i>
<i>Marriage of Philip to Queen Mary.....</i>	<i>1552</i>
<i>Absolution of England by the Pope’s Legate.</i>	<i>1558</i>
<i>Persecution of Protestants Continues.....</i>	<i>1560</i>

ACTS AND MONUMENTS

BOOK IX.

CONTAINING

An account of the acts and events of the reign of King Edward VI.

After the death of King Henry VIII, succeeded King Edward his son, at the age of nine years. He began his reign on the twenty-eighth of January A.D. 1547, and reigned six years, eight months, and eight days. He died on the sixth day of July A.D. 1553. Enough cannot be said to his commendation, of the excellent virtues and singular graces wrought in him by the gift of God. Yet because the renowned fame of such a worthy prince should not pass our history without some grateful remembrance, I propose to briefly touch some portion of his praise, taken out of the many things which might be described. For to stand upon all that might be said of him, would take too long; and yet to say nothing, would be too unkind. If kings and princes who have wisely and virtuously governed, have in all ages found writers to panegyrise (eloquently praise) and celebrate their acts and memory, who never knew them, nor were subject to them, then how much are we Englishmen bound not to forget our duty to King Edward? He was a prince of tender years; yet for his sage and mature ripeness in all princely ornaments, as I see but few to whom he may not be equal, so again I do not see many to whom he may not justly be preferred.

And here, to use the example of Plutarch in comparing kings and rulers, the Latins with the Greeks together, if I were to seek with whom to match this noble King Edward, I find none with whom to make my comparison more aptly, than with good king Josiah. For as one began his reign at eight years of age, so the other began at nine. Neither were their acts and zealous proceedings in God's cause very unlike. For as mild Josiah pulled down the high altars, cut down the groves, and destroyed all monuments of idolatry in the temple, so the like corruptions, dross, and deformities of popish idolatry which had crept into the church of Christ, this King Edward removed, and purged the true temple of the Lord. Josiah restored the true worship and service of God in Jerusalem, and destroyed the idolatrous priests. King Edward, in England, likewise abolished idolatrous masses and false invocation, reduced religion to a right sincerity again, and would have brought it more to perfection if life and time had answered his godly purpose. And though he did not kill the idolatrous sacrificers, as Josiah did, yet he put them to silence, and removed them from their places.

Moreover, in King Josiah's days the holy Scriptures and book of God's word was utterly neglected and cast aside; he most graciously repaired and restored it again. And did not King Edward do the same, with the self-same book of God's blessed word, and with other wholesome books of Christian doctrine, which before were decayed and extinguished in his father's days? Briefly, in all points and respects, no great difference is to be found between Josiah and this our godly king, except in length of reign. If Edward might have reached (by the sufferance of God) the continuance of Josiah's reign, proceeding in those beginnings which appeared in his youth, no doubt by his acts and doings some great perfection would have ensued to this church and realm. But the manifold iniquities of Englishmen deserved another plague, as will be declared in the sequel of this history.

In the meantime, to proceed as we have begun, with the excellent virtues of this young "Christian Josiah," we will give a taste of the noble nature and princely qualities of this king. By these the reader may judge for himself what is to be thought of the rest of his doings. And to begin first with that which is the chief property of all other external things in a prince,

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

that is, to be loved by his subjects. Such were the hearts of all English people towards this king, that there was never a prince in this realm more highly esteemed, or more dearly and tenderly beloved by all his subjects, but especially by the good and learned sort. And as he was beloved by his subjects, so he loved them back. His nature and disposition were meek, and much inclined to clemency. He always spared and favored the life of man, insomuch that when Joan was to be burned, all the council could not move him to put his hand to the warrant, but were obliged to get Dr. Cranmer to persuade him. And yet neither could he induce the king to do so, the king saying, “What, my lord, will you have me send her quickly to the devil in her error?” So that Dr. Cranmer himself confessed that he never had so much to do in all his life, as to cause the king to sign his hand, saying that he would lay all the charge of it upon himself before God. Edward lacked no promptness of wit, gravity of sentence, or ripeness of judgment. Favor and love of religion was in him from his childhood. And besides these notable excellences, and other great virtues in him, add moreover skill and knowledge of tongues and other sciences, in which he excelled far beyond his years.

[636]

Of all his justices, magistrates, and gentlemen who bore any authority within this realm, he knew their names, their housekeeping, their religion, and conduct, whatever it was. There were few sermons in his court, especially in the lord protector’s time, which he did not attend. And those he was present at, he noted them with his own hand.

But above all other examples of his commendation — and which is the chief point which ought most to concern all men — he was zealous in maintaining, promoting, preferring, embracing, and defending the true cause of Christ’s holy gospel. And it was his study, his zealous fervency, and his admirable constancy in this, that he promoted it in others by his own example.

In the days of this King Edward VI, the emperor Charles made a request to the king and his council, to permit the Lady Mary (who afterwards succeeded to the crown) to have mass in her house without prejudice of the law. And the council, one time, sitting upon matters of policy, and having that in question under consideration, sent Cranmer, who was then archbishop of Canterbury, and Ridley, then bishop of London, to entreat the king for it. Upon coming to his grace, they alleged their reasons and persuasions for accomplishing it. So the king hearing what they could say, replied out of the Scriptures so gravely and wisely, that they were forced to give way to his reply, and acknowledge its truth. Then, after long debating with his majesty, they alleged what dangers the refusal might bring upon his grace; what breach of amity on the emperor’s part; what troubles; what unkindness, and what occasions it would force, etc. The king answered, desiring them to content themselves, for he would, he said, rather spend his life and all he had, than agree to and grant what he knew certainly to be against the truth. When the bishops heard this, they still urged him to grant it. Then the good king seeing their importunate suit, his tender heart bursting out into bitter weeping, and sobbing, he desired them to be content. Then the bishops themselves, seeing the king’s zeal and constancy, wept as quickly as he did, and took their leave of his grace. On coming from him, the archbishop took Master Cheek, his schoolmaster, by the hand, and said, “Ah, Master Cheek, you may be glad all the days of your life that you have such a scholar. For he has more divinity in his little finger, than we all have in our whole bodies.” Thus the Lady Mary’s mass was prevented for that time.

Besides these heavenly graces and virtues, which are required in all faithful and Christian magistrates who have the government of Christ’s flock, neither was he unprovided with such outward gifts and knowledge as pertain to the political government of his realm. So that he

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

was not inexpert or ignorant of the monetary exchange, and all the circumstances of the same as regarding doings beyond the sea. But he was as skillful, and could say as much in these, as the chief doers in his affairs. Likewise in entertaining ambassadors, to whom he would give an answer to every part of their oration, to the great wonder of those who heard him. He was doing that in his tender years, by himself, which many princes at their mature age are seldom prone to do except by others. And as he was a great noter of things that pertained to princely affairs, so he had a chest for every year, for keeping such records and matters as were passed and concluded by the council. He would also require from them a reason and cause for everything that passed their judgments. And he always kept the key to this chest about him. He also cyphered his notes in Greek letters, so that those who waited on him would not read or know what he had written. Moreover, he had great respect for justice, and to the dispatch of poor men's lawsuits, and would appoint hours and times with Master Cox, then Master of his requests, how and by what order they might be helped in their causes, without long delay and attendance — and also debate with him, so that their matters might be heard and judged with equity.

Thus after the godly disposition of this king being declared, we will now describe the order and proceedings which he followed in his administration and government of both states, political as well as ecclesiastical. Coming to the crown after the decease of his father, because he was of young and tender age, he was committed to sixteen governors. Among them, especially, the Lord Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset, his uncle, was appointed as protector and overseer of him and of the commonwealth. He was a man not so highly advanced for his consanguinity as for his noble virtues, and especially for his favor to God's word. Through the endeavor and industry of Seymour, first, that monstrous hydra with six heads, I mean the Six Articles, which had devoured so many men before, was abolished and taken away. Then he restored the holy Scriptures in the mother tongue, and he extinguished and abolished masses. After small beginnings, little by little, greater things followed in the reformation of the churches. Then those who were in banishment for the danger of the truth, were received back to their country. To be brief, a new face of things now began to appear, as if on a stage, new players coming in, and the old ones being thrust out. For the most part, the bishops of churches and dioceses were changed. Those who had been dumb prelates before, were compelled to give way to others who would preach and take pains.

Besides this, men of learning and notable knowledge were sent for from foreign countries, and cordially received and promoted in this country. Among them were Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, and Paul Phagius. Of these, the first taught at Oxford; the other two professed at Cambridge, and with no small commendation by the whole university. Of the old bishops, some were committed to one prison ward, some to another. Bonner, bishop of London, was committed to the Marshalsea; and soon after, for his contempt and misdemeanor, he was deposed from his bishopric. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, with Tunstall, bishop of Durham, was thrown into the Tower for his disobedience. There he kept his Christmas for three years straight. He was more worthy of some other place outside the Tower, if it had pleased God otherwise, not to cause a further plague to this realm by that man.

But these meek and gentle times of king Edward, under the government of this noble protector, have this one commendation: that among the whole number of the popish sort, some of them stole secretly out of the realm; many were crafty dissemblers; some were open and manifest adversaries — yet of all that multitude, not one man lost his life. In short, during the whole six years of this king, there was much tranquility, and as it were, a breathing-time was granted to the whole church of England. So that the rage of persecution ceasing, and the sword being taken out of the adversary's hand, there was now no danger to

the godly, unless it were by wealth and prosperity, which often bring more damage in corrupting men's minds, than any time of persecution or affliction.

Briefly, during all this time, neither in Smithfield nor in any other quarter of this realm, was anyone heard to suffer for any matter of religion, either papist or protestant, either for one opinion or another, except two: one an Englishwoman, called Joan of Kent, and the other a Dutchman, named George.

Besides these two, there was no one else in all king Edward's reign who died in any cause of religion. However, one Thomas Dobbe was apprehended and imprisoned in the beginning of this king's reign, for speaking against the idolatry of the mass; he died in the same prison.

This Thomas Dobbe, being a student and a master of arts at Cambridge, was brought up in St. John's College, and was a fellow there, where he increased in the study of good letters. Among his equals he was very forward; of nature and disposition simple and modest; of zeal towards God fervent; patient in injuries, and injurious to no man. At length this godly man, intending to enter the Christian state of matrimony, resorted to a certain maiden not far off from where he dwelt. On this account he was greatly molested and wickedly abused by three of that college, named Hutchinson, Pindare, and Taper.

[637] A.D. 1547-1553.

With their malicious handling, scornful dealing, rebukes, and vilifications, they so vexed the virtuous simplicity of the man, that they never left him, till at length they wearied him out of the college. Having no rest or quietness there, because of the unreasonable and virulent handling of his adversaries, he was compelled to seek some other place to settle himself. On coming up to London, he chanced to pass through St. Paul's church, where it happened that at the south side of the church there was a priest celebrating mass, being at the elevation of the body as Thomas passed by. The young man, replete with godly zeal, and pitying the ignorance and idolatry of the people in honoring so devoutly what the priest lifted up, was not able to forbear. Opening his mouth and turning to the people, he exhorted them not to honor the visible bread as God, which neither was God, nor yet ordained from God to be honored, etc. For this he was apprehended by the Mayor, accused to the archbishop of Canterbury, and committed to the Compter (jail). There, falling into a sickness, he died. His pardon, notwithstanding was obtained by the lord Protector, and it would have been brought to him if he had lived. And thus much concerning Thomas Dobbe.

I find that in the first year of the reign of king Edward, there was one John Hume, servant to Master Lewnax, of Wresel, apprehended, accused, and sent up to the archbishop of Canterbury for these articles:

1. First for denying the sacrament (as the altar was then called) to be the real flesh and blood of Christ.
2. For saying that he would never take off his hat to it, even if he were burned for it.
3. For saying that if he were to hear mass, he *should* be burned.

For this he was sent up by his master and mistress Lewnax, with special letters to the archbishop, requiring him to be punished by law. But because I find no execution following, I therefore pass over this story.

These things premised, when this virtuous and godly young prince (endued as you have heard with special graces from God) was now peaceably established in his kingdom. He had

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

a council about him, grave, wise, and zealous in God's cause, especially his uncle, the duke of Somerset. The king then most earnestly desired the advancement of the true honor of Almighty God, and the planting of His sincere religion, as well as the utter suppression and extirpation of all idolatry, superstition, hypocrisy, and other enormities and abuses, throughout his realms and dominions. Therefore, following the good example of king Josiah, as expressed before, he determined to immediately enter into some reformation of religion in the church of England.

At his first entry (notwithstanding his father's good beginning in abolishing the usurped power of antichrist), he still found most of his laws were greatly against this zealous enterprise. He therefore purposed by the advice of his wise and honorable council, and of his own regal power and authority, to somewhat prosecute his godly purpose, until such time as by the consent of the whole estate of parliament, he might establish a more free, perfect, and uniform order in this.

Whereupon, intending first a general visitation over all bishoprics within his realm, to redress the abuses in them, he chose certain wise, learned, discreet, and worshipful personages to be his commissioners in that behalf. And so, dividing them into several companies, he assigned them several dioceses to visit, He likewise appointed to every company one or two godly learned preachers who, at every session, would in their preaching both instruct the people in the true doctrine of the gospel of Christ, and in all love and obedience to it, and also earnestly warn them against their old superstition and usual idolatry. And so that they might be more orderly directed in this commission, certain injunctions and ecclesiastical orders were delivered to them, drawn out by the king's learned council, which they should both inquire about, and also command in his majesty's behalf, to be thereafter observed by every person to whom they severally pertained in their circuits.

In these orders it was first enjoined, that all ecclesiastical persons should themselves observe, and cause to be observed by others, all such statutes as were made for abolishing the bishop of Rome's usurped power, and establishing the king's supreme authority; and that every one of them should, at least four times a year, declare in their public sermons to the people, that the one being most arrogantly usurped *against* the word of God, was now justly taken away, and the other was to be obeyed by all his grace's subjects.

And again, that every ecclesiastical person having a cure, should preach or cause to be preached within their several cures, one sermon every quarter of a year, in which they should sincerely set forth the word of God. And they should also exhort the people to the works of faith and mercy prescribed in the Scriptures, and not to works devised by man's imagination, such as going on pilgrimages and other similar idolatrous superstitions. These they should also, to the utmost of their power, reprove and speak against, declaring that all grace and goodness should be sought at God's hand alone, and not at any other creature's; and that they should not only immediately take down and destroy all those images which had previously been abused by pilgrimage or offerings within their cures. And they should also not allow thereafter, any lights or other idolatrous oblation to be made or set up before any image that was still allowed in the church.

Also that every holy-day (having no sermon in their church) they should immediately after the gospel, distinctly read in the pulpit the Lord's Prayer, the Belief (Apostles Creed), and the Ten Commandments in the English tongue. They should exhort the people not only to learn them, but also to teach them to their children and families. And also that they should charge all parents and governors of households, to bring up their youth in some good

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

exercise or occupation, whereby they might afterwards serve the commonwealth, and not run about like vagabonds and idle loiterers, and thereby incur the danger of the laws.

Furthermore, that persons, having a cure, should see the holy sacraments of Christ reverently administered within their cures. And that if any of them (by special license or other cases expressed in the statutes of this realm) should at any time be absent from their benefices, then they should leave in their places some godly, learned, and discreet curate, who was able to instruct the people in all truth and godliness, not seeking themselves, but rather the profit of their flock.

And likewise, that they should see provided and set up in some most convenient and open place in every church, one great Bible in English, and one book of the paraphrases of Erasmus upon the gospels,¹ both in English, so that the people might reverently, without any argument or contention, read and hear the same at such times as they chose, and not be prohibited by the parson and curate, but rather to be more encouraged to it.

And that the parsons and curates should not at any time (except for necessary causes) haunt any tavern or alehouse. Neither should they spend their time idly in unlawful games; but at every convenient leisure, they should give themselves to the reading or hearing of the holy Scriptures.

Moreover, that during the time of confession, in every period of Lent, they should examine their parishioners, whether they could say the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the articles of the Christian faith; and that if they could not, they should then reprove them, declaring further to them, that they should not presume to come to the Lord's table without the true knowledge of it, and an earnest desire to fulfill them.

Also, that they should not admit any man to preach within their cures, but those who were lawfully licensed; and that those who had at any time before had extolled and praised any idolatrous pilgrimage or other superstition, should now openly recant before the people.

And if there were any open hinderer or disturber of the reading or preaching of the word of God within their parishes, that then they should immediately bring them to the king's council, or to some justice of peace.

[638]

And further, so that learning and knowledge might be better maintained, it was also ordained, that every beneficed person who could yearly spend twenty pounds or upwards, and was not resident in their cures, should pay towards the relief of the poor within their parish every year, the fortieth part of their fruits and profits. And likewise, that every such person who could spend one hundred pounds yearly, or more, should for every hundred pounds, give a competent scholarship to some poor scholar within one of the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or else in some other grammar-school of the realm.²

And also that every priest, having the degree of a bachelor of divinity, should have his own New Testament in English and Latin, with the paraphrases of Erasmus upon the same, and he should diligently read and study it, and should collect and keep in memory all those comforting places of the Scriptures, which set forth the mercy, benefits, and goodness of

¹ Desiderius Erasmus (d. 1547) paraphrased the Gospels as part of his broader project of rewriting and expanding the New Testament texts in a more accessible and contemporary language.

² A grammar school in England in the 1500s was an educational institution that primarily focused on teaching Latin grammar. This was essential for those pursuing careers in the church, law, or higher education. These schools were often attached to religious institutions, and were designed to prepare students for university studies.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Almighty God towards all penitent and believing persons. Thus they might comfort their flock in all dangers of death, despair, or trouble of conscience. And therefore, every bishop in their visitations should from time to time test and examine how they had profited in their studies.

Although the mass was then still retained by the law, yet it was enjoined that at every high mass, the sayer or singer should openly and distinctly read the gospel and the epistle in English, in the pulpit, or in some other convenient place, so that the people might hear. And in like place and manner, they should read on every holy-day and Sunday, at matins, one chapter of the New Testament in English, omitting three of their nine Latin lessons, with their responses. And at even-song likewise, immediately after Magnificat, read one chapter of the Old Testament instead of their usual responses and memories.

Furthermore, because of the vain contentions that often fall among the people for going on procession, it was ordained that from then on, the priest and clerics should kneel in the midst of the church, and there distinctly sing or read the Litany in English, set forth by the authority of King Henry VIII; and that no person should depart from the church during the reading of the Scripture or the Litany, or during any sermon, without just and urgent cause.

Likewise, so that the people should spend the holy-days in hearing the word of God, in private and public prayers, in acknowledging their offenses to God, and their amendment of the same; in reconciling themselves charitably to their neighbors where displeasure has been given; in often receiving the communion of the body and blood of Christ; in visiting the poor and sick, and in all sober and godly conversation; and not in vanity, idleness, or drunkenness; nor yet in any bodily labor, other than during the time of harvest to save the fruits of the earth, if necessity so required; and that no curate should allow any person to receive the holy communion who had maliciously and openly contended with his neighbors, unless he first openly reconciled himself, and remitted all rancor and malice whatever.

Moreover, it was ordained that every dean, archdeacon, master of a collegiate church, or hospital, and prebendary, being a priest, should himself personally preach at least twice every year in some such place where he had jurisdiction and living; and that they and all other curates should teach the people that no man out of any private affection should maliciously violate any ceremony in the church, not then abrogated by the king's authority. So likewise, on the other side, they should not use them superstitiously or idolatrously, by attributing to them remission of sins, driving away evil spirits, and other such like dreams and fancies of men, or else putting any confidence of salvation in them. And further, that they should utterly take away and destroy all shrines and monuments of feigned miracles, pilgrimages, and other idolatrous superstition, in their churches, as well as in their private houses.

Also, that they should see provided within their churches, a strong and fit chest for the safe keeping of the people's alms given towards the relief of the poor. And that the curates should earnestly exhort and entreat their parishioners, especially at the making of their wills, that as they had been therefore willing to bestow much of their substance upon vain, superstitious, and blind devotions contrary to God's word, so now they would be much more ready to give some portion to their poor and needy brethren, knowing this is not only commanded in the word of God, but also promised to be rewarded. And to better relieve the poor, it was also appointed that all money and profits arising upon fraternities, images, or given to finding idolatrous lights, should be converted to the same use. Last of all, for the lack of learned curates and other good preachers, it was enjoined that the curates (having no

sermon) should read every Sunday to the people in their churches, one of the homilies which would be shortly set forth for that purpose by the king's authority.

There were also other articles in the injunctions, appointed for beauty and due order in the churches — such as for repairing chancels, and priests' houses; for keeping a register book of weddings, christenings, and burials; for reading these injunctions every quarter; for the due paying of tithes; for forbidding any other alteration of service in the church, or fasting days; for making attractive pulpits for the preachers; for avoiding simony in the buying and selling of benefices; for the charitable use of priests; for praying only upon the English and Latin primers published by King Henry VIII; for teaching grammar in the common schools; and lastly, that the chantry priests should teach young children either to write and read, or else some other good and profitable exercises.

Besides the general injunctions for the whole estate of the realm, there were also others particularly appointed for the bishops, which being delivered to the commissioners, were likewise at their visitations committed to the bishops, with charge to be inviolably observed and kept upon pain of the king's majesty's displeasure. The effect of this was in the following manner:

First, that they should to the uttermost of their wit and understanding, see and cause all the king's injunctions in their diocese to be duly, faithfully, and truly kept and observed, and that they should personally preach within their diocese, at least once in every quarter of a year — that is to say, once in their cathedral churches, and three times in several other places of their dioceses, as they see it most convenient and necessary, unless they had a reasonable excuse to the contrary. Likewise, that they should not retain any chaplain in their service or household, except those who were learned, or able to preach the word of God.

Moreover, that they should not give priestly orders to any person, except those who were learned in the holy Scriptures. Nor should they refuse orders to those who were learned in the Scriptures, being of honest conversation and living. And lastly, that they should not at any time or place preach, or set forth to the people, any doctrine contrary to the king's highness' homilies, nor admit or give license to anyone to preach within their diocese, except to those they know (or at least assuredly trust) would do the same. And if at any time they should perceive the contrary, reprov'd by hearing, or by report, they should then not only prohibit that person so offending, but also punish him and revoke his license.

Now, during the time that the commissioners were occupied abroad in their circuits, about the speedy and diligent execution of these godly and zealous orders and decrees of the king and his council, his majesty (with the advice of his council) desiring a further reformation in religion, as well as in his civil government, appointed a parliament of the three estates of his realm to be summoned to meet on the 4th of November, in the first year of his reign (A.D. 1547), which continued to the 24th of December. In this session, his highness desired the governance and order of his people to be in perfect unity and concord in all things, and especially in the true faith and religion of God.

[639] A.D. 1547-1553.

And with this, he also duly weighed the great danger that his loving subjects were in for confessing the gospel of Christ, through many cruel statutes made by his predecessors against the same. These statutes being left in force, might both cause the obstinate to despise his grace's godly proceedings, and also the weak to be fearful of their Christian-like profession. He therefore caused it, among other things, to be enacted by the authority of the same parliament, that all acts of parliament and statutes touching, mentioning, or in any

way concerning religion or opinions — that is to say, the statute made in the first year of the reign of King Richard II; and the statute made in the second year of the reign of King Henry V; and the statute made in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of King Henry VIII; concerning punishment and the reformation of heretics and Lollards, and every provision contained in them; also, the statutes made for abolishing diversity of opinions in certain articles concerning Christian religion, commonly called the Six Articles, made in the thirty-first year of the reign of King Henry VIII; also the statute made in the parliament begun the 16th of January in the thirty-third year of the reign of King Henry VIII, and afterwards postponed to the 21st of January in the thirty-fourth year of his reign, touching, mentioning, or in any way concerning books of the Old and New Testament in English, and the printing, uttering, selling, giving, or delivering of books or writings, and the retaining of English books or writings, and reading, preaching, teaching, or expounding the Scriptures, or in any way touching, mentioning, or concerning any of the said matters; and also one other statute made in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of King Henry VIII, concerning the qualification of the statute of the Six Articles; and all and every other act or acts of parliament concerning doctrine or matters of religion, and all and every branch, article, sentence, matter, pains, or forfeitures contained, mentioned, or in any way declared in any of the same acts and statutes — should from then on be utterly repealed, made void, and of no effect.

By this occasion, all his godly subjects then abiding within the realm, had free liberty to publicly profess the gospel; and many learned and zealous preachers, banished before, were now not only licensed freely to return home again, but also encouraged to boldly and faithfully travel in their function and calling. So that God was much glorified, and the people in many places were greatly edified.

Moreover, in the same session, his majesty, with the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons in the same parliament assembled, thoroughly understanding by the judgment of the best learned men, that it was more agreeable to the first institution of the sacrament of the most precious body and blood of our Savior Christ, and also more conformable to the common use and practice, both of the apostles and of the primitive church, for the space of five hundred years and more after Christ's ascension, that the holy sacrament should be administered to all Christian people under both kinds, of bread and wine, than under the form of bread only. And also, that it was more agreeable to the first institution of Christ, and the usage of the apostles and primitive church, that the people being present should receive the same as the priest, than that the priest should receive it alone. By their authority, they enacted that the holy sacrament should from then on be commonly delivered and administered to the people, throughout the churches of England and Ireland, and other of the king's dominions, under both kinds, bread and wine, unless necessity otherwise required. And also that the priest who should administer the same, should, at least one day before, exhort all persons who might be present, to prepare themselves to receive the same. And at the day prefixed, after some godly exhortation made by the minister, in which would be further expressed, the benefit and comfort promised to those who worthily receive this holy sacrament, and the danger and indignation of God threatened to those who presume to receive the same unworthily, to the end that every man might test and examine his own conscience before he comes to it. The minister should not, without a lawful cause, refuse it to any one person who would devoutly and humbly desire it.

After this consent of the parliament, the king was no less desirous to have the form of administration of the sacrament truly reduced to the right rule of the Scriptures and the first use of the primitive church, than he was to establish it by the authority of his own regal laws. He appointed certain of the gravest and best learned bishops, and others of his realm,

to assemble together at his castle of Windsor, and there to argue and treat this matter, and to conclude and set forth one perfect uniform order according to the rule and use aforesaid.

In the meantime, while the learned were thus occupied about their conferences, the lord protector and the rest of the king's council, further remembered that the time of the year then approached in which many superstitious abuses and blasphemous ceremonies were practiced against the glory of God, and the truth of his word. They determined to utterly abolish them, and directed their letters to Cranmer, then archbishop of Canterbury and metropolitan of England, requesting that he should command every bishop within his province, to immediately charge all the curates of their dioceses, that candles should no longer be borne on Candlemas day, nor ashes used in Lent, nor palms on Palm Sunday.

Whereupon the archbishop, zealously favoring the good and Christian-like purpose of the king and his council, immediately wrote to the rest of the bishops of that province, and among them, to Edmund Bonner, then bishop of London. We have more to say hereafter of his rebellious and obstinate disobedience. I will not speak of that now, but only note by the way, his former dissimulation and cloaked hypocrisy in outwardly consenting to this and all the king's proceedings. But whether it was for fear or other subtle pretense, I do not know.

About the same period, a report was made to the lords of the council, that great contention and strife arose daily among the common people in various parts of this realm, for pulling down and taking away the images from the churches, that had been idolatrously abused by pilgrimages, offerings, or otherwise. Some affirmed that one image was abused, others another, but most said that neither was abused. So that if speedy remedy was not had, it might turn to further inconvenience. Therefore, thinking it best for avoiding discord and tumult, it was determined that all manner of images should be clean taken out of all churches, and none allowed to remain. They again wrote their letters to the archbishop of Canterbury, requesting his ready aid in the following manner:

*Letter of the Council sent to the Archbishop
of Canterbury, for the abolishing of Images.*

"After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship: whereas now of late in the king's majesty's visitations, among other godly injunctions commanded to be generally observed through all parts of this his highness's realm, one was set forth for taking down all such images as had at any time been abused with pilgrimages, offerings, or censings. However, this said injunction has in many parts of this realm been quietly obeyed and executed, yet in many other places much strife and contention has arisen and daily arises, and more and more increases about the execution of the same. Some men are so superstitious, or rather willful, as they would by their good will retain all such images, even if they have been most manifestly abused. And also in some places the images which were taken down by the said injunctions, are now restored and set up again; and almost in every place there is contention for images, whether they have been abused or not. While these men go on both sides, contending whether this or that image has been offered to, kissed, incensed, or otherwise abused, proceedings have in some places taken place of such a sort, that further inconveniences are likely to ensue if remedy is not found in time.

[640]

"Considering therefore, that almost in no place of this realm is any sure quietness found, but where all images are clean taken away and pulled down already, and to the intent that all contention in every part of the realm about this matter may be put down, and so that the lively image of Christ should not contend for the dead images, which are not necessary things, and without which the churches of Christ continued most godly for many years, we have thought it

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

good to signify to you, that his highness's pleasure, with the advice and consent of us, the lord protector, and the rest of the council, is that immediately upon the sight of these images, with as convenient diligence as you may, you shall not only give orders that all the images remaining in any church or chapel within your diocese be removed and taken away, but also by your letters signify to the rest of the bishops within your province, his highness's pleasure, for the same order to be given by them and every one of them within their several dioceses. And in execution of this, we require both you and the rest of the said bishops to use such foresight, that the same may be quietly done, with as good a satisfaction of the people as possible. Thus fare your good lordship heartily well.

“From Somerset-place, the 11th of February, 1548.”

When the archbishop had received these letters, he forthwith directed his precept to Bonner, bishop of London, requiring, and in the king's name commanding him, that with all speed he should give in charge to the rest of the bishops within the province of Canterbury, to look immediately without delay to the diligent and careful execution of the contents of the letter through all parts of the diocese. And also that he himself should do the same within his own city and diocese of London. Whereupon the bishop, seeming then with like outward consent as before, to allow these doings, presently (by virtue of the precept) sent out his mandate to the rest of the bishops, as well as to the bishop of Westminster.

These things were thus determined by the learned men whom the king had appointed to assemble together for the true and right manner of administering the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, according to the rule of the Scriptures of God, and the first usage of the primitive church. After their long, learned, wise, and deliberate counsels, they finally concluded and agreed upon one godly and uniform order, not much differing from the manner used and authorized at present within this realm and church of England, commonly called *The Communion*. This agreement being exhibited to the king, and most gladly accepted, it was publicly printed, and by his majesty's council, sent to every bishop of the realm. It required and commanded them by letters on the king's majesty's behalf, that in their own persons they should immediately pay diligent and careful respect to the due execution of it, and with all diligence they should also cause the books which they then sent them, to be delivered to every parson, vicar, and curate within their diocese, so that they likewise might well and sufficiently qualify themselves for the better distribution of the communion (according to the tenor of the book) by the feast of Easter next ensuing, as more fully appears by their letters following here:

*Letters missive from the Council to the Bishops of the Realm,
concerning the Communion to be administered in both kinds.*

“After our most hearty commendations to your lordship, whereas in the parliament recently held at Westminster, it was among other things most godly established that according to the first institution and use of the primitive church, the most holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ should be distributed to the people under the kinds of bread and wine; according to the effect of which the king's majesty, minding, with the advice and consent of the lord protector's grace, and the rest of the council, to have the said statute well executed in such sort, or like as is agreeable with the word of God (so that the same may also be faithfully and reverently received by his most loving subjects, to their comfort and well-doing) has caused sundry of his majesty's most grave and well-learned prelates, and other learned men in the Scriptures, to assemble themselves for this matter. After long conference together, they have with deliberate advice, finally agreed upon such an order to be used in all places of the king's majesty's dominions, in the distribution of the said most holy sacrament, as may appear to you by the book which we herewith send to you. Knowing your lordship's

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

knowledge in the Scriptures, and earnest good will and zeal to setting forth all things according to the truth of them, we are well-assured that you will, of your own good will, and out of respect to your duty, diligently set forth this most godly order here agreed upon, and commanded to be used by the authority of the king's majesty — yet remembering the crafty practice of the devil, who does not cease to work by all ways and means, the hindrance of all godliness.

“And considering furthermore, that a great number of the curates of the realm, either for lack of knowledge cannot, or for lack of a good mind will not, be so ready to set this out as we would wish; and as the importance of the matter and their own bounden duties require; we thought it good to pray and request your lordship, and nevertheless, in the king's majesty's our most dread Lord's name, to command you, to have an earnest diligence and careful respect both in your own person, and by all your officers and ministers also, to cause these books to be delivered to every parson, vicar, and curate within your diocese, with such diligence that they may have sufficient time to well instruct and advise themselves, for the distribution of the most holy communion, according to the order of this book, before this Easter time. And that they may, by your good means, be well-directed to use such good, gentle, and charitable instruction of their simple and unlearned parishioners, as may be to all their good satisfaction as much as may be, we are praying you to consider that this order is set forth to the intent that there should be in all parts of the realm, and among all men, one uniform manner quietly used. The execution of this, as it likely will stand very much in the diligence of you and others of your vocation, so we immediately require you to have a diligent respect to it, as you tender the king's majesty's pleasure, and will answer for the contrary. And thus we bid your lordship right heartily farewell. From Westminster, the 13th of March 1548.”

By means of this letter, and of the godly order of the learned, and also of the statute and act of parliament mentioned earlier, all private blasphemous masses were now by just authority fully abolished throughout this realm of England, and the right use of the sacrament of the most precious body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ was truly restored in their place. But nevertheless, as at no time can anything be so well done by the godly, that the wicked will not find some subtle means to deface it, so at this time, through the perverse obstinacy and dissembling frowardness of many of the inferior priests and ministers of the cathedral and other churches of this realm, there arose a disturbing schism and variety of fashions in celebrating the common service and administration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the church. For some gladly followed the order, zealously allowing the king's proceedings; others, though not so willingly, admitted them, and yet dissembling, they used only part of them; but many, carelessly despising it all, still exercised their old accustomed popery.

Book of Common Prayer – 1549

The king and his council having good intelligence of this, fearing the great inconveniences and dangers that might happen through this division, and being loath to use any great severity towards his subjects, but rather desirous to bring them to some conformity by some quiet and godly order, by their prudent counsel, again appointed the archbishop of Canterbury, with certain of the best learned and discreet bishops and other learned men, to diligently consider and ponder the premises.

[641] A.D. 1547-1553.

Thereupon, having an eye and respect to the most sincere and pure Christian religion taught by the holy Scriptures, as well as to the usages of the primitive church, they sought to draw up and make one convenient and fit order, rite, and fashion of Common Prayer, and one

administration of the sacraments, to be had and used within this realm of England, and the dominions of the same. After most godly and learned conferences, through the aid of the Holy Spirit, with one uniform agreement concluded, they set forth, and delivered to the king's highness, a book in English, entitled, "A Book of the Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, for the use of the Church of England." His highness receiving this with great comfort and quietness of mind, immediately exhibited it to the lords and commons of the parliament which was then assembled at Westminster, about the 4th of November, in the second year of his reign, in the year 1548, and continuing to the 14th of March next ensuing.

Whereupon, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons of the parliament assembled. They well and thoroughly considered the most godly concern of the king's highness, of the lord protector, and others of his majesty's council. They gathered together the archbishops, bishops, and other learned men, as the godly prayers, orders, rites, and ceremonies in the said book of Common Prayer, to consider altering those things which were altered, and retaining those things which were retained in the book. And also to consider the honor of God, and the great quietness which, by the grace of God, might ensue upon that one uniform rite and order, in such common prayer, rites, and ceremonies to be used throughout England, Wales, Calais, and the Marches thereabouts. They first gave to his highness most lowly and hearty thanks for the book. And then they most humbly prayed him, that it might be ordained and enacted by his majesty with the assent of the lords and commons in that parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same. That not only every person and persons who had offended concerning the premises might be pardoned (other than those who then remained in ward in the Tower of London, or in the Fleet), but also that all and singular of the ministers in any cathedral, or parish churches, or other places within the realm of England, Wales, Calais, and the Marches of the same, or in other of the king's dominions, should from and after the feast of Pentecost next coming, be bound to say and use each of the matins, evensong, celebration of the Lord's Supper, and the administration of the sacraments, and all other common and public prayers — in such order and form as was mentioned in the book, and none otherwise.

Although they were so godly and good, that they gave occasion to every honest and conformable man, to most willingly to embrace them, yet — lest any obstinate persons who would willingly disturb so godly an order and quiet in this realm, go unpunished — they further requested that it might be ordained and enacted by the authority aforesaid, that if any manner of parson, vicar, or other minister whatever, who ought to say or sing the Common Prayer mentioned in the book, or administer the sacraments, that after the feast of Pentecost next coming, should they refuse to use the Common Prayer, or to administer the sacraments in such cathedral or parish churches, or in other places as he might use or minister, in such an order and form as mentioned and set forth in the book; or if they should willfully, and obstinately standing in the same, use any other rite, ceremony, order, form, or manner of mass, openly or privily, or matins, evensong, administration of the sacraments, or other public prayer, than was mentioned and set forth in the said book; or should preach, declare, or speak anything in derogation or discredit of the said book, or anything contained in it or any part of it — and should be lawfully convicted of it, according to the laws of this realm, by the verdict of twelve men, or by his own confession, or by the notorious evidence of the fact, he should then lose and forfeit to the king's highness, his heirs and successors, for his first offense, one whole year's profit of whichever of his benefices or spiritual promotions it might please the king's highness to assign and appoint; and also for the same offense, should suffer imprisonment for six months without bail or surety.

But if any such person, after his first conviction, should soon offend again, and be lawfully convicted, then for his second offense, he should suffer imprisonment for one whole year, and should also be deprived, *ipso facto*, of all his spiritual promotions forever. So that it would be lawful for the patrons and donors to give the same to any other learned man, in like manner as if the party so offending were dead.

And if any person or persons should offend a third time, and be lawfully convicted, then he would, for that third offense, suffer imprisonment during his life. If any such person or persons aforesaid, so offending, *did not have any benefice or spiritual promotion*, then for his first offence he should suffer imprisonment for six months without bail or surety; and for his second offence, imprisonment during his life.

This request, or rather the actual agreement of the lords and commons of the parliament, once it was understood by the king, was also soon ratified and confirmed by his regal consent and authority. Thereupon, the *Book of Common Prayer* was presently printed, and commanded to be used throughout the whole realm and dominion, according to the tenor and effect of the statute.

Moreover, in the same session of the said parliament, it was enacted and established by the authority of it, that because great, horrible, and unspeakable inconveniences had, from time to time, arisen among the priests, ministers, and other officers of the clergy, through their compelled chastity, and by such laws as prohibited to them the godly and lawful use of marriage, that therefore all and every law and laws positive, canons, constitutions, and ordinances previously made by the authority of man alone, which prohibited or forbade marriage to any ecclesiastical or spiritual person or persons, of whatever estate, condition, or degree they were, or by whatever name or names they were called, which by God's law may lawfully marry, in all and every article, branch, and sentence concerning only the prohibition of the marriage of the persons aforesaid, should be utterly void and of no effect. And that all manner of forfeitures, pains, penalties, crimes, or actions, which were contained in the laws, and followed the same, concerning the prohibition of the marriage of the ecclesiastical persons, should from then on also be clearly and utterly void. On the occasion of which, it was thereafter lawful for any ecclesiastical person to live most godly in the pure and holy estate of matrimony according to the laws and word of God.

But if the first injunctions, statutes, and decrees of the prince were but slenderly regarded by many, with much less good affection were these now received by several (especially the book of Common Prayer). Indeed, and that was by some who had always before, in outward show, willingly allowed the former doings, as it appears plainly by Bonner, the bishop of London. By his former letters and other mandates, he seemed to favor all the king's proceedings. Yet, notwithstanding both the statute for establishing the communion, and for abolishing all private masses, and also this statute of the ratifying and confirming of the book of Common Prayer, he still permitted sundry idolatrous private masses with peculiar names to be solemnly sung daily within particular chapels of the cathedral church of St. Paul's. He cloaked them with names like the Apostles' communion, and our Lady's communion, not once finding any fault with them, until such time as the lords of the council were obliged by their letters to command and charge him to see better to such things.

Over and besides all this, the lord protector, with the rest of the king's privy and learned council, assembled together in the Star Chamber to advance the king's godly proceedings. They called before them all the justices of peace. There it was pronounced to them by the lord Rich, then lord chancellor, an eloquent and learned admonition, requiring them to see to the due execution of the king's laws.

[642]

It is apparent from these acts, what zealous care there was in this young king, and in the lord protector, concerning the reformation of Christ's church, by these injunctions, letters, precepts, and exhortations. By which we have to note, not so much the careful diligence of the king and his learned council, as the lingering slackness of justices and lawyers. And especially of some bishops and old popish curates, by whose cloaked contempt, willful connivance, and stubborn disobedience, the Book of Common Prayer, long after its publication, was either not known at all, or else very irreverently used in many places of the realm. When the king perfectly understood this by the complaint of several persons, he was not a little grieved to see the godly agreement of the learned, and the willing consent of the parliament, and his grace's own zealous desire, having so little effect among his subjects. He therefore decreed, with the advice of his whole council, to write again to all the bishops of his realm, for speedy and diligent redress in this matter. He commanded them that they themselves should have a more special regard to the execution of his wishes, and also that all others within their several precincts and jurisdictions, should by their good instructions and example, be more frequently and with better devotion, moved to use and frequent the book. This further appears by the ensuing letter:

*A Letter directed by the King, and his Council,
to Bonner, Bishop of London.*

“Right reverend father in God, right trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well: and whereas after great and serious debating and long conference of the bishops and other grave and well-learned men in the holy Scriptures, one uniform order for common prayers and the administration of the sacraments has been, and is most godly set forth, not only by the common agreement and full assent of the nobility and commons of the late session of our late parliament, but also by the like assent of the bishops in the same parliament, and of all other the learned men of our realm in their synods and provincial convocations. It was much to our comfort to understand the godly labor then taken diligently and willingly for the true opening of things mentioned in the said book, by which the true service and honor of Almighty God, and the right ministration of the sacraments being well and sincerely set forth according to the Scriptures and use of the primitive church, much idolatry, vain superstition, and great and slanderous abuses were taken away. So it is no small occasion of sorrow to us, to understand by the complaints of many, that our said book, so much labored for, and also sincerely set forth, remains in many places of our realm, either not known at all, or not used; or at least if used, it is very seldom. And that in such a light and irreverent way, as the people in many places either have heard nothing, or if they have heard, they neither understand, nor have that spiritual delight in it, that pertains to good Christians. The fault of this, as we must of reason impute to you and others of your vocation, called by God, through our appointment, to due respect to this and similar matters; so considering that by these and similar occasions, our loving subjects still remain in their blindness and superstitious errors, and in some places, they remain in irreligious forgetfulness of God, whereby His wrath may be provoked upon us and them. Remembering with this, that among other cures committed to our princely charge, we think this the greatest: to see the glory and true service of Him maintained and extolled, by whose clemency we acknowledge ourselves to have all that we have, we could not except by the advice and consent of our dearest uncle, Edward Duke of Somerset, governor of our person, and protector of our realm, dominions, and subjects, and the rest of our privy council, admonish you about the premises. In these, because it was your office to use earnest diligence, and to prefer the same in all places within your diocese, as the case required, so we have thought it good to pray and request you, and nevertheless to straitly charge and command you, that from now on you have an earnest and special regard to reduce these things, so that the

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

curates may do their duties more often and in a more reverent way; and the people may be occasioned by the good advice and examples of yourself, your chancellor, archdeacons, and other inferior ministers, to come more often and with more devotion to their said common prayers, to give thanks to God, and to be partakers of the most holy communion. In doing so, by showing yourself diligent, and giving a good example in your own person, you will both discharge your duty to the great Pastor, to whom we all have to account, and also do us good service. And on the other side, if we hereafter (notwithstanding these letters and commandments of ours) hear complaint, and find the same fault in your diocese, we will have just cause to impute the fault of it, and of all that ensues from it, to you. And consequently we will be occasioned thereby to otherwise see to the redress of these things, for which we would be sorry. And therefore we charge and command you, upon your allegiance, to look well upon your duty in this, as you respect our pleasure.

“Given under our signet at our manor of Richmond,
the 23rd of July, the third year of our reign, 1549.”

The bishop of London, among the rest of the bishops receiving these letters, willingly accepted them in an outward show (as before). Therefore, immediately with the said letters, they directed the following precept to the dean and chapter of the cathedral church of St. Paul's, commanding them to look to duly accomplishing these things accordingly.

A Letter of Bonner, to the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's.

“Edmund by the grace of God, etc. To my well beloved brethren, the dean and chapter of the cathedral church of St. Paul in London, and to the other ministers there and every of them, I send greeting. And whereas I have recently received letters from our sovereign lord the king, of such tenor as is annexed to this, and according to my most bounden duty, I am right well willing, and desiring that the said letters should be duly executed and observed in all points, according to the tenor and as pertains to the purport of the same. These, therefore, are to require, and also to straitly charge you, and every of you, on his majesty's behalf, etc., that you admonish and command, or cause to be admonished or commanded, all and singular parsons, vicars, and curates of your jurisdiction, to accordingly observe and accomplish the same from time to time. Furthermore, I am requiring and likewise charging you, and every of you, to certify this to me, to my chancellor or other my officers in this behalf, with such convenient speed as pertains both to your proceedings in the execution of them, and also to the persons and names of all those who from now on are found negligent in doing their duties in the premises, or any of them.

“Given at my house at Fulham, the 26th of July,
in the year of our Lord 1549, and in the
third year of his majesty's reign.”

Moreover, as the king at this time heard the muttering of rebellion then stirring (of which more will be said shortly), and also being credibly informed that, through the evil example, slackness of preaching, and administering of the sacraments, and the careless contempt of bishop Bonner, not only were many of the people in the city of London and other places of his diocese, very negligent and forgetful of their duties to God (in frequenting the divine service then established and set forth by the authority of parliament); but also that others, utterly despising it, often frequented in secret places of his diocese, the popish mass and other foreign rites not allowed by the laws of this realm. Therefore the king thought it good to appoint the lord protector and the rest of his privy council to call the bishop before them, and to deal with him according to their wise and discreet judgment.

[613] A.D. 1547-1553.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

On the 11th of August 1549, they sent a messenger for him. And upon his appearance, he made a declaration of such information and complaints as had been brought against him. Then, after sharp admonitions and reproofs for his evil demeanors, they delivered to the bishop, from the king (for his better reformation and amendment), certain private injunctions to be followed and observed by himself. And as in the first branch of the injunctions, he was personally assigned to preach at St. Paul's Cross on Sunday for the next three weeks (because both the dangerous and fickle state of the times, and also partly his own suspicious behavior required it), they further delivered to him in writing such articles to address in his sermon, as they then thought most fitting and necessary for the time. All of these injunctions and articles I insert here:

Certain private Injunctions and Articles given to Bonner by the Council.

“Because we are notified that among other disorders of our subjects at this present time, there are several in our city of London, and other places within your diocese, who are very negligent and forgetful of their duty to Almighty God, from whom all good things are to be looked for. They assemble themselves very seldom for common prayer and the holy communion (now being a time when it is more needful with heart and mind to pray to our heavenly Father for his aid and succor), and fewer times than they were accustomed to before. We are right sorry for this. So too, we understand that this offense to God is most generally committed through your evil example, and the slackness of your preaching and instructing our people to do their duties. For up to now, upon all principal feasts, and those called *majus duplex*, you yourself usually executed these in person. Now, since the time that by the advice of our whole parliament we have set a most godly and devout order in our church of England and Ireland, you have very seldom or never executed upon such other days, to the contempt of our proceedings, and the evil example to others. And because it is also brought to our knowledge, that many in London, as well as in other places of your diocese, frequent and haunt foreign rites of masses, which are not allowed by the orders of our realm. And they despise and forbear to praise and laud God, nor will they pray according to such rites and ceremonies as are approved in this realm, and set out by our authority. And further, that adultery and fornication is maintained and kept openly and commonly in the city of London, and in other places of your diocese, by which the wrath of God is provoked against our people. You have previously been admonished about this; yet up to now you have made no redress as pertains to the pastoral office, authority, and cure of a bishop. Therefore, we to whom the supreme cure and charge of this church pertains, to avert from us the high indignation of Almighty God, by the advice of our most entirely beloved uncle the lord protector, and the rest of our privy council, we have thought it no less than our most bounden duty, to admonish, charge, and warn you, without delay, that you most strictly look upon the premises, and see them so reformed that no negligence may appear on your behalf, upon such pain as we may inflict upon you by our laws ecclesiastical and temporal, to deprivation or otherwise, as seems reasonable to us, according to the offense. And to the intent that you might better see to the reformation of the said abuses, we thought it good to give you the following injunctions:

“1. You shall preach at St. Paul's Cross, in London, in proper person, on Sunday come three weeks from this date, and in the same sermon declare and set forth the articles annexed to this; and hereafter you shall preach once every quarter of the year there, exhorting in your sermon the people to obedience, prayer, and godly living; and you shall be present at every sermon hereafter made at St. Paul's cross, if sickness or some other reasonable cause do not hinder you.

“2. You yourself in person shall from henceforth on every day which up to now in this church of England was accounted a principal feast, or *Majus duplex*, and at all such times as the

bishops of London, your predecessors, usually celebrated and sang high mass, now celebrate and execute the communion at the high altar in St. Paul's, for the better example of all others, unless sickness hinders you.

"3. You shall yourself, according to your duty and the office of a bishop, call before you all those who do not come and frequent the common prayer and service in the church, or do not come to God's table and receive the communion at least once a year, or whoever frequents or goes to any other rite or service than is appointed by our book — either of matins, evensong, or mass — in any church, chapel, or other private places within your diocese; and you shall see all such offenders brought before you and punished according to the ecclesiastical laws, with severe and strict punishment. Likewise you shall see one only order used in your diocese, according to our said book, and none other.

"4. You shall both by yourself, and all your officers under you, search out and bring before you, more diligently than up to now (as pertains to your office) all adulterers, and see them punished according to the ecclesiastical laws, and the authority given you in that behalf.

"5. 'We have heard also complaints, that the church of St. Paul's, and other churches in London are more neglected of late, in reparation of the glass, as well as other buildings and ornaments, than they were previously, and that many persons in the city, from malice, deny the payment of their due tithe to their curates, by which the curates are both injured and made not so well able, and in a way, discouraged to do their duties. In this thing, it is also our will and commandment, that you shall diligently look to, and see it redressed as it applies.

"6. Because all these complaints are mostly done and committed in London, to the intent you may look more earnestly, better, and more diligently to their reformation, our pleasure is that you shall abide and keep residence in your house there, in the city, see, and principal place of your diocese, and nowhere else, for a certain time, until you are otherwise licensed by us."

Disloyalty in Cornwall and Devonshire

And thus having brought Bishop Bonner home to his own house, we will leave him there a while to take his ease in his own lodging, till we return to him again. In the meantime we will make a little digression into Cornwall and Devonshire,³ to relate some part of the disloyal doings of the men there, against their meek and excellent prince. They were not content with him, but contrary to all order, reason, nature and loyalty, they advanced in a rebellious conspiracy against him, and against his proceedings, through the pernicious instigation of popish priests. Hating the injunctions and godly order of reformation set forward by the king, and especially mourning to see their old popish church of Rome decaying, they did not cease by all sinister and subtle means, under God's name and the king's, and under color of religion, to persuade the people, and to assemble in companies, to gather captains, and at last to burst out in rank rebellion. Nor were there lacking among the lay sort, some as seditiously disposed to rebellion, as they were to mischief and madness.

Among them, the chief captains were Humfrey Arundel, governor of St. Michael's Mount, James Rosogan, John Rosogan, John Pain, Thomas Underbill, John Soleman, and William Segar. There were eight priests who were the principal stirrers, some of them governors of the camps; afterwards they were executed. Their names were Robert Bochim, John Temson, Roger Baratt, John Wolcock, William Asa, James Mourton, John Barow, Richard Bennet, besides a multitude of other popish priests. The number of those concerned in the rebellion, amounted to a little less than 10,000 stout traitors.

³ Devonshire and Cornwall are located in the south-western region of England, forming the South West Peninsula. Devon, lies east of Cornwall, with the English Channel to the south.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Their first intent was, after they had spoiled their own districts most miserably, to invade the city of Exeter, and so all other parts of the realm. But they were repulsed from Exeter, and then they fell to spoiling and robbing wherever or whatever they might catch.

[644]

At length, laying their traitorous heads together, they consulted upon certain articles to be sent up. But such differences of opinion prevailed among them, that their plans utterly failed. Some seemed more tolerable; others were altogether unreasonable. Some would have no justice. Some would have no state of gentlemen. The priests ever harped upon one string, namely, to bring the bishop of Rome back into England.

After much ado, at last a few articles were agreed upon, to be forwarded to the king.

*The Articles of the Commons of Devonshire,
and Cornwall, sent to the King.*

“1. Because man, unless he is born of water and the Holy Spirit, cannot enter into the kingdom of God, and because the gates of heaven are not opened without His blessed sacrament and baptism, therefore, we will that our curates shall minister this sacrament at all times of need, week-days as well as holydays.

“2. We will have our children confirmed by the bishop whenever we shall, within the diocese, resort to him.

“3. Because, as we constantly believe that after the priest has spoken the words of consecration at mass, there celebrating and consecrating the same, there is very really the body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ, God and man; and that no substance of bread and wine remains after, but the very self same body that was born of the Virgin Mary, and was given upon the cross for our redemption. We will therefore have mass celebrated as it has been in times past, without any man communicating with the priest, as many, rudely presuming to unworthily receive the same, make no distinction between the Lord’s body and other kinds of food; some saying that it is bread before and after, some saying that it is profitable to no man unless he receives it, with many other abusive terms.

“4. We will have the consecrated host preserved in our churches. We will have holy bread and holy water in remembrance of Christ’s precious body and blood.

“5. We would have our priests sing, or say with an audible voice, God’s service in the choir of the parish churches, and not have God’s service set forth like a Christmas play.

“6. Because priests are men dedicated to God, for ministering and celebrating the blessed sacraments and preaching God’s word, we would have them live chaste without marriage, as St. Paul did, being the elect and chosen vessel of God, saying to all honest priests, ‘Be followers of me.’

“We would have the Six Articles which our sovereign lord king Henry VIII set forth in his latter days, be used and so taken as they were at that time.

“We pray God save king Edward, for we are his, both body and goods.”

*The Answer sent by the King’s Majesty,
to certain of his people assembled in Devonshire.*

“Knowledge has been given to us and our dearest uncle Edward duke of Somerset, governor of our person, and protector of all our realms, dominions, and subjects, and to the rest of our privy council, of some assemblies made by you, who ought to be our loving subjects, against all order, law, and otherwise than any loving and kind subjects have ever attempted against their

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

natural and liege sovereign lord. Yet we have thought it fitting at this time, not to condemn or reject you, as we might justly do, but to treat you as our subjects, thinking that the devil does not have that power in you, to make you, of natural born Englishmen, so suddenly become enemies to your own native country; or to make traitors of you, our subjects; or under some pretense, to relieve yourselves, to destroy yourselves, your wives, children, lands, houses, and all other commodities of your life. This we say: we trust that although you are seduced by ignorance, you will not be obstinate upon gaining knowledge. And though some among you (just as there will ever be some tares among good wheat) forget God, neglect their prince, do not esteem the state of the realm, but like careless desperate men, delight in sedition, tumult, and wars — yet nevertheless, most of you will hear the voice of your natural prince, and will by wisdom and counsel be warned, and cease your evils in the beginning, whose ends will be your own destruction, even by Almighty God's order. Therefore, we speak to you as our subjects, seduced by ignorance, and we are content to use our princely authority, like a father to his children, to admonish you of your faults — not to punish them, but to put you in remembrance of your duties, and not to avenge your forgetfulness.

“First, As to your disorderly rising in multitudes, and assembling yourselves against our other loving subjects, to array yourselves to war, who among you all can answer to Almighty God, who charges you to obey us in all things? Or how can any English good heart answer us, our laws, and the rest of our very loving and faithful subjects, who indeed by their obedience make our honor, estate, and degree?

“You use our name in your writings, and abuse it against ourself. What injury you do us, to call those who love us, to your evil purposes by the authority of our name! God has made us your king by his ordinance and providence, by our blood and inheritance, by lawful succession and our coronation — but not to this end, as you use our name. We are your most natural sovereign lord and king, Edward the Sixth, to rule you, to preserve you, to save you from all your outward enemies, to see our laws well ministered, every man to have his own; to suppress disorderly people, to punish traitors, thieves, pirates, robbers, and such like, yes, to keep our realms from foreign princes, from the malice of Scots, of Frenchmen, and of the bishop of Rome. Thus, good subjects, our name is written; and thus it is honored and obeyed. It has this majesty by God's ordinance, and not by man's. So that we cannot write too much about this offense of yours. And yet we do not doubt that this is enough from a prince to all reasonable people; from a king to all kind-hearted and loving subjects; from a powerful king of England to every natural Englishman.

“Your pretenses, which you say move you to do these things, and with which you seek to excuse this disorder, we assure you, are either all false, or else so vain that we do not doubt that after you understand the truth, you will all, with one voice, acknowledge yourselves ignorantly led, and seduced by error. And if there are any who will not, they are rank traitors, enemies of our crown, seditious people, heretics, papists, or those who do not care how they seek to provoke an insurrection; and those who cannot become so rich with their own labors, and with peace, as they can with spoils, wars, robberies, and such — yes, with the spoil of your own goods, and with the living of your labors, the sweat of your bodies, the food of your own households, wives and children. They are those who, for a time, will use pleasant persuasions with you, but in the end will cut your throats for your own goods.

“You are persuaded that your children, even when necessity requires it, will not be christened except on the holydays. Learn from us how false this is. Our book which we have set forth by the free consent of our parliament, in the English tongue, teaching you the contrary, even in the first leaf, indeed, the first side of the leaf of that part which treats baptism. Good subjects, look and do not be deceived, for we do not speak to others. Those who have put this false opinion into your ears, do not mean the christening of your children, but the destruction of

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

you who are our christened subjects. Let this be known to you: our honor is so much, that we may not be found faulty of our word. Prove it, if by our laws you may not christen your children upon necessity, every day or hour in the week, then you might be offended. But seeing that you may do it, how can you believe those who teach you the contrary? What do you think they mean in other things, who move you to break your obedience against us, your king and sovereign, upon these false tales and persuasions?

[645] A.D. 1547-1553.

“Therefore, all of you who will acknowledge us as your sovereign lord, and who will hear the voice of us your natural king, may easily perceive how you are deceived; and how subtly traitors and papists, with their falsehood, seek to achieve and bring their purpose to pass. Every traitor will be glad to dissemble his treason, and feed it secretly, and every papist his popery, and nourish it inwardly. And in the end, they would make you, our subjects, partakers of treason and popery, under the pretense of a commonwealth and holiness.

“And how are you seduced by those who put in your heads, that the blessed sacrament of Christ’s body does not differ from other common bread? If our laws, proclamations, and statutes, are all to the contrary, then why would any man persuade you against them? We ourselves in our own heart, our council in all their profession, our laws and statutes in all their purposes, our good subjects in all their doings, most highly esteem that sacrament, and use the communion to our comfort. We make so much of a distinction between it and other common bread, that we think there is no profit from other bread but to maintain our bodies. But of this blessed bread we take it to be the very food of our souls to everlasting life. What do you think, good subjects? Being your prince, your lord, your king by God’s appointment, will we more prevail with truth, than certain evil persons do with open falsehood? Will any seditious person persuade you that the sacrament is despised, which by our laws, by ourself, by our council, by all our good subjects, is esteemed, used, participated, and daily received? If ever you were seduced, if ever deceived, if ever traitors were believed, if ever papists poisoned good subjects, it is now. It is not the christening of children, not the reverence of the sacrament, not the health of your souls that they aim at, good subjects. It is sedition; it is high treason; it is your destruction they seek, however craftily, however piteously, however cunningly they do it. With one rule, judge the end which must follow upon your purposes. Almighty God forbids, upon pain of everlasting damnation, disobedience to us, your king. If we were slow, would God err? If your offence is towards God, do you think it pardoned without repentance? Is God’s judgment mutable? Your pain is damnation, your judge is incorruptible, your fault is most evident.

“Likewise you are badly informed in other articles, such as for confirmation of your children, for the mass, for the manner of your service of matins and even-song. Whatever is ordered in them has been long debated and consulted by many learned bishops, doctors, and other men of great learning in this realm. In nothing was so much labor and time spent, nothing so fully ended.

“As for the service in the English tongue, it has manifest reasons for it. Perhaps it seems a new service to you; yet indeed it is nothing other than the old. The self same words are in English which were in Latin, saving a few things were taken out which were so childish that it would have been a shame to hear them in English, as all can judge who choose to report the truth. The difference is that you, our subjects, may understand in English, being our natural country tongue, that which was up to now was spoken in Latin; then it only served those who understood Latin, but now it serves all of you who are born English. How can it with reason offend any reasonable man, that he should understand what any other man says, and consent with the speaker? If the service of the church was good in Latin, it remains good in English. For nothing is altered, but to speak with knowledge that which was spoken with ignorance,

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

and to let you understand what is said to you, to the intent you may further it with your own devotion. It is an alteration for the better, unless knowledge is worse than ignorance. So that whoever has moved you to dislike this order, can give you no reason for it, nor answer you, if you understood it.

“Therefore, you our subjects, remember that we speak to you, being ordained your prince and king by Almighty God. If in any way we could advance God’s honor more than we do, we would do it. See that you become subject to God’s ordinances, obeying us your prince, and learn from those who have authority to teach you, who have power to rule you, and will execute our justice if we are provoked. Do not learn from those whose fruits are nothing but willfulness, disobedience, obstinacy, dissimulation, and destruction of the realm.

“For the mass, we assure you, no small study or pains have been spent by all the learned clergy in this. And to avoid all contention, it is brought even to the very use as Christ left it, as the apostles used it, and as the holy fathers delivered it. But it is indeed somewhat altered from what the popes of Rome had made it for their own gain. Although you may hear the contrary from some evil popish men, yet our majesty, who for our honor may not be blemished, nor stained, assures you that they deceive you, abuse you, and blow these opinions into your heads, to accomplish their own purpose.

“And so likewise judge about the confirmation of children. Let them answer you this one question: Do they think that a child christened is damned, because it dies before confirmation? They are confirmed when they have arrived at the years of discretion, to learn that which they professed by baptism; they are taught in age that which they received in infancy; and yet no doubt they are saved by baptism, not by confirmation; and they are made Christ’s by christening, and taught how to continue by confirmation. Therefore, on the whole good subjects, mark how our doctrine is founded upon true learning, and theirs upon shameless errors.

“To conclude, besides our gentle manner of informing you, whatever is contained in our book, either for baptism, sacrament, mass, confirmation, and service in the church, is established by our parliament, agreed by the whole clergy, indeed, devised by the bishops of the realm, and further, confirmed by God’s word. How dare you trust, yes, how dare you give ear, without trembling, to any person — to disallow a parliament — to allow a subject to persuade you against our majesty — a man from his singular arrogancy against the determination of the bishops, and all the clergy, any invented argument against the word of God?

“But now we resort to you our subjects, and say of your blindness, of your unkindness and unnatural conduct, that if we thought it had not begun from ignorance, and been continued by persuasion of certain traitors among you, who we think are few in number, but busy in their doings, we could not be persuaded but to use our sword, and do justice, as we are ordained by God to redress your errors by revenge. But though love and zeal overcome our just anger, yet how long that will be, God knows, in whose hand our heart is. Or rather for your own sakes, being our christened subjects, we would that you were persuaded rather than vanquished, informed than forced, taught than overthrown, quietly pacified than rigorously prosecuted.

“You require to have the statute of Six Articles revived. Do you know what you require? Or do you know what ease you have with the loss of them? They were laws made, but quickly repented; they were too bloody to be borne by our people. And yet at first they were indeed made of some necessity. Oh subjects! How are you entrapped by subtle persons? Out of pity, we took the articles away, because they were bloody; and you now will ignorantly ask to have them back again. You know full well that they helped us to extend rigor, and gave us cause to draw our sword very often. They were like a whetstone to our sword, and for your sakes we

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

ceased to use them. Since our mercy moved us to write our laws with mildness and equity, how are you blinded to ask for them in blood?

“But leaving this manner of reasoning and resorting to the truth of our authority, we let you know that these have been annulled by our parliament, with great rejoicing of our subjects, and are not now to be called into question by subjects. Dare any of you then, bearing the name of a subject, stand against an act of parliament — a law of the whole realm? What is our power if laws were thus to be neglected? Indeed, what is your surety if laws are not kept? Assure yourselves that we, of no earthly power under heaven, can make such a reputation as we do of our power, to have our laws obeyed; and this cause of God, which we have taken in hand, to be thoroughly maintained, from which we will never remove a hair’s breadth, nor give way to any creature living, much less to any subject. But in this we will spend our royal person, our crown, treasure, realm, and all our estate, of which we assure you by our high honor.

[616]

“For in this indeed rests our honor; in this stands our kingdom; in this do all kings acknowledge us to be a king. And do any of you dare to breathe or think against our honor, our kingdom, our crown?

“In the end of this, your request (as we are given to understand it), you would have them stand in force until our full age. To this we think, if you knew what you were saying, you would never have uttered that notion, nor ever have given breath to such a thought. For what do you think of our kingdom? Are we of less authority for our age? Are we not your king now, as we shall be? Or will you be subjects later, and are you not subjects now? Do we not now have the right we will have? If we would suspend and hang our doings in doubt until our full age, you must first know, as a king, we have no difference of years nor time, except that as a natural man and creature of God, we have youth; and by His sufferance we shall have age: We are your rightful king, your liege lord, your king anointed, your king crowned, the sovereign king of England, not by our age, but by God’s ordinance, not only when we will be twenty-one years, but when we are ten years. We possess our crown, not by years, but by the blood and descent from our father King Henry VIII. You are our subjects, because we are your king; and rule we will, because God has willed. It is as great a fault in us not to rule, as in a subject not to obey.

“In truth, those who move this matter, if they dared utter it themselves, they would deny our kingdom. But our good subjects know their prince, and will increase, not diminish his honor; enlarge, not abate his power; acknowledge, not defer his kingdom till certain years. All is one, to speak against our crown and to deny our kingdom, as to require that our laws may be broken until we attain twenty-one years. Are we not your crowned, anointed, and established king? In what then are we of less majesty, of less authority, or less state, than were our progenitors, kings of this realm, except that your unkindness, your unnaturalness will diminish our estimation? We have up to now, since the death of our father, by the good advice and counsel of our dear and entirely beloved uncle, kept our state, maintained our realm, preserved our honor, defended our people from our enemies. We have up to now been feared and dreaded by our enemies; yes, by princes, kings, and nations. Indeed, in this we are not at all inferior to any of our progenitors, which grace we acknowledge to be given to us from God; and how else, if not by the good obedience of our people, the good counsel of our magistrates, and the due execution of our laws? By the authority of our kingdom, England up to now has gained honor; during our reign, it has won from the enemy, and not lost.

“It has been marvelled that we, of such young years, should have reigned so nobly, so royally, so quietly. And how does it chance that you, our subjects of that our county of Devonshire, would give the first occasion to slander this realm of England, to give courage to the enemy, to brand our realm with the evil of rebellion, to make it a prey to our old enemies, to diminish

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

our honor, which God has given, our father left, our good uncle and council preserved for us? What greater evil could you commit than even now, when our foreign enemy in Scotland and on the sea, seeks to invade us, to rise in this manner against our law, to provoke so justly our wrath, to ask our vengeance, and to give us occasion to spend that force upon you, which we meant to bestow upon our enemies, to begin to slay you with that sword which we drew against the Scots and other enemies, to make a conquest of our own people, which otherwise should have been of the whole realm of Scotland?

“Thus far you see we have descended from our high majesty for love, to consider you in your base and simple ignorance, and have been content to send you an instruction like a fatherly prince, who of justice might have sent you your destruction like a king to rebels. And now let you know, that as you see our abundant mercy, so if you provoke us further, we swear to you by the living God, by whom we reign, you shall feel the power of the same God in our sword. How mighty it is, no subject knows; how puissant it is, no private man can judge; how mortal it is, no English heart dare think. But surely, surely, as your lord and prince, your only king and master, we say to you, repent yourselves, and take our mercy without delay. Or else we will at once extend our princely power, and execute our sharp sword against you, as against very infidels and Turks, and rather endanger our own royal person, state, and power, than not execute the same.

“And if you will prove the example of our mercy, learn from those who recently arose, pretending some grievances, and yet acknowledging their offenses, who have not only received most humbly their pardon, but also feel by our order, to whom all public order alone pertains, redress devised for their grievances. In the end, we admonish you of your duties towards God, to whom you shall answer in the day of the Lord, and of your duties towards us, to whom you shall answer by our order, and take our mercy while God so inclines us, lest when you are constrained to ask, we will be too hardened in our heart to grant it to you; and where you now hear of mercy, mercy and life, you shall then hear of justice, justice and death.

“Given at Richmond, the 8th of July, the third year of our reign.”

Besides the articles of these Devonshire men, the rebels also sent up, not long after, a supplication to the king, to which an answer was again made by the king’s learned council.

To behold the malicious working of those popish priests, to kindle more the spark of sedition in the people’s hearts, what rumors they raised up against the king and his council! They made the vulgar multitude believe that they should be made to pay, first for their sheep, next for their geese and pigs also, and such other things. And whatever they had in store, or should put into their mouths, they must pay a tax for it to the king! A word was never thought or meant about this by the king. But it seemed fit matter for such priests, by which to set the prince against his subjects by the ears.

Against this seditious company of rebels, the king and his council sent Sir Jolin Russel, knight and lord privy seal, as lieutenant-general of the king’s army. The charge and conduct of suppressing this insurrection chiefly depended on him. He was joined, as part of ordinary council in those affairs put under him, by Sir William Herbert, Sir J. Pawlet, Sir Hugh Pawlet, Sir Thomas Speck, with the lord Grey, and others.

Thus the lord privy seal, accompanied by the lord Grey, advancing his power against the rebels, though not equal in number of soldiers, yet through the Lord’s help, he repulsed them about the latter end of July 1549. Notwithstanding, the rebels recovered themselves, and encountered a second time with the lord privy seal, about the beginning of August. They were utterly vanquished and overthrown, so that the popish rebels not only lost the field,

but a great part of them also lost their lives. They lay there slain miserably in the chase for about two miles.

These rebels, to make their party more sure by the help and presence of their “consecrated god,” brought the pix with them into the battle, with the host in it, under his canopy. And instead of an altar, they set him riding in a cart. Nor was there any lack of masses, crosses, banners, candlesticks, with holy bread also, and plenty of holy water, to defend themselves from devils and all adversaries. In the end, these could neither help their friends, nor save themselves from the hands of their enemies. The consecrated god, and all the trumpery about him, was very soon after taken in the cart, and there thrown into the dust. It left a notable lesson not to put their confidence hereafter in such vain idols, but only in the true and living God and immortal Maker, serving Him according to his prescribed word, and that was only in the faith of his Son, and not according to their own dreaming fantasies.

[617] A.D. 1547-1553.

Note: This event brings to my remembrance another similar popish field of battle (called *Musselburgh field*) fought in Scotland the year before this, where the Scots likewise encamped themselves against the lord protector, and the king’s power. They brought with them to the battle, the consecrated gods of their altars, with masses, crosses, banners, and all their popish array, having full confidence by virtue of them, to have a great victory against the English army. The number of the Scots army so far exceeded ours, and they were so appointed with their pikes in the front ranks against our horsemen (who gave the first onset) that our men were glad to retreat, but not without the loss of diverse gentlemen. Notwithstanding, the mighty arm of the Lord so turned the victory, that the Scots, in the end, with all their masses, pixes, and idolatrous trinkets, were put to the rout. In that field were slain between thirteen and fourteen thousand, and not more than a hundred Englishmen. The original cause of this war was the promise of the Scots, made before to king Henry, for the marriage of the young Scottish queen to king Edward. The Scots afterwards broke this promise.

During this commotion among the popish rebels in Cornwall and Devonshire, another disturbance began to be engendered in **Oxford** and **Buckinghamshire**. But that was soon appeased by lord Grey, who chased the rebels to their houses. Two hundred of them were taken, and a dozen of the ringleaders were delivered to him, some of whom were executed.

In **Norfolk** and parts thereabout, although the origin of their tumultuous stirring was not for the same cause, yet the obstinate hearts of that unruly multitude seemed no less bent upon mischief, and to disturb the public peace. The rude and confused rabble was overthrown and slain, numbering at least four thousand, it is supposed,. And the chief stirrers and authors of that commotion were taken and executed. One of them (Ket) was hanged in chains.

Besides these insurrections, about the latter end of July 1549, another commotion began in **Yorkshire**. The causes moving them to raise this rebellion were these: first and principally, their traitorous hearts grudging at the king’s proceedings in advancing and reforming the true honor of God and his religion. Another cause was trusting to a blind and fantastic prophecy with which they were seduced, thinking the prophecy would shortly come to pass. The tenor of that prophecy, and the purpose of the traitors, was that, “There should no king reigning in England; that the noblemen and gentlemen should be destroyed; and that the realm should be ruled by four governors, to be elected and appointed by the commons holding a parliament, to begin at the south and north seas of England,” etc. They imagined

that their rebellion in the North, and the other rebellion of the Devonshire men in the West, meeting (as they intended) at one place, would be the means to bring about their traitorous devilish device. Plotting together how they might find more company to join with them in their detestable designs, their plan was to rise at once in two places, the one seven miles distant from the other. At first they would rush to kill and destroy those gentlemen and men of substance about them who favored the king's proceedings, or who would resist them.

It would be tedious to recite what riot these rebels gave themselves to, ranging about the country from town to town to enlarge their rebellious band, taking those by force who were not willing to go, and leaving no man above the age of sixteen in any town where they came. Thus their numbers were so increased, that in a short time they had gathered three thousand to favor their wicked attempts,. They were likely to gather more, if the Lord's goodness, through prudent circumspection, had not interrupted the course of their furious beginning.

For first came the king's gracious and free pardon, discharging and pardoning them and the rest of the rebels of all treasons, murders, felonies, and other offences done to his majesty, before the 21st of August A.D. 1549. This pardon influenced many of the rebels. And though the leaders contemptuously refused it, yet they were soon taken and executed, and this rebellion was suppressed.

Proceedings Against Bishop Bonner.

Let us now return to Bonner, bishop of London, where we left him before' that is, in his own house, where he was commanded by the council to remain.

To better understand the circumstances relating to Bonner, it is requisite to retrace matters from the beginning of King Edward's time. King Edward, in the first year of his reign, A.D. 1547, for the order of his visitation, directed certain commissioners, such as Sir Anthony Cook, Sir John Godsalue, knights; Mr. John Godsalue, Christopher Nevinson, doctors of the law; and John Madew, doctor of divinity; who sat on their commission in St. Paul's church. There were present at the same time, bishop Bonner, John Royston, Polydore Virgil, Peter Van, and others. After the sermon was given, and the commission read, they administered an oath to the bishop of London, to renounce the bishop of Rome, with his usurped authority, and to swear obedience to the king, according to the form of the statute made in the thirty-first year of king Henry VIII. Also that the bishop should present and redress all such things as were needed to be reformed within the church.

Whereupon the bishop humbly and instantly desired that he might see their commission, only for this purpose (he said): that he might better fulfill and put into execution the things in which he was charged by them or their commission. The commissioners replied that they would deliberate more upon the matter. And so they called the other ministers of the church before them, and administered the same oath to them, that they did to the bishop. Certain interrogatories and articles of inquisition were read to them by Peter Lilly, the public notary. This done, and after their oaths were taken, the commissioners delivered to the bishop certain injunctions, in print as well as written, and homilies set forth by the king. The bishop received all these things, under the words of this protestation: "I receive these injunctions and homilies with this protestation, that I will observe them, if they are not contrary and repugnant to God's law, and to the statutes and ordinances of the church." He then added immediately, with an oath, that he never read the homilies and injunctions.

This protestation being made, Bonner instantly desired Peter Lilly, the registrar, to register it. And so the commissioners delivered the injunctions and homilies to Master Bellassere,

archdeacon of Colchester, and Gilbert Bourn, archdeacon of London, Essex, and Middlesex. They enjoined them to put them into speedy execution, and also reserved other injunctions to be administered afterwards, to the bishop as well as to the archdeacons, as they might see cause, etc. So continued the visitation till three o'clock the same day. At that hour and place, the commissioners sitting, and the canons and priests of the church appearing before them, they were examined by virtue of their oath, for their doctrine and conduct. First, John Painter, one of the cathedral church, there and then openly confessed that he lived viciously and immorally. Diverse other canons and priests of the church confessed these crimes in like manner, and could not deny they were culpable.

After the commissioners had delivered the king's injunctions and book of homilies to Master Royston, prebendary, and to the proctor of the dean and chapter of the cathedral church of St. Paul, they enjoined them to see them executed. They adjourned their visitation until seven o'clock the next day. By this visitation, it appears how Bonner made his protestation after receiving the king's injunctions.

[648]

And further, we may perceive the immoral life and conversation of these unmarried priests of popery. The bishop shortly after his protestation, whether for fear, or for conscience, repenting himself, went to the king, where he submitted himself, and recanting his former protestation, craved pardon of the king for his demeanor toward his grace's commissioners. Which pardon although it was granted to him by the king, for acknowledging his fault, yet, for example, it was thought good that he should be committed to the Fleet.

The Form of Bonner's Recantation.

"Whereas I, Edmund, bishop of London, have at such time as I received the king's majesty's injunctions and homilies of my most dread sovereign lord, at the hands of his highness's visitors, unadvisedly made such protestation, as now upon better consideration of my duty of obedience, and of the evil example that might ensue to others from it, appears to me neither reasonable, nor such as might well stand with the duty of a humble subject. Since the same protestation, at my request, was then enacted and put in record by the register of that visitation, I have thought it my duty not only to declare before your lordships, that upon better consideration of my duty, I now renounce and revoke my said protestation, but also most humbly beseech your lordships, that my revocation of the same may likewise be put in the same records for a perpetual memory of the truth, most humbly beseeching your good lordships, both to take order that it may take effect, and also that my former and unadvised doings may be, by your good mediations, pardoned by the king's majesty.

"EDMUND, London."

Thus we see how, upon his humble submission, he received his pardon from the king. And yet, for example's sake, he was commanded to the Fleet. He did not continue there long, but according to the king's pardon, he was restored both to his house and living again, in the first year of the king, 1548.

It will be remembered how, in the second and a great part of the third year of the king, Bonner demeaned himself, by not advancing the king's proceedings. And yet he acted in such a way that no advantage could be taken against him by law, both in swearing his obedience to the king, and in receiving his injunctions; also in confessing his assent and consent touching the state of religion then; and in directing his letters, according to the archbishop of Canterbury's precepts, to Cloney (his sumner), to the bishop of Westminster, and to other bishops, for abolishing images, for abrogation of the mass, for bibles to be set

up in the churches, and for administering the sacrament in both kinds, with such other matters of reformation. At length, hearing of the death of the lord admiral, the lord protector's brother, and afterwards of the insurrection of the king's subjects, Bonner began to draw back somewhat and became slack in his pastoral diligence. So that in many places of his diocese and in London, the people were not only negligent in resorting to divine service, but they also frequented and haunted foreign rites of masses. And also himself, contrary to his usual manner, on principal feasts he refused to officiate in person. Whereupon being suspected and complained about, and brought before the king's council (as said before), after sharp admonitions and reproofs, he had certain private injunctions sent to him to compel him to preach at St. Paul's Cross on certain days.

The delivery of these injunctions and articles to the bishop (with the time of his preaching being appointed) he was soon after known among the citizens and commons within the city of London, so that every man expecting the appointed time, wished to hear the preaching. The time having come, the bishop, according to the injunctions, publicly preached at the cross of St. Paul's on the first day of September. However, as hypocrisy never lurks so secretly in the hearts of the wicked, that at one time or another, God in his most righteous judgment, will not make it open to the world. So Bonner's long cloaked obstinacy and hatred against the king's godly proceedings, was most plainly manifested in his sermon.

For although he was commanded to treat only such special points as were mentioned in his articles, in order to withdraw the minds of the people, as much as it lay in him, from the right and true understanding of the holy sacrament administered in the holy communion then set forth by the authority of the king's majesty (according to the true sense of the holy Scripture), he spent most of his sermon treating the gross, carnal, and papistical presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar. And he also not only slenderly touched on the rest of his articles, but with a rebellious and willful carelessness, he utterly omitted the whole last article, concerning the lawful authority of the king's highness during his non-age — even though by special command, he was chiefly appointed to address this, because it was the traitorous opinion of the popish rebels.

This contemptuous and disobedient dealing, just as it greatly offended most of the king's faithful and loving subjects present there, so it much displeased that faithful and godly preacher, John Hooper, who was afterwards bishop of Worcester and Gloucester, and in the end, a most constant martyr for the gospel of Christ; and it also displeased William Latimer, bachelor of divinity. Therefore, well weighing the foulness of the act, and their bounden allegiances to their prince, they exhibited to the king's highness, under both their names, a bill of complaint or denunciation against the bishop.

The king's majesty thus having perfect intelligence, by the information of these two credible persons, of the contemptuous and perverse negligence of this bishop, in not accomplishing his highness' command, thought it necessary with all convenient speed to look more severely to the punishment of such dangerous and rebellious obstinacy. And therefore, by the advice of the lord protector, and the rest of his honorable council, the king directed his commission under his great seal to the archbishop of Canterbury, the bishop of Rochester, and to other grave and trusty personages and counsellors, appointing and authorizing them to call before them the bishop of London, as well as the denouncers, and upon due examination and proof, to proceed against him summarily, according to law, either to suspension, excommunication, committing to prison, or deprivation.

The commission being sealed with the king's great seal, it was by his highness's council directly delivered at court to Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and the rest of

the commissioners, who were all present there together. Upon receipt of it, they determined to sit at the archbishop's house at Lambeth the next Wednesday, which was the 11th of September; and they appointed the bishop of London to be summoned before them. The manner of his behavior at his appearance must be described, because it both declares the froward (willful) nature and stubborn condition of the person, and also what esteem and authority he thought the commissioners had.

At his first entry into the archbishop's house at Lambeth, where the archbishop and the commissioners sat, he passed by them with his cap on his head (as if he did not see them), until someone plucked him by the sleeve, asking him to do reverence to the commissioners. He laughingly turned himself, and spoke to the archbishop in this way: "What, my lord, are you here? By my pledge, I did not see you." — "No," said the archbishop, "you would not see." — "Well," he said, "you sent for me; have you anything to say to me?" — "Yes," said the commissioners, "we have here authority from the king's highness to call you to account for the sermon you made recently at St. Paul's Cross, because you did not publish to the people the article which you were commanded to preach upon." At these words the bishop, either because he did not like to hear of this matter, or else because he wished to make his friends believe that he was called to account only for his opinions in religion, began to speak of other matters, and said to the archbishop, "In good faith, my lord, I wish one thing were held in more reverence than it is."

[649] A.D. 1547-1553.

What is it?" asked the archbishop. — "The blessed mass," he said. — "You have written very well of the sacrament: I marvel you do not honor it more." The archbishop of Canterbury perceiving the bishop's subtlety, replied to him, "If you think it is well, it is because you do not understand it." The other then, adding to his ignorance an obstinate impudence, answered, "I think I understand it better than you who wrote it." To which the archbishop replied, "Truly I will easily make a child that is but ten years old understand it as much as you. But what is this to the matter?"

When they began to enter the judicial prosecuting of their commission, and had called upon the denouncers to propose such matter as they had to object against him, hearing them speak, he fell to scorning and taunting them, saying to the one, that he spoke like a goose; and to the other, that he spoke like a woodcock, and utterly denying their accusations to be true. The archbishop seeing his peevish malice against the denouncers, asked him whether, if he would not believe them, he would credit the people present there? And then (because many of those present were at the bishop's sermon at St. Paul's Cross) he stood up and read the article of the king's authority, saying to them, "How say you, my masters, did my lord of London preach this article?" They answered, "No, no." At which the bishop, turning himself about, deridingly said, "Will you believe this foolish people?"

Besides this, he used many irreverent, unbecoming, obstinate, and contrary words towards the commissioners (in defacing their authority with the terms of *pretended* commissioners, *pretended* witnesses, and unjust, unlawful, and *pretended* proceedings, terming some of them daws, woodcocks, fools, and such like). I will omit them here, for they appear in the sequel of the history.

On Wednesday, the 11th of September 1549, in the third year of the reign of King Edward VI, Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, metropolitan and primate of all England, with Nicholas Ridley then bishop of Rochester, Sir William Petre, knight, one of the king's two principal secretaries, and Master William May, doctor of the civil law, and dean of St. Paul's,

by virtue of the king's commission, sat judicially upon the examination of Edmund Bonner, bishop of London, within the archbishop's chamber of presence, at his house in Lambeth. Before them, the said bishop also personally appeared there. At which time the archbishop, in the name of the rest, declared to the bishop, that a grievous complaint had been previously made and exhibited against him in writing, to the king's majesty and his most honorable council, and that therefore his highness, with their advice, had committed the examination of it to him, and his colleagues present there. He showed a bill of complaint, exhibited to the king by William Latimer, and John Hooper, ministers, which they requested Sir William Petre to read.

These things ended, the bishop, like a subtle lawyer having secret intelligence before of these matters (whatever he pretended to the contrary) pulled out of his bosom a solemn protestation ready written, which he exhibited to the commissioners, requesting that the same might be openly read.

The protestation being read, he requested the commissioners that he might have the bill of complaint delivered to him. When he had well perused it, he said that the same was very general, and so general that he could not directly answer it. The archbishop answered that the special cause of the complaint against him was that he had transgressed the king's command, given to him by his council, in that in his sermon made at St. Paul's Cross, he did not set forth to the people the king's highness' royal power in his minority, according to the tenor of the article delivered to him for that purpose. And for proof of this he called William Latimer and John Hooper, who had put up the bill of complaint to the king against him.

When the bishop had earnestly looked upon them, he said, "As for this merchant, Latimer, I know him very well, and have borne with him, and winked at his doings a great while. But I have more to say to him hereafter. But as to this other merchant, Hooper, I have not seen him before. However I have heard much of his naughty preaching." And then turning to the archbishop (on purpose, most likely to make his friends think that he was not called there to answer for his contemptuous disobedience, but for matters of religion), said to him, "Ah, my lord, now I see that the cause of my trouble is not for the matter that you pretend against me, but it is because I preached and set forth in my recent sermon that the true presence of the most blessed body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ is in the sacrament of the altar. As for these my accusers, just as they are evil, infamous, notorious, and criminal persons, so they are manifest and notable heretics and seducers of the people, especially regarding the sacrament of the altar; and most of all this Hooper. For whereas in my late sermon at St. Paul's Cross, I preached that in the blessed sacrament of the altar, after the words of consecration, there is the true body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ, the self-same in substance that was hanged and shed upon the cross — he, the same afternoon, having a great rabble with him of his damnable sect, openly in the pulpit in my diocese, erroneously preached against it to the people. And maliciously inveighing against my sermon, he denied the verity and presence of Christ's true body and blood to be in the sacrament, and also falsely and untruly interpreted and expounded my words. And especially where I preached and affirmed the very true body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ to be in the sacrament, the self-same substance that was hanged and shed upon the cross, he, like an ass — as he is an ass indeed — falsely changed and turned the word *that* into *as*, like an ass, saying, that I had said *as* it hanged, and *as* it was shed upon the cross."

The archbishop perceiving the bishop's drift, and hearing him talk so much of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament, said to him, "My lord of London, you speak much of a presence in the sacrament. What presence is there, and of what presence do you

mean?" The bishop being somewhat stirred and moved in mind, as appeared by his choleric countenance, spoke again to the archbishop very earnestly, and said, "What presence, my lord? I say and believe that there is the very true presence of the body and blood of Christ. What and how do you believe my Lord?" The archbishop, minding to nip the gross absurdities of the papists, asked him further, "Whether Christ was there, face, nose, mouth, eyes, arms, and lips, with other lineaments of his body." The bishop shaking his head, said, "Oh, I am right sorry to hear your grace speak these words," and boldly urged the archbishop to show his mind in this. Wisely weighing the presumption of the party, with the place and occasion of their assembly, the archbishop refused to do so, saying that their being there at that time was not to dispute of those matters, but to prosecute their commission committed to them by their prince. And therefore he desired Bonner to answer to such things as were objected against him.

Upon which Bonner requested to have a copy both of the commission, and also of the denunciation, with time to answer. The commissioners willingly granted this, assigning him to appear again before them on the next Friday, at eight o'clock before noon, and then to answer the tenor of the denunciation.

On Friday, the 13th of September, four commissioners, with Sir Thomas Smith Knight, the other of the king's two principal secretaries, and joint commissioner with them, sat judicially in the archbishop's chapel in his house at Lambeth; before whom appeared the bishop of London. The archbishop, in the name of the rest, first said to him, "My lord of London, the last time you were before us, we laid certain articles and matter to your charge regarding your disobedience to the king's majesty, and you have this day to make your answer. Therefore, now show us what you have to say for your defense."

[650]

The bishop first asking the archbishop if he had said all, and he replying, "Yes," gave this answer: "My lord, the last day that I appeared before you, I remember there sat in the king's majesty's commission, your grace, you my lord of Rochester, you Master Secretary Petre, and you Master Dean of St. Paul's. But now I perceive there also sits Master Secretary Smith, who because he did not sit at the beginning, nor took the commission upon himself, should not do so. For by the law, those who begin must continue the commission." The archbishop answered, that he was no lawyer, and therefore he could not show what the law wills in that case, but if the law is so indeed, surely I take it to be an unreasonable law.

"Well," said the bishop, "there are those here who know the law, and yet I do not say this to stand or stick much in this point with you, but to tell it to you, as it were, by the way; for I have my answer ready here."

Then Master Secretary Petre said to the bishop, "My lord, in good truth, I must say to you, that although I have professed the law, yet by discontinuance and disuse of it, and having been occupied a long time in other matters, I have perhaps forgotten what the law will do precisely in this point. But admitting that if the law were as you say, yet you know, my lord, that this is our certain rule in law: *Quod consuetudo est juris interpret optimus* (that custom is the best interpreter of law). And I am sure you will not and cannot deny, that the custom in this realm is commonly used to the contrary in all judgments and commissions. And in very deed, we were all together at the court, having the commission presented to us, and took it upon us. And therefore, to stick in such trifling matters, you will, in my judgment, hurt yourself and your matter, rather than otherwise."

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

“Truly, Master Secretary,” said the bishop, “I have also for a long while been disused in the study of law, but having occasion, partly by reason of this matter to turn to my books, I find the law to be as I say, and yet, as I said, I tell you of it by the way, not minding to stick much with you in that point.”

At these words, Master Secretary Smith said also to the bishop, “Well, my lord of London, as cunning as you make yourself in the law, there are those here who know the law as well as you. And for my part I have studied the law too, and I promise you these are but quirks invented to delay matters. But our commission is to proceed summarily, and to cut off such frivolous allegations.”

“Well,” replied the bishop, “look well on your commission, and you will find these words in it: ‘To proceed according to the law and justice:’ and I ask both law and justice at your hands.”

Then Master Secretary Petre desired him to stand no more upon this, but to proceed to his answer. Whereupon the bishop Bonner took a writing which contained his answer to the denunciation exhibited the day before by Latimer and Hooper, and delivering it to the archbishop, he said that it was in his own handwriting, and for lack of sufficient time it was written so hastily and cursorily, that it could scarcely be read by any other. Therefore he desired to read it himself; and so taking it back, he read it openly.

The purport of his answer was that Hooper and Latimer were heretics, and therefore infamous and not to be believed or admitted as witnesses. Further, that the injunctions given to him were not sealed with the broad seal, or signed by the king, and that, notwithstanding, he did preach against rebellion and in behalf of the king’s authority — alleging that the witnesses were not to be believed, and that the charge was not true.

While he was reading the answer, objecting against his denouncers, causes for which he would have had the denouncers rejected by the commissioners. The archbishop of Canterbury replied that, “If there were any such law, he thought it was not a good or godly law, but a law of the bishop of Rome.”

“No, sir,” said the bishop of London, “it is the king’s law used in this realm.”

“Well, my lord,” said the archbishop, “you are too full of your law. I wish you had less knowledge in that law, and more knowledge in God’s law, and of your duty.”

With that, Secretary Petre desired the bishop to proceed in reading his answers. He did so, and when he had finished, Latimer delivered a writing to the archbishop and the rest of the commissioners; who then said to the bishop of London, “here are certain articles which we intend to administer to you.”

The commissioners assigned him Monday the 16th of September next following, to appear before them, and to make his full answers to all the articles administered to him by them this day.

On Monday, the 16th of September, the archbishop of Canterbury, associated with the bishop of Rochester, Secretary Smith, and Dr. May, dean of St. Paul’s, sat judicially within his chapel at Lambeth. Before them there and then appeared the bishop of London, as assigned in the last session. At that time he exhibited to the commissioners, in writing, his answers to the articles.

But before they were read, the archbishop said to him that his recent answers, made on the 13th of September to the denunciation, were very obscure, and also contained much matter

of slander against Latimer and Hooper, and much untruth. Therefore they desired to purge themselves. Whereupon Latimer, obtaining leave to speak, said that the bishop of London had most falsely, untruly, and uncharitably accused him, laying to his charge many feigned and untrue matters, and such as he would never be able to prove. For example, he alleged that William Latimer and John Hooper, with other heretics conspiring against him on the first day of September, after the bishop's sermon, assembled themselves together unlawfully against the bishop; that saying was most untrue. For neither that day, nor before that day, nor until certain days after, did he ever know or speak with Hooper. As to Latimer preaching there, he never held, taught, or preached anything concerning the blessed sacrament, other than he ought to do; nor otherwise than according to the Scriptures, and the true catholic faith of Christ's church. Therefore he offered himself to be tried by the archbishop, or other such learned men as it might please the king's majesty, or the commissioners, to appoint. And further, he offered to submit to be hanged, drawn, and quartered, if the bishop could justly prove to be true the things that he had shamefully laid to his charge there. Then Master Hooper obtained like license, and spoke to this effect:

"This ungodly man," pointing to the bishop, "has most uncharitably and ungodly accused me before your grace and this audience, and has laid to my charge that I am a heretic. Whereas, I take God to record, I never spoke, read, taught, or preached any heresy, but only the most true and pure word of God. And whereas, he says, I frequent the company of heretics; I do much marvel of his so saying; for it has pleased my lord protector's grace, my singular good lord and my lady's grace, to have me with them, and I have preached before them, and much used their company, with diverse other worshipful persons, and therefore I suppose this man means them. And further, whereas he says that I have made heretical books against the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, calling it mathematical, I perceive that this man knows not what this word mathematical there means, and therefore understands not my book: which, I take God to be my judge, I have made truly and sincerely, and according to his holy word: and by the same his holy word and Scriptures I am always and shall be ready to submit myself to your grace's judgment and the superior powers to be tried;" with many such more words of like importance.

This ended, the archbishop asked the bishop how he could prove that Hooper and Latimer assembled together against him on the first of September, as he had alleged, seeing that they now denied it, and therefore he willed him to answer immediately.

The bishop then answered that he would duly prove it, if he might be allowed to do it according to law. And with that, he pulled out of his sleeve certain books, saying, "I have this scoundrel's books which he made against the blessed sacrament, which you shall hear."

[651] A.D. 1547-1553.

Then, as he was turning certain leaves of it, Hooper began to speak again, but the bishop, turning himself towards him, tauntingly said, "Put up your pipes, you have spoken for your part, I will meddle no more with you." And with that, he read a certain sentence from the book. This done, he said, "Look, here you may see his opinion, and what it is." At these words, the people standing behind, and seeing his irreverent and unseemly demeanor and railing, fell suddenly into great laughing. At this, the bishop being moved, and not perceiving the reason why they laughed, turned towards them in a great rage, saying, "Ah, woodcocks, woodcocks!"

Then one of the commissioners said, “Why do you say so, my lord?” “Indeed,” the bishop replied, “I may well call them woodcocks, who will thus laugh, and do not know at what, nor having yet heard what I said or read.”

“Well, my lord of London,” said the archbishop, “then I perceive you would persuade this audience, that you were called here for preaching your belief in the sacrament of the altar, and therefore you lay to these men’s charge (meaning Hooper and Latimer) that they have accused you of that. However, there was no such thing laid to your charge, and therefore this audience will hear openly read, the denunciation that is put up against you, to the intent that they may better perceive your dealing in this.” And with that, he said to the people, “My lord of London would make you believe that he is called here for declaring and preaching his opinion regarding the sacrament of the altar. But to the intent that you may perceive how he goes about to deceive you, you will hear the denunciation that is laid in against him, read to you.” And thereupon he delivered the denunciation to Sir John Mason, knight, who read it openly. This done, the archbishop said again to the audience, “Behold, you hear how the bishop of London is called for no such matter as he would persuade you.”

With this, the bishop being in a raging heat, as one void of all humanity, turned himself around to the people, saying, “Well, now hear what the bishop of London says for his part.” But the commissioners, seeing his inordinate rebelliousness, forbade him to speak any more, saying that “he used himself very disobediently.”

Notwithstanding, the bishop persisted in his irreverent manner of dealing with the commissioners. He pulled out of his sleeve another book, and said to the archbishop; “My lord of Canterbury, I have here a note out of your books that you made touching the blessed sacrament, in which you affirm the verity of the body and blood of Christ to be in the sacrament; and I have another book also of yours of the contrary opinion; which is a marvelous matter.”

To which the archbishop replied that he made no books contrary one to another, and that he would defend his books. However, he thought the bishop did not understand them; “for I promise you,” he said, “I will find a boy ten years old, who will be more apt to understand that matter than you, my lord of London.”

Thus, after a great many words, the commissioners, thinking it not good to spend any more time with him, desired the bishop to show his answers to the articles objected, against him the previous day. Having them ready, he read the same to them. In them he laments that someone of his vocation, at the malicious denunciation of vile heretics, should be used in such a strange manner, having nevertheless done the best he could to declare his obedience to the king’s majesty for the discouraging of rebellion; and also for the truth of Christ’s true body, and his presence in the sacrament of the altar; for which alone the malicious denouncers, with their accomplices, had studied to trouble him.

Then in reply to the charge of omitting to defend the authority of the king during his minority, he said, for better setting forth the king’s majesty’s power and authority in his minority, he had collected out of histories, as well as out of the Scriptures, the names of several young kings who, notwithstanding their minority, were faithfully and obediently honored, and reputed for very true and lawful kings — such as Henry III being but nine years old; Edward III being but thirteen, Richard II being but eleven; Henry VI being not fully one year; Edward V being but eleven; Henry VIII being but eighteen years of age. And out of the Old Testament, Uzziah, who was but sixteen years old; Solomon and Manasseh being but twelve; Josiah, Jehoiachim, and Joash being but eight years of age when they

entered their reigns. All of these notes, with many others, he had purposed to declare, if they had come to his memory, as indeed they did not, because he was disturbed — partly for lack of preaching, and partly because of a bill that was delivered to him from the king's council, to declare the victory then had against the rebels in Norfolk and Devonshire — this being of some length, it confounded his memory; and also partly because his book in his sermon fell from him, which had his notes which he had collected for that purpose. So that he could not remember what he intended, yet in general he persuaded the people to obedience to the king's majesty, whose minority was manifestly known to them, and to all others.

When he had ended the reading of his answers, the commissioners said to him that in them he had very obscurely answered the article beginning thus: "You shall also set forth in your sermon that our authority," etc. He answered, that he had already made as full and sufficient an answer in writing, as he was bound to make by law.

The judges again demanded of him, whether he would answer otherwise, or not? To which he said, "No, unless the law compelled him." Then they asked him whether he thought the law compelled him to answer more fully, or not.' He answered, "No;" adding further that he was not bound to answer to such positions.

The commissioners then seeing his stubborn rebellion. told him plainly, that if he persisted this way, and would not answer otherwise, they would, according to the law, take him as if he had confessed it. He said, as before, that he had already fully answered them. But when they requested to have the notes which he had made of his sermon, he said they would have them if they would send for them. And as in his answer he stated that he did not know what the opinion of the rebels was, the judges declared to him that their opinion was that, "the king's majesty, before his grace came to the age of twenty-one years, did not have such full authority to make laws and statutes, as when he came to further years; and that his subjects were not bound to obey the laws and statutes made in his young age." The bishop answered that he was not of the opinion of the rebels mentioned in that article, as it appeared by his answers to the denunciation, as well as to the fifth article objected against him.

This ended, they admitted for witnesses upon the articles objected against him, Master John Cheek, Henry Markham, John Joseph, John Douglas, and Richard Chambers, whom they bound with an oath upon the holy evangelists, to truly answer and depose upon the same articles in the presence of the bishop who, like a wily lawyer, protested against receiving, admitting, and swearing those witnesses, also demanding a competent time to minister interrogatories against them, with a copy of all the acts of that day. The delegates were well pleased with this, and assigned him to administer his interrogatories against Master Cheek on that day, and against the rest on the next day.

After this, the judges' delegate assigned the bishop to appear again before them on the Wednesday next ensuing, between the hours of seven and eight o'clock before noon, in the hall of the archbishop's manor of Lambeth, there to show cause why he should not be declared *pro confesso* (confessed) upon all the articles to which he had not answered, and to see further process done in the matter. And so they departed (while he still protested against the validity of all their proceedings).

In the meanwhile, the commissioners certified to the king's majesty and his council what the demeanor of the bishop was, and what objections he had made against their proceedings, and their doubts whether by the tenor of his majesty's commission, the commissioners might proceed not only with the denunciation, but with their mere office; and also whether they might determine or hear the cause as well.

[652]

His majesty, for a better understanding of this, on the 17th of September sent to the commissioners a full and perfect declaration of his will and pleasure in the commission, giving them full authority to proceed at their own discretion.

After this declaration had been sent down to, and received back from the king, the bishop of London appeared again before them on Wednesday, the 18th of September, in the great hall at Lambeth. There he declared that he had already sufficiently answered all things. Yet to further satisfy the term assigned to him, to show cause why he should not be declared *pro confesso* upon the articles to which he had not fully answered, he had a writing to exhibit why he should not be so declared, which he read there openly. In this writing, using his accustomed irreverent terms of *pretended*, *unjust*, and *unlawful* process and assignment, he said he was not bound by the law (for good and reasonable causes) to obey them, especially their assignment.

When his frivolous objections were read, the archbishop seeing his inordinate and intolerable contempt of manner and language towards them, charged him very sharply, saying, "My Lord of London, if I had sat here only as archbishop of Canterbury, it would have been your duty to act more lowly, obediently, and reverently towards me than you have. But seeing that I with my colleagues, now sit here as delegates from the king's majesty, I must tell you plainly, that you have behaved yourself too inordinately. For every time that we have sat in commission, you have used such unseemly fashions, without any reverence and obedience, giving taunts and checks to us, with the servants and chaplains, as well as to certain of the most ancient who are here, calling them fools and daws, with similar expressions, such that you have given the multitude an intolerable example of disobedience. And I assure you, my lord, you and another bishop whom I could name, have acted so contemptuously and disobediently, as I think the like has not been heard of before, by which you have done much harm."

At these words the bishop said scornfully to the archbishop, "You show yourself to be a proper judge." The archbishop then reminded him how indiscreetly, the last day in the chapel, he had called all the people "woodcocks."

The bishop answered that William Latimer, one of the denouncers, had practiced with the audience, that when he lifted up his hand to them, they should say as he said, and do as he did; such as, one time, upon lifting up his hand, "No, no;" and at another time, "Yes, yes," and they laughed at what they could not tell.

To these words Latimer replied, saying that, "he did not lift up his hand at any time, except to cause them to hold their peace."

Then secretary Smith said to the bishop, that in all his writings and answers he did not once acknowledge them as the king's commissioners, but always used protestations, calling them *pretended* commissioners, *pretended* delegates, *pretended* commission, *pretended* articles, *pretended* proceedings, so that all things were *pretended* with him. "Such terms," he said, "proctors use to delay matters for their clients, when they would not have the truth known. But you, my lord, to use us, the king's majesty's commissioners, with such terms, do very naughtily. And I pray you, what else did the rebels do but act in the same way? For when letters and pardons were brought to them from the king and his council, they would not credit them, but said they were none of the king's or his council's, but gentlemen's doings, with similar terms. But now, my lord, because we cannot make you confess whether, in your sermon, you omitted the article regarding the king's majesty's authority in his tender age or

not, but have still said you will not answer otherwise than you have done, and that you have already sufficiently answered, so that we can by no means induce you to confess plainly what you did, yes or no — therefore I say, to the intent we may come to the truth, we have dilated the matter more at large, and have drawn out other articles to which you shall be sworn. And then I trust, you will dally with us no more as you have done.”

Then the delegates ministered to him certain new articles and injunctions, and bound him there with an oath in form of law, to make a full and true answer. Notwithstanding, the bishop still protested the nullity and invalidity of these articles, injunctions, and process, also desiring a copy, with a competent time to answer.

The judges decreed a copy, commanding him to come to his examination the next day.

Then the commissioners received for a witness Sir John Mason, Sir Thomas Chalenor, knights. Master William Cecil, Armigal Wade, and William Hunnings, clerks to the king’s council, whom they bound with a corporal oath in the presence of the bishop.

These articles being thus administered to the bishop of London, the next day, being Thursday the 19th of September, the before-named commissioners sat in the archbishop’s chamber of presence at Lambeth, attending the coming of the bishop of London. Before them there appeared Robert Johnson the bishop’s registrar, who declared to the commissioners that the bishop his master could not at that time personally appear before them without great danger of his bodily health. This was because he feared to fall into a fever because of a cold he had contracted by exerting himself too much the night before, whereby he was compelled to keep to his bed. Nevertheless, if he could, without danger of his bodily health, he would appear before them the same afternoon. This excuse the judges were content to take in good part. Master Smith remarked that, “if he were sick indeed, the excuse was reasonable, and to be allowed. But,” he said, “I promise you, my lord has so dallied with us, and previously used such delays, that we may mistrust that this is but a feigned excuse. However, upon your faithful declaration, we are content to tarry until one o’clock this afternoon.” And so they did, desiring Master Johnson to then signify to them whether the bishop could appear or not.

At that hour, Robert Johnson and Richard Rogers, gentlemen of the bishop’s chamber, appeared again before the commissioners, declaring that for the causes before alleged, their master could not appear at that time. Whereupon Master secretary Smith said to them, “My lord of London, your master has used us very poorly, and previously sought delays. And now, perhaps, perceiving these last articles to touch the heart of it, and therefore being loth to answer, he feigns being sick. But because he will not so deceive us any more, we will send the knight marshal to him, commanding him that if he is sick indeed, to let him alone; for that is a reasonable excuse. But if he is not sick, then to bring him directly to us; for I promise you he will not use us as he has done. And therefore Master Johnson, do the part of a trusty servant as becomes you. But it is also your part to show my lord his stubborn heart and disobedience, which does him more harm than he is aware of. What, does he think to stand with a king in his own realm? Is this the part of a subject? Indeed, I suppose we will have a new Thomas à Becket. Let him take heed, for if he plays these parts, he may happen to be made shorter by the head. He may appeal if he thinks it good; but appeal to where? To the bishop of Rome? I say he cannot appeal except to the same king who has made us his judges, and to the bench of his council. And how they will take this matter when they hear of it, I do not doubt. He would make men believe that he was called before us for preaching his opinion about the sacrament. In this, I assure you, he acted both falsely and wickedly, and more than was becoming of him, and more than he was commanded to do, for he was not

desired to speak of that matter. Yet we will lay no such thing to his charge, and therefore we will not have him delay us." This ended, the delegates decreed to wait for him until the next day at two o'clock, being a Friday, the 20th of September.

[653] A.D. 1547-1553.

At that day and time the bishop himself appeared (personally before them in the same chamber of presence), where he exhibited his answers to the last articles. After this, and perceiving that Master secretary Smith was shorter with him than the other commissioners. He would not allow him to delay the matter any longer with his vain subtleties in law, but urged him to go directly to his matter. Sometimes he sharply rebuked the bishop for his ill and stubborn behavior towards them. Bishop Bonner, to destroy the secretary's authority, exhibited in writing a recusal of the secretary's judgment against him, in which he rejects the secretary as a prejudiced and hostile person, unfit to sit in judgment upon him. When this was read by the bishop, the secretary told him plainly, that he would proceed in his commission; and he would still be his judge; and he said further, "My lord, you say in your recusal, that I said you 'were acting like thieves, murderers, and traitors.' Indeed, I said it, and I will so say again, since we perceive it by your actions."

The bishop in a great rage replied, "Well, sir, because you sit here by virtue of the king's commission, and are secretary to his majesty, and also one of his highness' council, I must and do honor and reverence you. But, as you are but Sir Thomas Smith, and say as you have said, 'That I act like thieves, murderers, and traitors,' I say you lie, and I defy you. Do what you can to me. I do not fear you, and therefore what you do, do quickly."

The archbishop with the other commissioners said to him, that for such irreverent behavior he was worthy of imprisonment.

Then the bishop, in madder fury than before, replied, "In God's name you may send me where you will, and I must obey you, and so I will, unless you send me to the devil. For there I will not go for you. Three things I have: a small portion of goods, a poor carcass, and my own soul. The first two you may take, but as for my soul, you shall not get it."

"Well," the secretary then said, "you shall know that there is a king."

"Yes, sir," said the bishop, "but that is not you; nor, I am sure, will you take it on yourself."

"No sir," said the secretary, "but we will make you know who it is." And with that, the commissioners commanded the bishop and all the rest to depart the chamber, until they called for him again.

Now that the commissioners were in consultation, the bishop, with Gilbert Bourn, his chaplain, Robert Warnington his commissary, and Robert Johnson his registrar, were tarrying in a vacant place before the door of the chamber. The bishop, leaning on a cupboard, and seeing his chaplains very sad, said

"Sirs, what do you mean by this? Why show yourselves to be sad and heavy in mind, as appears to me by your outward gestures and countenances? I would wish you, and I require you, to be as merry as I am (as he laid his hand on his breast). For before God, I am not sad nor heavy, but merry and of good comfort, and am right glad and joyful of my trouble, which is for God's cause, and it does not grieve me at all. But the great matter that grieves me and pierces my heart is, that this Hooper and such other vile heretics and beasts are allowed and licensed to preach at Paul's Cross, and in other places within my diocese, most detestably preaching and railing at the blessed sacrament of the altar, and denying the verity and presence of Christ his true body and blood to be there; and so they infect and betray my flock.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

But I say it is there in very deed, and in that opinion I will live and die; and I am ready to suffer death for it. Therefore, you being Christian men, I require you, and also charge and command you in the name of God, and on his behalf, as you will answer him for the contrary, that you go to the mayor of London, and to his brethren the aldermen, praying and also requiring them earnestly in God's name and mine, and for my own discharge on that behalf, that from now on, when any such detestable and abominable preachers (and especially those who hold opinions against the blessed sacrament of the altar) come to preach to them, they quickly depart from their presence, and do not hear them, lest tarrying with such preachers, they not only hurt themselves in receiving their poisoned doctrine, but also give encouragement to others, who thereby might take an occasion to think and believe that their erroneous and damnable doctrine is true and good."

And then, turning himself around, and beholding two of the archbishop's gentlemen who kept the chamber door where the commissioners were in consultation, and perceiving that they had heard all his talk, he spoke to them also, and said,

"And, sirs, you are my lord of Canterbury's gentlemen, I know you very well. And therefore I also require and charge you in God's behalf, and in his name, that you do the same where you chance to see and hear such corrupt and erroneous preachers, and also notify my lord your master of the same, and of these sayings of mine that I have now spoken here before you, as you are Christian men, and shall answer before God for the contrary."

With this, the commissioners called for the bishop again, who read to them an instrument containing an appeal to the king.

Then the delegates proceeded to the examination of his last answers. Finding them imperfect, they demanded of him on what specific day of August he was sent for by the lord protector? He obstinately answered that he was not bound to make any other answer than he had already made, nor would he otherwise answer as long as Master secretary Smith was present, whom he had recused before, and would not recede from his recusation.

The secretary, seeing him so willful and perverse, said sharply to him, "My lord, come off and make a full and perfect answer to these articles, or else we will take other order with you."

"In faith, sir," the bishop then said, "I thought you had been learned. But now before God I perceive well that either you are not learned, or else you have forgotten it. For I have so often answered lawfully and sufficiently and have shown sufficient and reasonable causes, that I must judge that you are too ignorant in this."

"Well," said Master secretary, "you will not then answer otherwise?"

"No," said the bishop, "unless the law compels me."

"Then," said the secretary, "call for the knight marshal, that he may be taken to ward."

With that, all the rest of the commissioners charged the bishop, that he had very outrageously and irreverently behaved himself towards them, sitting on the king's majesty's commission, and especially towards Sir Thomas Smith, his majesty's secretary, and for that and other contemptuous words which he had spoken, they declared they would commit him to the Marshalsea.

By this time the marshal's deputy came before them, whom Master secretary commanded to take the bishop as prisoner, and so keep him, that no man might come to him.

When the secretary had ended, the bishop said to him, "Well, sir, it might have become you right well, that his grace of Canterbury, here present, being first in commission, and your better, should have done it."

Then the commissioners assigning him to be brought before them on Monday, to make full answer to these articles, or else to show cause why he should not be declared guilty by confession, concluded the session.

Now, as the bishop was departing with the undermarshal, he turned himself in a great fury toward the commissioners, and said to Sir Thomas Smith, "Sir, where you have committed me to prison, you shall understand, that I will require no favor at your hands, but shall willingly suffer what shall be put me to, such as bolts on my heels; yeas, and if you will, iron about my middle, or wherever you will."

Then departing again, he returned once more, and said to the archbishop, "Well, my lord, I am sorry that I, being a bishop, am thus handled at your grace's hand; but more sorry that you allow abominable heretics to practice as they do in London and elsewhere, infecting and disquieting the king's liege people.

[654]

And therefore I require you, as you will answer to God and the king, that from now on you will abstain from doing this. For if you do not, I will accuse you before God and the king's majesty." And so he departed, using many reproachful words against the common people, who stood and spoke to him along the way as he went out.

The sixth action or process against Bonner, Bishop of London.

It was assigned, that upon Monday, the 23rd of the same month, the bishop should again appear before the commissioners, to show a final cause why he should not be declared *pro confesso*, upon all the articles to which he had not fully answered.

Accordingly, the bishop was brought before them by the under-marshal, and there declared that his appearance at that time and place was not voluntary, for he was brought there against his will by the keeper of the Marshalsea. He then intimated a general recusation of all the commissioners, alleging that because the archbishop with all his colleagues had neither observed the order of their commission, nor proceeded against him in any laudable form of judgment, but attempted many things unlawfully against his person, dignity, and state, especially in committing him to prison. And he therefore refused and declined from the judgment of the archbishop and his colleagues, and excepted against their jurisdiction. Therefore, according to his appeal, he purposed to submit himself to the tuition, protection, and defense of the king's majesty; for whose honor and reverence' sake, he said, they should not proceed any further against him.

The archbishop, however, with the others, told him plainly that they would still be his judges, and proceed against him according to the king's commission. Then the bishop, seeing that they would still proceed against him, intimated an appeal to the king's majesty. The commissioners, notwithstanding, stood to their commission, and straitly urged him to give a more complete answer to his articles than he had done. The bishop said that he would stand to his recusations and appeal, and would not make any other answer.

Then the delegates demanded of him what cause he had to allege, and why he should not be declared *pro confesso* upon the articles to which he had not fully answered. The bishop still answered (as before) that he would adhere to his appeal and recusation.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Whereupon the archbishop, with the consent of the rest, seeing his pertinacity, pronounced him obstinate, and declared him guilty, upon all the articles which he had not answered.

This done, Master secretary Smith showed a letter which the bishop of London had sent to the lord mayor, and the aldermen of the city of London, as follows:

*To the right honorable and my very good Lord,
the Lord Mayor of London, with all his worshipful Brethren,
my very dear and worshipful Friends, with speed.*

“Right honorable, with my very humble recommendations. Whereas I have perceived of late, and heard with my ears, what vile beasts and heretics have preached to you, or rather like themselves, have prated and railed against the most blessed sacrament of the altar, denying the truth and presence of Christ’s true body and blood to be there, giving you and the people liberty to believe what you wish, teaching you detestably, that faith in this behalf must not be constrained, but that every man may believe as he will. Because of this, lest my presence and silence might to some have been seen to allow their heretical doctrine, and given credit to them, betraying my flock of the catholic sort, you know I departed yesterday from the heretic praters’ uncharitable charity, and so I could have wished that you and all others who are catholic might have done, leaving those there with him who are already cast away, and will not be recovered. For tarrying with him still, you will not only hurt yourselves in receiving his poisoned doctrine, but also give countenance that their doctrine is tolerable because you are content to hear it, and say nothing against it. And because I cannot tell when I will speak with you to notify you of this, I therefore thought it good for my own discharge and yours, to write this much to you, requiring and praying you again and again in God’s behalf, and for my own discharge, that you do not allow yourselves to be abused with such wicked preachers and teachers, in hearing their evil doctrine that you perceive them going about to sow. And thus our blessed Lord long and well preserve you all with this noble city in all good rest, godliness, and prosperity. Written in haste, this Monday morning, the 16th of September 1549.

“Your faithful beadsman ⁴ and poor bishop,
“Edmund Bonner.”

This letter being read, the secretary demanded whether he wrote it or not. He would not otherwise answer, but that he would still adhere and stand to his former recusations and appeals. The commissioners seeing this, determined to continue this case until the following Friday, assigning the bishop to be there to hear a final decree of this matter.

On Friday the commissioners did not sit in commission according to their appointment, but deferred it till Tuesday, the 1st of October. On that day the bishop appearing before them, the archbishop declared to him, that although on Friday last, they had appointed to pronounce their final decree and sentence in this matter, yet as they thought this sentence (although they had just cause to give it), would be very severe against him, they had not only deferred it until this day, but desiring to be friendly to him, and to use a more gentle reformation towards him, had made such suit for him. Although he had grievously offended the king’s majesty, yet if he would have acknowledged his fault, and made some amends in submitting himself, he would have found much favor. The sentence would not have been so extreme against him, as it was likely to be now.

The bishop not at all regarding this gentle and friendly admonition, but persisting in his rebelliousness, he made another protest against the commissioners, and then appealed from

⁴ *Beadsman*: a man person who is paid to pray for the soul of another.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

them to the king. He refused to answer, on the plea that he was not free, but a prisoner. He then handed in both his protests and his appeal in writing, after having publicly read them.

These things ended, the archbishop said to him, "My lord where you say that you come compelled, or else you would not have appeared, I much wonder. For you would thereby make us and this audience here believe that because you are a prisoner, you should not therefore answer. If this were true, it would be enough to confound the whole state of this realm. For I dare say, that of the greatest prisoners and rebels who your keeper there (meaning the under-marshal) ever had under him, he cannot show me one who has used such defense as you have done."

"Well," said the bishop, "if my keeper were learned in the laws, I could show him my mind."

"Well," said the archbishop, "I have read over all the laws as well as you, but to another end and purpose than you did; and yet I can find no such privilege in this matter."

Then Master Secretary Smith charged him very severely how disobediently and rebelliously he had behaved himself towards the king's majesty and authority.

The bishop replied, "he was the king's majesty's lawful and true subject, and acknowledged his highness to be his gracious sovereign lord, or else he would not have appealed to him as he did. Yes, and he would gladly lay his hands, and his neck also, under his grace's feet. And therefore he desired that his highness's laws and justice might be administered to him."

"Indeed," replied Master Secretary, "you say well my lord. But I pray you, what else have all those rebels in Norfolk, Devonshire, and Cornwall, and other places done? Have they not said the same thing?"

[655] A.D. 1547-1553.

"We are the king's true subjects, we acknowledge him as our king, and we will obey his laws,' with similar phrases. Yet when either commandment, letter, or pardon was brought to them from his majesty, they did not believe it, but said it was forged and made under a hedge, and was gentlemen's doings — so that they neither would nor did obey anything."

"Ah, sir," said the bishop, "I perceive your meaning; you would say that the bishop of London is a rebel like them."

"Yes, by my pledge," said the secretary. At which the people laughed.

Then the dean of St. Paul's said to him that, "he marvelled much, and was very sorry to see him so intractable, that he would not allow the judges to speak." To whom Bonner disdainfully answered; "Well, Master Dean, you must say something." And likewise at another time, as the dean was speaking, he interrupted him and said, "You may speak when your turn comes." Then secretary Smith said, "I would that you knew your duty."

"I would," he retorted, "that you knew it as well," with an infinite deal more of such stubborn and contemptuous behavior. The commissioners weighing this, determined that the archbishop (Cranmer), with their whole consent, should openly read and publish their final decree or definitive sentence against him. He did this, pronouncing the bishop to be entirely deprived from the bishopric of London.

The sentence specified that the bishop of London had neglected the king's injunctions in his diocese, and especially had not complied with his majesty's command to preach in behalf of the king's authority as impeached by the rebels; and the sentence embodied the words of the royal injunctions, which he thus neglected, and which are as follows:

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

“You shall also set forth in your sermon, that the authority of our royal power is (as of truth it is) of no less authority and force in our younger age, than it is and was of any of our predecessors, even though the same were much older, as may appear by the example of Josiah and other young kings in Scripture. And therefore all our subjects are to be no less bound to the obedience of our precepts, laws, and statutes, than if we were thirty or forty years of age.”

When this sentence of deprivation was ended, the bishop immediately appealed by word of mouth:

“I, Edmund, bishop of London, brought in and kept here as a prisoner against my consent and will, do under my former protestation, and to the intent it may also appear, that I have not consented nor agreed to anything done against me and in my prejudice. I allege and say that this sentence given here against me, is *lex nulla* (legally void); and so far as it appears to be *aliqua* (in part), I say it is *iniqua* and *injusta* (unfair and unjust); and that therefore I appeal to the most excellent and noble king Edward VI, by the grace of God, king of England, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, and of the church of England, and also Ireland, next and immediately under God here on earth, supreme head; and to his court of chancery or parliament, as the law, statutes, and ordinances of this realm will allow and bear in this behalf, desiring instantly first, second, and third, according to the laws, letters, reverential or dismissory, to be given and delivered to me in this behalf, with all things expedient, requisite, or necessary in any way.”

The judges said, “they will declare and signify to the king’s majesty what is done in this matter.”

The archbishop of Canterbury, considering that most of the audience did not understand the meaning of the sentence which was read in the Latin tongue, said to them, “Because there may be many of you here who do not understand the Latin tongue, and so cannot tell what judgment has been given, I will therefore show you its effect.” And with that, he declared in English the causes expressed in the sentence, adding these words:

“Because my lord of London (Bonner) is found guilty in these matters, therefore we here, by our sentence, have deprived him of our bishopric of London. And we show this to you so that from now on you shall not esteem him any more as bishop of London.”

Then Bonner desired the archbishop to declare likewise how he had appealed. But the other, seeing his brazen contempt, refused it, saying, “You may do it yourself.” Whereupon the bishop again said very disdainfully, “What will your grace do with me, regarding my imprisonment? Will you still keep me in prison?”

The commissioners answered him that they perceived now more in the matter than they did before, and that his behavior was a greater rebellion than he was aware of, and therefore they would not discharge him, but committed him back to his keeper, to be kept in prison. There he most justly remained until the death of that most worthy and godly prince king Edward VI. After that time, Bonner wrought most horrible mischief and cruelties against the saints of God, as it will appear later, throughout the reign of queen Mary.

Immediately after his deprivation, he wrote from the Marshalsea other supplicatory letters to the lord chancellor, and to the rest of the king’s council. In these he complained that because of the great enmity that the duke of Somerset and Sir Thomas Smith bore to him, his earnest suits to the king and his council could not be heard. He therefore most humbly desired their lordships to consider him, and to let him have liberty to prosecute this matter before them, and he would daily pray for the good preservation of their honors. Afterwards he wrote in the same way to the king’s majesty.

The king, upon receiving Bonner's petition, gave in charge and commandment to certain men of honor and worship, and persons skillful in the law — such as, to the lord Rich, high chancellor, the lord treasurer, the marquis of Dorset, the bishop of Ely; Lord Wentworth, Sir Anthony Wingfield, Sir William Herbert, knights; doctor Rich, Wooton, Edward Montague, lord chief justices; Sir John Baker, knight; along with judge Hale, John Gosnold, doctor Oliver, and also doctor Layson — so that by perusing all such acts, matters, and muniments (documentation) of Bonner exhibited, produced, propounded, and alleged by him, with all his protestations, recusations, and appeals, they might upon mature consideration give their direct answer, whether the appeal of Bonner was to be deferred to, and whether the sentence against him stood sufficient and effectual by the law or not. Soon after their diligent discussion, and considerate advice, they gave their answer that the appeal of Edmund Bonner was null and unreasonable, and in no way to be deferred to; and that the sentence by the commissioners against him was rightly and justly pronounced.

And this was the conclusion of Bonner's whole matter and deprivation.

Reformation of Church Services

Thus leaving Doctor Bonner for a while in the Marshalsea, we will proceed further in the course of our history, as the order of years and time requires. The trouble of the lord protector (duke of Somerset) falls here jointly with the deprivation of Doctor Bonner. Yet as the duke was shortly delivered again, I will therefore delay treating it till his second trouble, which was two years later. And so in the meantime, I intend to continue the matter regarding the king's godly proceedings for the reformation of religion in the year 1549.

First, a note should be made here about Peter Martyr and his learned labors and disputation concerning the sacrament, in the University of Oxford this same year, with Doctor Chedsey and others. The dispute was that the substance of bread and wine was not changed in the sacrament, and that the body and blood of Christ was not carnally and bodily in the bread and wine, but united to it only sacramentally.

In like manner, some mention should be made here about the ecclesiastical laws. Thirty-two persons were assigned to compile them, by act of parliament in 1549. But because these are matters of treatise rather than historical, I mean to defer their further consideration to the end of the history of this king's days. Meanwhile, I will pass on to other matters.

[656]

Books of Latin service called in and abolished.

It follows in our history, that certain of the vulgar multitude, hearing of the apprehension of the lord protector,⁵ and supposing that the alteration of public service into English, and the administration of the sacrament and other rites recently appointed in the church, had been the act chiefly or only of the lord protector, began now to spread abroad the report that they would now have their old Latin service with holy bread and holy water, and their other superstitious ceremonies again. Therefore the king, with the privy council, directed his letters of request, and his straight commandment, to the bishops in their diocese, to cause the deans and prebendaries of their cathedral churches — all parsons, vicars, and curates, with the church-wardens of every parish within their diocese — to bring in and deliver up all

⁵ Edward Seymour, the Duke of Somerset and Lord Protector of England, was captured on 11 October 1549. He was brought before King Edward VI, who outlined charges against him, including ambition, vainglory, rash wars during the king's youth, neglect of Newhaven, enriching himself from the royal treasury, and ruling by his own authority.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

antiphoners, missals, grailes, processionales, manuals, legends, pies, porthoses, journals, and ordinals following the use of Sarum, Lincoln, York, Bangor, Hereford, or any other private use; and all other books of religious service, which might be any hindrance to the service now set forth in English, charging also and commanding that all those who are found disobedient in this behalf should be committed to ward (jail).

And because the king was informed that among the people there was a refusal to pay toward the finding of bread and wine for the holy communion, by which the communion in many places was omitted, the bishops in like manner had given in charge to provide for redress of this, and to punish them who might refuse. By this it appears that no wafer cakes, but common bread was then, by the king's appointment, ordinarily received and used in churches. This was about the end of December A.D. 1549.

Taking down Altars, and setting up the Table instead.

The year next, 1550, other letters for taking down altars in churches, and setting up the table instead, were sent to Nicholas Ridley who, being bishop of Rochester before, was now made bishop of London in Bonner's place. The copy and contents of the king's letters are these:

The King's Letters to Nicholas Ridley, Bishop of London, etc.

"Right reverend father in God; right trusty and well-beloved, we greet you well. And whereas it has come to our knowledge that the altars within most of the churches of this realm being taken down already, upon good and godly considerations, there yet remain altars standing in other churches. By the occasion of this, much variance and contention arises among sundry of our subjects. If good foresight were not had, they might perchance engender great hurt and inconvenience. We admonish you, that minding to have all occasion of contention taken away, which many times grows by those and similar diversities, and considering that among other things belonging to our royal office and cure, we account the greatest to be, to maintain the common quiet of our realm. We have thought it good, by the advice of our council, to require you — and nevertheless, to especially charge and command you — to avoid all matters of further contention and strife about the standing or taking away of the said altars, to give substantial order throughout all your diocese, so that with all diligence all the altars in every church or chapel be taken down, in places exempted as well as not exempted within your diocese. And in place of them, a table be set up in some convenient part of the chancel, within every such church or chapel, to serve for the administration of the blessed communion. And to the intent that the same may be done without the offense of those of our loving subjects who are not yet so well persuaded in that behalf as we would wish, we send to you with this letter, certain considerations gathered and collected, that aid the purpose. These and such others as you think appropriate, are to be set forth to persuade the weak to embrace our proceedings in this part. We pray you to have them declared to the people by some discreet preachers, in such places as you think fitting, before taking down the said altars. Thus both the weak consciences of others may be instructed and satisfied as much as may be, and this, our pleasure, may be more quietly executed. To better do this, we require you to open the aforesaid considerations in our cathedral church in your own person, if convenient, or otherwise by your chancellor or some other grave preacher, both there and in such other market towns and most notable places of your diocese, as you may think most requisite.

"Given under our signet at our palace of Westminster,
the '24th of November, in the fourth year of our reign."

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

*Reasons why the Lord's Board should be
in the form of a Table, rather than an Altar.*

1. The form of a table shall more move the simple away from the superstitious opinions of the popish mass, to the right use of the Lord's Supper. For the use of an altar is to make sacrifice; the use of a table is to serve for men to eat upon. Now, when we come to the Lord's board, what do we come for? Is it to sacrifice Christ again, and to crucify him again? Or is it to feed upon Him who was crucified and offered up only once for us? If we come to feed upon him, to spiritually to eat his body, and to spiritually to drink his blood, which is the true use of the Lord's Supper, then no man can deny that the form of a table is more appropriate for the Lord's board than the form of an altar.

2. Whereas it is said, that the Book of Common Prayer mentions an altar, and therefore it is not lawful to abolish what the book allows. To this it is thus answered: the Book of Common Prayer calls the thing on which the Lord's Supper is administered indifferently a table, an altar, or the Lord's board, without prescribing any form, either of a table or of an altar. So that whether the Lord's board has the form of an altar, or of a table, the Book of Common Prayer calls it both an altar and a table. For just as it calls it an altar, upon which the Lord's Supper is administered, a table and the Lord's board, so it calls the table where the holy communion is distributed with praise and thanksgiving to the Lord, an altar — for there the same sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is offered. And thus it appears that there is nothing either said or meant contrary to the Book of Common Prayer.

3. The popish opinion of mass was that it might not be celebrated except upon an altar, or at least, upon a super-altar, to supply the fault of the altar, which must have had its imprints and characters, or else it was thought that the thing was not done lawfully. But this superstitious opinion is more held in the minds of the simple and ignorant by the form of an altar, than of a table. Therefore it is more fitting for the abolishing of this superstitious opinion, to have the Lord's board in the form of a table than of an altar.

4. The form of an altar was ordained for the sacrifices of the law, and the Greek word so implies. But now, both the law and the sacrifices of the law have ceased; and therefore the form of the altar used in the altar ought to cease with it.

5. Christ instituted the sacrament of his body and blood at his last supper at a table, and not at an altar, as it manifestly appears by the three Evangelists. And St. Paul calls coming to the holy communion, coming to the Lord's Supper. And also it is not read that any of the apostles, or the primitive church, ever used any altar in the ministration of the holy communion.

Therefore, seeing that the form of a table is more agreeable to Christ's institution, and with the usage of the apostles, and of the primitive church, than the form of an altar, the form of a table is therefore rather to be used than the form of an altar in the administration of the holy communion.

[657] A.D. 1547-1553.

6. It is said in the preface to the Book of Common Prayer, that if any doubt arises in the use and practicing of that book; to appease all such diversity, the matter shall be referred to the bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same, so that the same order is not contrary to anything contained in that book.

After these letters and reasons were received, Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London, held his visitation in which, among other injunctions, the bishop exhorted those churches in his diocese, where the altars then remained, to conform themselves to those other churches which had taken them down, and had set up in place of the multitude of their altars, one decent table in every church.

There arose a great diversity about the form of the Lord's board, some using it in the form of a table, and some of an altar. When the bishop was required to determine what was most fitting in this, he declared he could do no less of his bounden duty, to appease such diversity, and to procure one godly uniformity, than to exhort his entire diocese to that which he thought best agreed with Scripture, with the usage of the apostles, and with the primitive church. And also, to that which is not only not contrary to anything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, but also that might highly further the king's most godly proceedings in abolishing the vain and superstitious opinions of the popish mass from the hearts of the simple, and to bring them to the right use of the Lord's Supper, as taught by the holy Scriptures. And so he appointed the form of a table to be used in his diocese. And in the church of St. Paul, he broke down the wall then standing by the high altar.

Correspondence between Edward and Mary

Now we will enter into those matters which happened between King Edward and his sister Mary, as seen by their following letters:

*Mary, to my Lord Protector and the rest
of the King's Majesty's Council.*

"My lord, I perceive by the letters which I lately received from you and others of the king's majesty's council, that you are all sorry to find so little conformity in me regarding the observation of his majesty's laws. I am well assured that I have offended no law, unless it is a recent law of your own making, for altering matters in religion, which in my conscience is not worthy to have the name of a law, both for the king's honor sake, the welfare of the realm, and giving an occasion for an evil report throughout Christendom — besides the partiality used in it, and (as my conscience is very well persuaded) the offending of God, which surpasses all the rest. But I am well assured that the king's father's laws were all allowed and consented to without compulsion by the whole realm, both spiritual and temporal, and all you executors were sworn upon a book to fulfill the same, so that it was an authorized law. And I have obeyed that, and will do so with the grace of God, till the king's majesty, my brother, has sufficient years to be a judge in these matters himself. In this, my lord, I was plain with you when I was last at the court, and declared to you at that time I would stand to, and I now assure you all, that the only occasion of my stay from altering my opinion, is for two causes.

"One is principally for my conscience' sake; the other, that the king, my brother, will not hereafter charge me with being one of those who were agreeable to such alterations in his tender years. And what fruits daily grow by such changes, since the death of the king, my father, it well appears to every indifferent (unbiased) person, both to the displeasure of God, and the unquietness of the realm.

"Notwithstanding, I assure you all, I would be as loath to see his highness take hurt, or that any evil should come to his realm, as the best of you all. And none of you have the same cause, considering how I am compelled by nature, being his majesty's poor and humble sister, most tenderly to love and pray for him, and for his realm (being born within it), and wish all health and prosperity to God's honor.

"And if any judge the contrary of me for my opinion's sake, as I trust none does, I do not doubt in the end, with God's help, to prove myself as true a natural and humble sister, as those of the contrary opinion, with all their devices and altering of laws, will prove themselves true subjects. I am praying you, my lord, and the rest of the council, to trouble and unquiet me no more with matters touching my conscience, in which I am at a full point, with God's help, whatever happens to me, intending, with His grace, to trouble you little with any worldly suits, but to bestow the short time I think to live, in quietness. And I pray for the king's majesty, and

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

all of you, heartily wishing that your proceedings may be to God's honor, the safeguard of the king's person, and quietness to the realm.

"Moreover, where your desire is that I would send my controller and Doctor Hopton to you, by whom you would signify your minds more amply to my content and honor — it is not unknown to you all, that the chief charge of my house rests only upon the labors of my controller. He has not been absent from my house three whole days since setting it up, unless it were for my letters patent. So that if it were not for his continual diligence, I think my little portion would not have stretched so far. And my chaplain, by occasion of sickness, has been long absent, and is not yet able to ride.

"Therefore, as I cannot forbear my controller, and my priest is not able to journey, so I will desire you, my lord, and all the rest of the council, that having anything to be declared to me, except on matters of religion, you will either write your minds, or send some trusty person with whom I will be contented to talk, and answer as the case requires. I assure you that if any servant of mine, either man or woman, or chaplain, should move me to the contrary of my conscience, I would not give ear to them, nor suffer the like to be used within my house. And thus, my lord, with my hearty commendations, I wish to you and the rest, as well to do as myself.

"From my house at Kenning Hall, the 22nd of June 1549.
"Your assured friend to my power, "Mary."

To this letter the council replied, giving instructions to Doctor Hopton, who would himself inform the princess of the mind of the council, after which the king wrote to her as follows:

The King's Letter to the Lady Mary
24th of January 1550.

"Right dear, etc. We have seen by letters of our council, sent to you of late, and by your answer regarding your chaplains having offended our laws in saying mass, the good and convenient advices of our council, and your fruitless and indirect mistaking of the same. This moves us to write at this time, that where good counsel from our council has not prevailed, yet the same from ourself may have due regard. The whole matter we perceive rests in this: that you — being our next sister, in whom above all others of our subjects, nature should place the most estimation of us — would wittingly and purposely, not only break our laws yourself, but also have others maintained to do the same. Truly, however, the matter may have other terms, but other sense it has not. And although by your letter it seems you challenge a promise made to you, that you may do so, yet surely we know the promise had no such meaning, either to maintain, or to continue your fault. You must know this, sister, that you were borne with at first, when the law was made — not that you should disobey the law, but that by our lenity and love you might learn to obey it. We made a distinction between you and our other subjects, not that all others should follow our laws, and you alone oppose them, but that you might be brought as far by love, as others were by duty. The error in which you rest is double, and it is so great, that neither for the love of God can we suffer it unredressed, nor for the love of you can we but wish it amended.

[658]

"First, you retain a fashion in honoring of God, who indeed is thereby dishonored, and you err in zeal for lack of knowledge. And having knowledge offered to you, you refuse it, not because it is knowledge, we trust (for then we might despair of you), but because you think it is not knowledge. And surely in this we can best reprehend you, because we learn daily in our school, that we may therefore learn things, because we do not know them, and we are not allowed to say we do not know those things, or we think they are not good, and therefore we will not learn

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

them. Sister, you must think nothing can commend you more than reason, according to which you have used up to now; and now for very love we will, ourself, offer you reason. If you are persuaded in conscience contrary to our laws, you or your persuaders will freely be allowed to say what you or they can, so that you will hear what will be said in response.

“In this point you see I set aside my estate, and talk with you as your brother, rather than your supreme lord and king. Thus should you — being as well content to hear of your opinions as you are content to hold them — in the end thank us as much for bringing you to light, as now you are loath to see it, before you learn. And if this much reason, with our natural love, will not move you, for which we would be sorry, then we must consider the other part of your fault, which is the offence of our laws. For though up to it has been suffered in hope of amendment, yet now, if there is no hope, why should there be sufferance? Our charge is to have the same care over every man’s estate, that every man ought to have over his own. And in your own house, just as you would be loath to openly suffer one of your, servants, being next you, to most manifestly break your orders, so you must think in our state it shall miscontent us to permit you, who are so great a subject, not to keep our laws. Your nearness to us in blood, your greatness in estate, the condition of this time, makes your fault the greater. The example is unnatural, that our sister should do less for us than our other subjects. The cause is slanderous for so great a personage as yourself to forsake our majesty.

“Finally, it is too dangerous in a troublesome commonwealth, to make the people mistrust a faction. We are young, you think, in years to consider this. Truly sister, it troubles us more; for it may be that this evil suffered in you is greater than we can discern. And so we are as much troubled because we doubt whether we see the whole peril, as we do for what we see. Indeed we will presume no further than our years gives us; that is, in doubtful things, not to trust our own judgment. But in evident things we think there is no difference. If you should not do as other subjects do, would it not be evident that you would not be a good subject? Were it not plain in that case, that you would not treat us as your sovereign lord? Again, if you were suffered to manifestly break our laws, would it not be a covert for others to do so? And if our law is broken, and despised, where is our estate? These things are so plain, that we could almost have judged them six years past. Indeed, it grieves us not a little, that you, who should be our greatest comfort in our young years, should alone give us occasion for discomfort. Do you not think that it must trouble us? And if you can think so, you should amend it, sister. Without doubt, our natural love towards you is great, and therefore do not diminish it yourself. If you would be loved by us, show some token of love towards us, that we do not say with the Psalm, “They rendered me evil for good.” If you would be believed, when by writing you confess us to be your sovereign lord, then hear what in other things is often alleged. “Show me your faith by your works.”

“In the answer of your letter to our council, we remember you hold only upon one reason, divided into two parts. The first is that in matters of religion, your faith is no other than what all Christendom confesses. The next is that you will assent to no alteration, but wish things to stand as they did at our father’s death. If you mean in the first to rule your faith by that which you call *Christendom*, and not by this Church of England, in which you are a member, then you err in many points, such as our father would not have suffered, whatever you may say about things standing still as they were left by him. The matter is too plain to write what may be gathered, and too perilous to be concluded against you. For the other part, if you like no alteration by our authority, of things that were not altered by our father, then you do us too great an injury. We take ourself, for the administration of this our commonwealth, to have the same authority which our father had, diminished in no part, neither by example of Scripture, nor by universal laws. The histories in Scripture are plenteous, which show us that almost the best ordered church of the Israelites was led by kings younger than we are. Well, sister, we will not in these things interpret your writings for the worst; love and charity will expound them.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

But yet you must not be bold to offend in that to which you see your writings might be twisted. To conclude, we exhort you to do your duty. And if there is any impediment, not of purpose, you will find a brotherly affection in us to remedy the same. We will give orders to teach and instruct you, and so procure you to do your duty willingly, so that you will perceive you are not used merely as a subject, and only commanded — but as a daughter, a scholar, and a sister, who is taught, instructed, and persuaded. For this reason, when you have considered this letter of ours, we pray that we may shortly hear from you.”

The Lady Mary's Answer to the King.

“My duty most humbly remembered to your majesty, please understand that I have received your letters by Master Throgmorton, the bearer. The contents of it trouble me more than any bodily sickness, even if it were to the death; and rather for your highness charging me to be both a breaker of your laws, and also an encourager of others to do the same. I most humbly beseech your majesty to think that I never intended towards you otherwise than my duty compels me to; that is, to wish your highness all honor and prosperity, for which I do and daily shall pray. And where it pleases your majesty to write that I claim a promise made otherwise than it was meant, the truth is, the promise could not be denied before your majesty's presence, at my last waiting upon you. And although, I confess, the ground of faith (to which I take reason to be but a handmaid) and my conscience also has and does agree with the same. Yet touching that promise, for so much as it has pleased your majesty (God knows by whose persuasion) to write, it was not so meant. I most humbly desire your highness to examine the truth of it indifferently, and either your majesty's ambassador, now with the emperor, will inquire about the same, if it is your pleasure to have him bring it up, or else to cause it to be demanded of the emperor's ambassador here, even if he were not within this realm at that time.

“And thereby it will appear that I have not offended your majesty in this point, if it may please you to so accept it. And even though your majesty at these years (God be praised) has as much understanding and more, than is commonly seen in that age, yet considering you hear but one side (your highness not offended) I would be a suiter to the same, so that till you were grown to more mature years, it might stand with your pleasure to stay in matters regarding the soul. So undoubtedly your majesty should know more, and hear others, and nevertheless be at your liberty and do your will and pleasure. And whatever your majesty has conceived of me, either by letters to your council, or by their report, I trust in the end to prove myself as true to you, as any subject within your realm. And I will by no means stand in argument with your majesty, but in a most humble way beseech you, even for God's sake, to suffer me, as your highness has done up to now. It is for no worldly respect that I desire it, God is my judge; but rather than to offend my conscience, I would desire of God to lose all that I have, and also my life. Nevertheless, I live and die your humble sister and true subject.

[659] A.D. 1547-1553.

“Thus, after pardon craved of your majesty, for my rude and bold writing, I beseech Almighty God to preserve you in honor with as long continuance of health and life, as any noble king ever had.

“From Beaulien, the 3rd of February.
“Your majesty's most humble and
“unworthy sister, Mary.”

After many other letters from the council to the princess Mary, and from her in reply, and also to his majesty, the king wrote the following:

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

The King's Letter to the Lady Mary.

“Right dearly and right entirely beloved sister, we greet you well, and let you know that it grieves us much to perceive no amendment in you, of that which we, for God's cause, your soul's health, our conscience, and the common tranquility of our realm, have so long desired. We assure you that our sufferance has much more demonstration of natural love, than contentment of our conscience, and foresight of our safety. Therefore, although you give us occasion, almost as much as it is in you, to diminish our natural love, yet we are loath to feel it decay, and do not mean to be so careless of you as we are provoked to be.

“And therefore meaning your welfare, and joining with it a care not to be found guilty in our conscience to God, having cause to require forgiveness that we have so long, from respect of love toward you, omitted our bounden duty, we send at this present time our right trusty and right well-beloved councillor, the lord Rich, chancellor of England, and our trusty and right well beloved councilors, Sir Anthony Wingfield, knight, controller of our household; and Sir William Paget, knight, one of our principal secretaries, with a message to you, regarding the order of your house, willing you to give them firm credit in those matters they will say to you from us, and do there, in our name.

“Given under our signet, at our castle of Windsor,
the 24th day of August, in the first year of our reign.”

A Copy of the King's Instructions, given to the said Lord Chancellor, Sir Anthony Wingfield, and Sir William Paget, knights, etc., the 24th of August 1551.

“You, the said lord chancellor and your colleagues, shall immediately repair to the lady Mary, giving to her his majesty's hearty commendations, and show the reason for your coming is as follows:

“Although his majesty has a long time, by his majesty's own mouth and writing, as well as by his council, endeavored that the lady being his sister, and a principal subject and member of his realm, should both be indeed, and also show herself conformable to the laws and ordinances of the realm, in the profession and rites of religion, using all gentle means of exhortation and advice that the reformation of the fault might willingly come of herself, as was the expectation and desire of his majesty, and all good and wise men. Yet notwithstanding, his majesty sees that up to now, no manner of amendment has followed. But by the continuance of the error, and manifest breach of his laws, no small peril may happen to the state of his realm. The sufferance of such a fault being directly to the dishonor of God, and the great offense of his majesty's conscience, and also that of all other good men. Therefore of late, even with the consent and advice of the whole state of his privy council, and diverse others of the nobility of his realm, whose names you may repeat if you think it convenient, his majesty resolutely determined it just, necessary, and expedient, that her grace should not in any way use or maintain the private mass, or any other manner of service, than that which is authorized and allowed by the law of the realm. And to signify his majesty's determination to her grace, it was thought in respect of a favorable proceeding with herself, to have the same not only to be manifested by her own officers and servants, being most esteemed with her, but also to be executed with them in her house, for the quiet proceeding in the very matter, as well as less molesting her grace with any message by strangers, in that time of her solitariness in which her grace was then, because of the recent sickness.

“For this purpose, her three servants — Rochester, Englefield, and Waldgrave — were sent in message in the following manner. First, to deliver his majesty's letter to her; next to discharge the complaints about saying mass; and prohibiting the entire household from hearing any. In

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

this, the king's majesty perceives from their own report upon being returned to the court, how negligently, and indeed how falsely they have executed their commandment and charge, contrary to the duty of good subjects, and to the manifest contempt of his majesty. It went so far that, before his majesty's council, they have refused to do that which pertains to every true faithful subject, so far to the offense of his majesty, and derogation of his authority, that their punishment could in no way be forborne. Yet in the manner of their punishment, his majesty and his council has such consideration and respect for her person, being his sister, that without doubt his majesty could not with honor have had the like consideration or favor in the punishment of the dearest councillor he has, if any of them had so offended. Therefore his majesty has sent you the three, not only to declare to her grace the causes of his recently sending his officers in message there, but also the causes of their absence now presently.

"And further, in the default of the officers to order her chaplains, as well as her whole household, that his majesty's laws may be observed there. And in the communication with her, you will take occasion to answer in his majesty's name certain points of her letter recently sent to his majesty. The copy of this letter is now also sent to you to peruse, for your better instruction how to proceed in this. First, her allegation of the promise made to the emperor must be so answered as the truth of the matter serves, of which every one of you have often heard sufficient testimony in the council. For offering her body at the king's will, rather than change her conscience, it grieves his majesty much that her conscience is so settled in error, and yet no such thing is meant by his majesty, nor by any of his council, to once hurt or will evil to her body; but even to the bottom of their hearts, they wish for her a sound mind in a sound body. And therefore you will do well to persuade her grace, that this proceeding comes only of the conscience. The king has to avoid offense to God, and from necessary counsel and wisdom, to see his laws executed in such weighty causes. Also, because it is thought that Rochester had the care and consideration of her grace's provision of her household, and by his absence that household might be disordered or disfurnished; his majesty has sent a trusty skillful man of his own household, to serve her grace for the time being. He is also sufficiently instructed by Rochester about the state of things in her household. And if there is anything lacking in the same, his majesty's pleasure is, that his servant will advertise his own chief officers of his household, to the intent that the same may be supplied from any store here, or otherwise conveniently helped, so that her grace will not lack.

"Having thus proceeded with her grace, for the declaration of the causes of your coming, you shall then cause to be called before you the chaplains, and all the rest of the household there present, and in the king's majesty's name most straitly forbid the chaplains either to say or use any mass or kind of service other than authorized by the law. And likewise you shall forbid all the rest of the company to be present at any such prohibited service, upon pain of being most severely punished, as deservedly falling into the danger of the king's indignation, and charge them all alike, that if any such offense is openly or secretly committed, they shall notify some of his majesty's council. In that case, you shall use the reasons of their natural duty and allegiance that they owe as subjects to their sovereign lord, which derogates all other earthly duties.

"Also, if you find any of the priests, or any other person disobedient to this order, then you shall commit them directly to prison, as you think convenient.

[660]

"Also, because you were privy to the determination at Richmond, and there understood how necessary it was to have reformation in this, his majesty upon the great confidence he has in your wisdom and uprightness, remits to your discretion the manner of proceeding in this. And if anything chances to arise there otherwise than according to these instructions, then to assist

you in the execution of your charge, our instructions in sum are to avoid the use of the private mass, and other unlawful service in the house of the lady Mary.

“Also, you shall devise by some means as you think fit, to understand after your departure, how the order you give is observed, and as you judge fit, to certify the same to me.”

An Account of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.

The first imprisonment of Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, was before the deprivation of bishop Bonner. Yet because he was not deposed from his bishopric till the next or 2nd year after (A.D. 1551), I have therefore put off his history to this present place.

When the king’s injunctions for a visitation of the whole realm were sent out, this bishop displayed a spirit of neglect and disobedience; and in his sermons warned the people against the preachers of the gospel, and generally against the king’s proceedings. Having disobeyed the king’s injunctions, he was sent to the Fleet, and there so he misconducted himself, and also before the council, that he was committed to the Tower.

Certain of the council, by the king’s appointment — the duke of Somerset, the lord treasurer, the lord privy seal, the lord great chamberlain, and Master Secretary Petre — many times had access to him in the Tower to persuade him. Repairing to him on the 10th of June 1550, he desired to see the king’s book of proceedings. Upon the sight of it, he would give a full answer, seeming to be willing to conform himself in all things to the king’s proceedings, and promising that in case anything offended his conscience, he would open it to none but the council. Upon which it was agreed that the book would be sent to him to see his answer, that his case might be resolved, and that he would have the liberty of the gallery and garden in the Tower when the duke of Norfolk was absent.

The answer of the bishop being received, through the report of the lords who had been with him, declaration was made the 8th of July 1550, that his answers were doubtful. Therefore it was determined that he should be directly examined, to determine whether he would sincerely conform himself to the king’s proceedings or not.

The following articles were therefore sent to him for his subscription as a proof of his conformity.

“Whereas I, Stephen, bishop of Winchester, having been suspected as one too much favoring the bishop of Rome’s authority, decrees, and ordinances, and as one who did not approve or allow the king’s majesty’s proceedings in alteration of certain rites in religion, was summoned before the king’s highness’s council, and admonished for it; and having certain things appointed for me to do and preach for my declaration, I have not done that as I ought to do, although I promised to do it. By this I have not only incurred the king’s majesty’s indignation, but also diverse of his highness’s subjects have, by my example, taken encouragement (as his grace’s council is certainly informed) to complain at his majesty’s most godly proceedings. I am right sorry therefore, and acknowledge I have been deservedly punished, and most heartily thank his majesty, that of his great clemency it has pleased his highness to deal with me, not according to rigor, but mercy. And to the intent that it may appear to the world how little I complain at his highness’s doings, which are most godly in religion, and most profitable to the commonwealth, I affirm and say freely of my own will, without any compulsion, as ensues:

“1. That by the law of God, and the authority of the Scriptures, the king’s majesty, and his successors, are the supreme heads of the churches of England and of Ireland.

“2. That the appointing of holy-days and fasting days; as Lent, Ember days, or any such like, or to dispense with them, is in the king’s majesty’s authority and power: and his highness as

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

supreme head of the churches of England and Ireland, and governor of them, may appoint the manner and time of the holydays and fasting days, or dispense with them, as seems most convenient to his wisdom, for the honor of God and the wealth of this realm.

“3. That the king’s majesty has most Christianly and godly set forth, by and with the consent of the whole parliament, a devout and Christian book of service of the church, to be used by the church, this book is to be accepted and allowed by all bishops, pastors, curates, and all ministers ecclesiastical of the realm of England, and so to be declared and commended by him in all places where he happens to preach or speak of it to the people, that it is a godly and Christian book and order, and is to be allowed, accepted, and observed by all the king’s majesty’s true subjects.

“4. I acknowledge the king’s majesty now is (whose life God long preserve), my sovereign lord and supreme head, under Christ, to me as a bishop of this real, and natural subject to his majesty, and now in his young and tender age, is my full and entire king; and that I and all other of his highness’s subjects are bound to obey all his majesty’s proclamations, statutes, laws, and commandments that are made, promulgated, and set forth in his highness’s young age, as though his highness were at present thirty or forty years old.

“5. I confess and acknowledge, that the statute commonly called the Statute of the Six Articles, on just causes and grounds, is repealed and disannulled by authority of parliament.

“6. That his majesty and his successors have authority in the churches of England, and also of Ireland, to alter, reform, correct, and amend all errors and abuses, and all rites and ceremonies ecclesiastical, as seems from time to time to his highness and his successors, most convenient for the edification of his people, so that the same alteration is not contrary or repugnant to the Scriptures and law of God.

“Subscribed by STEPHEN WINCHESTER,
with the testimonial hands of the council to the same.

Although Winchester subscribed to these articles with his own hand, granting the supremacy of the king, yet because he stuck so much in the first point regarding his submission, and would in no case subscribe, but only made his answer in the margin, it was therefore thought good that the master of the horse, and Master Secretary Petre should repair to him again, exhorting him to look better upon it; and at the same time, his subscription or answers were required to the following articles:

*Copy of the last Articles sent to Stephen Gardiner,
the Bishop of Winchester.*

“Whereas I, Stephen, bishop of Winchester, have been suspected as one who did not approve or allow the king’s majesty’s proceedings in alteration of certain rites in religion, and was convented before the king’s highness’s council, and admonished by it, and having certain things appointed for me to do and preach for my declaration, have not done in this as I ought to do, whereby I have deserved his majesty’s displeasure; I am right sorry therefore. And to the intent that it may appear to the world how little I complain at his highness’s doings, which are most godly in religion, and most profitable to the commonwealth, I affirm as follows:

[661] A.D. 1547-1553.

“1. That the late king, of most famous memory, king Henry VIII, our late sovereign lord, justly and for good reason and ground has taken away, and caused to be suppressed and defaced, all monasteries and religious houses, and all conventicles and convents of monks, friars, nuns, canons, fellows, and other persons called religious, and that the same being so dissolved, the persons who are bound and professed to obedience to a person, place, habit, and other

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

superstitious rites and ceremonies, upon that dissolution and order appointed by the king's majesty's authority as supreme head of the church, are clearly released and acquitted of those vows and professions, and at their full liberty, as though those unwitty and superstitious vows had never been made.

"2. That any person may lawfully marry, without any dispensation from the bishop of Rome, or any other man, with any person whom it is not prohibited to contract matrimony with, by the Levitical law.

"3. That vowing and going on pilgrimage to images, or the bones or relics of any saints, has been superstitiously used, and the cause of much wickedness and idolatry, and therefore have been justly abolished by the late king, and the images and relics so abused have been (great and godly considerations) defaced and destroyed.

"4. That the counterfeiting of St. Nicholas, St. Clement, St. Catharine, and St. Edmund, by children previously brought into the church, was a mere mockery and foolishness, and therefore was justly abolished and taken away.

"5. It is convenient and godly that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, that is, the whole Bible, are had in English and published, to be read by every man, and that whoever repels and discourages men from reading from them, does evil.

"6. That the said late king, on just ground and reason, received into his hands the authority and disposition of chantries, and such livings as were given for the maintenance of private masses, and well changed various of them to other uses.

"7. The king's majesty that now is, by the advice and consent of the parliament, upon just ground and reason, suppressed, abolished, and took away the said chantries, and such other livings as were used and occupied for maintenance of private masses, and masses satisfactory for the souls of those who are dead, or finding *obits*,⁶ lights, or other similar things. The mass that was usually said by priests was full of abuses, and had very few things of Christ's institution, besides the epistle, gospel, the Lord's prayer, and the words of the Lord's supper. The rest, for the most part, were invented and devised by bishops of Rome, and by other men of the same sort, and therefore justly taken away by the statutes and laws of this realm; and the communion which replaced them, is very godly, and agreeable to the Scriptures.

"8. That it is most convenient and fit, and according to the first institution, that all Christian men should receive the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ in both the kinds, that is, in bread and wine.

"9. And the mass, in which only the priest receives and others but look on, is but the invention of man, and the ordinance of the bishop of Rome's church, but not agreeable to the Scriptures.

"10. That upon good and godly considerations, it is ordered in the said book and order, that the sacrament should not be lifted up, and shown to the people to be adored, but is to be received with godly devotion, as it was when first instituted.

"11 That it is well, politically, and godly done, that the king's majesty by act of parliament, has commanded all images which have stood in churches and chapels, to be abolished and defaced, lest at any time hereafter they might give occasion for idolatry, or be abused, as many of them have previously been, with pilgrimages and such idolatrous worshipping.

12. That by the same authority of parliament, all massbooks, and other books of the service in Latin, previously used, should be abolished and defaced, for certain superstitions contained in

⁶ *Obits* (or *obiits*) were annual commemorative services in the Middle Ages, often associated with an endowed mass, held on the anniversary of a person's death to pray for their soul.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

them, as well as to avoid dissension: And that the said service in the church should be in one uniform conformity throughout the realm, and on no occasion to the contrary through those old books.

“13. That bishops, priests, and deacons, have no commandment from the law of God, either to vow chastity, or to abstain continually from marriage.

“14. That all canons, constitutions, positive laws, and ordinances of man, which prohibit or forbid marriage to any bishop, priest, or deacon, are justly, and upon godly grounds and considerations, taken away and abolished by authority of parliament.

“15. The homilies recently commanded and set forth by the king’s majesty, to be read in the congregation of England, are godly and wholesome, and teach such doctrine as ought to be embraced by all men.

“16. The book set forth by the king’s majesty, by authority of parliament, containing the form and manner of making and consecrating archbishops, bishops, priests, and deacons, is godly, and in no point contrary to the wholesome doctrine of the gospel, and therefore ought to be received and approved of by all the faithful members of the church of England, and especially the ministers of God’s word, and commended by them to the people.

“17. That the orders of sub-deacon, Benet and Colet, and such others as were commonly called *minores ordines*, are not necessary by the word of God to be reckoned in the church, and are justly left out in the said book of orders.

“18. That the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, and that nothing is to be taught as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which may be concluded and proved by the holy Scriptures.

“19. That upon good and godly considerations it was and is commanded by the king’s majesty’s injunctions, that the paraphrases of Erasmus in English, should be set up in some convenient place in every parish church of this realm, so that the parishioners may most conveniently resort to read the same.

“20. And because these articles aforesaid, contain only such matters as are already published and openly set forth by the king’s majesty’s authority, by the advice of his highness’ council, for many great and godly considerations — and among others, for the common tranquility and unity of the realm — his majesty’s pleasure, by the advice aforesaid, is that you the bishop of Winchester, shall not only affirm these articles with subscription of your hand, but also declare and profess yourself well contented, willing, and ready to publish and preach the same at such times and places, and before such audience, as from time to time shall seem convenient and requisite to his majesty, upon pain of incurring such penalties and punishments by his majesty’s laws, as may be inflicted upon you for not doing the same.

“These articles were sent to him on the 15th of July.

The bishop of Winchester receiving and perusing these articles, made this reply: that first regarding the article of submission, he would in no way consent, affirming, as he had done before, that he had never offended the king’s majesty in any such way as might give him cause thus to submit ‘himself; praying earnestly to be brought to his trial, in which he refused the king’s mercy, and desired nothing but justice. And for the rest of the articles, he answered that after he was past his trial on the first point, and was at liberty, then it should appear what he would do — it not being reasonable, as he said, that he should subscribe them in prison.

When the king and his council had intelligence of his answer, it was agreed that he should be sent for before the whole council, and peremptorily required to subscribe the articles which had been sent to him. This the bishop refused to do.

[662]

Upon this, the fruits of his bishopric were sequestered, and he was required to conform himself to their orders, within three months, upon pain of deprivation.

After this sequestration, the bishop was brought to Lambeth before the king's commissioners, namely, the archbishop of Canterbury; Nicholas, bishop of London, Thomas, bishop of Ely; Henry, bishop of Lincoln; Secretary Petre, judge; Sir James Hales, knight; Dr. Leyton and Dr. Oliver, lawyers; and John Gosnold, esquire, etc., to be examined by them on nineteen articles which were objected against him, charging him with direct disobedience to the royal injunctions.

After the articles were exhibited to him, and he had leave to answer, he used all the wary shifts and remedies of the law, by way of protesting, recusing, and excepting against the commission, and also requiring of the actuaries, the copies both of the articles and of his protestation. Indeed, he so cavilled and dallied from day to day to answer directly, that at last he appealed from them to the king's royal person, reputing them not to be competent and impartial judges to hear and determine his cause. In the end, the commissioners proceeded to the sentence definitive against him, deposing him from all the rights and emoluments of the see of Winchester.

This sentence being given, the bishop of Winchester excepted against it as unjust, and of no effect in law, and then and there, immediately after the pronouncing of the sentence, by word of mouth, appealed to the king's royal majesty.

And here we leave Winchester for a while, till we come to treat his later death later on. As we number some among good lawyers, so he is to be reckoned among ignorant and bad divines, proud prelates, and bloody persecutors, as it may appear both by his cruel life and his pharisaical doctrine.

The History of Edward Seymour, Lord Protector

*The Tragic History of the worthy
Lord Edward, Duke of Somerset, Lord Protector.*

After having recorded so many troublesome matters, we come now to the lamentable and tragic history of the lord Edward, duke of Somerset, the king's uncle, and protector of his person, and of his realm. We purpose to relate in order, the origin and whole occasion, even from the beginning.

King Edward, after both his father and mother were dead, had three uncles on his mother's side: Edward, Thomas, and Henry Seymour. Of the two first, one was made protector of the realm, and the other high admiral. These two, so long as they were joined together in amity and concord, they preserved both themselves, the king their nephew, and the whole commonwealth, from the violence and fear of all danger. But the subtle old serpent, always envying man's felicity, through slanderous tongues, sought to sow discord between them; then suspicion; and last of all extreme hatred — so that the protector suffered his brother to be condemned, and to lose his head. By this it came to pass, by God's judgment upon him, or because, after the death of his brother and the king (Edward being still young and tender of age, he was less able to shift for himself) that not long after, he was overthrown by his

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

enemies, and imprisoned in the Tower. And at last he lost his head also, to the great lamentation of many good men.

For a better introduction of this history, we will begin with the brother of the lord protector. Sir Thomas Seymour, high admiral of England, who had married Queen Catharine Parr, late wife to king Henry VIII. Now it happened (on what occasion I do not know) that a dispute took place between the queen and the duchess of Somerset, and then also, on behalf of their wives, displeasure began between the brothers. Although it was appeased for a time through the persuasion of friends, yet a short time later it broke out again, both to the trouble of the realm, and especially to the confusion of themselves. First, it was laid to the lord admiral's charge, that he purposed to destroy the young king, and to transfer the crown to himself. Being attainted and condemned, he suffered at Tower-hill on the 20th of March 1549. Just as there were many who reported that the duchess of Somerset had wrought his death, so there were many who thought and affirmed that the fall of one brother would be the ruin of the other.

It was not long after the beheading of the lord admiral, that insurrections began in diverse quarters of the realm. By their occasion, the lord Russel, lord privy seal, was sent to the Western parts, and the lord Dudley, earl of Warwick, was sent with an army into Norfolk; where both he and a great number of gentlemen who were with him, meeting with the rebels, were in great danger. Notwithstanding, in the end the rebels were overthrown, which was about the beginning of September 1549. After this victory, in the month following, at the return of the earl of Warwick, there was great working and consultation among the lords. They assembled themselves in the house of Mr. York, and at Baynard's Castle, and in the lord mayor's house at London, against the lord protector, who then remained with the king at Hampton Court. The lord protector writes thus about this business and trouble, in his letters to the lord Russel in the West country:

*A Letter of the Lord Protector, to the Lord Russel,
Lord Privy Seal, concerning troubles working against him.*

“After our right hearty commendations to your good lordship, here has risen of late such a conspiracy against the king's majesty and us, as never has been seen, which they cannot maintain but with such vain letters and false tales surmised, as was never meant nor intended by us. They pretend and say that we have sold Boulogne to the French, and that we withhold wages from the soldiers, and they spread other such tales and letters abroad (of which, if any one thing is true, we would not wish to live). The matter now being brought to a marvellous extremity, such as we would never have thought it could have come to, especially from those men towards the king's majesty and us, of whom we have deserved no such thing, but rather much favor and love. But the case being as it is, this is to require and pray you to hasten here to the defense of the king's majesty, with such force and power as you may, to show the part of a true gentleman, and of a sincere friend. This thing we trust God will reward, and the king's majesty in time to come, and we will never be unmindful of it too. We are sure you will have other letters from them; but as you tender your duty to the king's majesty, we require you not to hesitate, but to immediately repair with such force as you have, to his highness's Castle of Windsor, and cause the rest of whatever force you may command, to follow you. And so we bid you farewell right heartily.

“From Hampton Court, the 6th of October.

“Your Lordship's assured loving friend,

“Edward Somerset.”

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

To this letter of the lord protector, sent the 6th of October, the lord Russel replying on the 8th, first laments the heavy dissension between the nobility and him, which he takes for such a plague, as a greater could not be sent by Almighty God upon this realm. He said it was the next way “to make us conquerors, slaves, and likely to induce on the whole realm a universal calamity and thralldom, unless the merciful goodness of the Lord helps, and in some way order is taken in staying these great extremities.” As to the duke’s request in his letters, since the lord Russel heard beforehand of this broil of the lords, and fearing lest some conspiracy had been meant against the king’s person, he hastened forward with such force as he could command for the safety of the king.

But now to return to the matter of the lords who, together with the earl of Warwick, were assembled at London against the lord protector. When the king with his council at Hampton Court heard of this, secretary Petre was sent to them, with the king’s message. But the lords detained him with them, making no reply to the message.

[663]

Then the lord protector wrote to them as follows:

“My lords, we commend us most heartily to you; and whereas the king’s majesty was informed that you were assembled in such a way as you now remain, and was advised by us and such others of his council as were then about his person, to send Master Secretary Petre to you, with such message that thereby might have ensued the surety of his majesty’s person, with preservation of his realm and subjects, and the quiet both of us and yourselves, as Master Secretary can well declare to you. His majesty and we of his council here do not a little marvel that you detain the said Master Secretary with you, and have not granted to send a reply to his majesty, neither by him nor any other. And for ourselves, we much more marvel and are right sorry, as both we and you have good cause to be, to see the manner of your doings bent with violence, to bring the king’s majesty and us to these extremities. Now we intend, if you will take no other way but violence, to defend as nature and our allegiance binds us, to extremity of death, and to put all into God’s hand, who gives victory as it pleases him. So that, if any reasonable conditions and offers might take place (as up to now none have been signified to us from you, nor do we understand what you require or seek, or what you mean), and you seek no hurt to the king’s majesty’s person, then as regards all other private matters, to avoid the effusion of Christian blood, and to preserve the king’s majesty’s person, his realm, and his subjects, you will find us agreeable to any reasonable condition that you will require. For we esteem the king’s safety and the tranquility of the realm more than all other worldly things — indeed, more than our own life. Thus praying you to send your determinate answer to this by Master Secretary Petre, or if you will not let him go, then by this bearer. We beseech God to give both you and us grace to determine this matter, as may be to God’s honor, the preservation of the king, and the quiet of us all, which may be, if the fault is not in you. And so we bid you most heartily farewell.

From the king’s majesty’s Castle of Windsor,
the 7th of October, 1549.”

After these letters were received, with the reasonable condition of the lord protector — not much regarded by the lords, for they still persisted in their purpose — they took this advice: first, to keep themselves in the city of London, as strong as they might. And therefore calling upon the mayor and aldermen, they commanded them in any case to provide a good and substantial watch by night, and a good ward by day, for the safeguard of their city, and the ports and gates. This was consented to, and the companies of London in their turn kept watch and ward accordingly.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Then these lords and councilors demanded of the lord mayor and his brethren, 500 men to aid them to fetch the lord protector out of Windsor from the king. But the mayor answered that he could grant no aid without the assent of the common council of the city. So the next day a common council was notified. But in the meantime, the lords of the council assembled themselves at the lord mayor's house, who then was Sir Henry Amcottes, fishmonger. William Lock, a mercer, and Sir John Aileph, were sheriffs. There the council agreed and published a proclamation against the lord protector, charging him as follows:

1. That the lord protector, by his malicious and evil government, was the occasion of all the sedition that lately happened within the realm.
2. The loss of the king's pieces in France.
3. That he was ambitious and sought his own glory, as appears by building the most sumptuous and costly houses in the time of the king's wars.⁷
4. That he did not esteem the grave counsel of the councilors.
5. That he sowed division between the nobles, the gentlemen, and the commons.
6. That the nobles have assembled themselves together at London for no other purpose but to cause the protector to live within limits, and to take such order for the surety of the king's majesty as was fit, whatever the protector's doings might be; which they said were unnatural, ungrateful, and traitorous.
7. That the protector slandered the council to the king, and did whatever lay in him, to cause variance between the king and the nobles.
8. That he was a great traitor, and therefore the lords desired the city and commons to aid them, to take him from the king.

In witness and testimony of the contents of the proclamation, the lords subscribed their names.

After the proclamation, the lords, or most of them, continuing in London, came the next day to the Guildhall. This was during the time that the Lord Mayor and his brethren sat in their court or inner chamber, and communed a long while with the mayor. At last the mayor and his brethren came out to the common council, where he read the king's letter sent to the mayor and citizens, commanding them to aid him with a thousand well-appointed men out of their city, and to send them with all speed to his castle at Windsor.

This letter was directed to Sir Henry Amcottes, knight, lord mayor, to Sir Rowland Hill, knight, mayor elect, and to the aldermen and common council of the city of London. The day and date of the letter was the 6th of October, in the third year of his reign, being signed with the hand of the king, and of the lord protector.

This letter of the king and of the lord protector was not so secretly devised, nor so speedily sent, that the lords still remaining in London did not have knowledge of it immediately (by means, some suppose, of the lord Paget, who was then with the king and the protector). They were there, ready-furnished with their own bands of serving-men, and other soldiers and men-at-arms.

The lords directly addressed their letters to the said lord mayor and aldermen, also in the king's name, not only for a support of armed men to serve their purposes, and for a

⁷ The only sedition was the resistance of the Roman Catholics to the reformation of the church; the king lost no lands in France; and there were no wars other than the one with Scotland that began under Henry VIII.

sufficient watch to fortify their city, but also that they should not obey any such letters, proclamations, or injunctions sent to them from the lord Protector. These letters of the lords came to the lord mayor and his brethren, the 6th of October.

After the receipt of these two letters, the one from the king, and the other from the lords, which both came at one time, with contrary commandment to the lord mayor and citizens of London, they were perplexed as to what measures to take. On one side, the name and authority of the king was much; on the other side, the power of the lords, then lying in London, was not little, and it seemed then to be such as would have no refusal.

The case thus standing in doubt, the recorder requested that the citizens would grant their aid rather to the lords, for the protector had abused both the king's majesty and the whole realm; and that unless he were taken from the king, and made to understand his folly, this realm was in great hazard. He therefore required that the citizens would assent to aid the lords with five hundred men.

No other answer was made by a great part of the common council, but silence. The recorder (who at that time was Mr. Brook) still looked to them for an answer. At last a wise and good citizen stepped up, named George Stadow. He said —

“In this case it is good for us to think of things past, to avoid the danger of things to come. I remember, in a story written in Fabian's Chronicle, of the war between the king and his barons, which was in the time of King Henry III. And then the barons (as our lords do now) demanded aid from the mayor and city of London, and that was in a rightful cause for the commonwealth, which was for the execution of diverse good laws against the king, who would not allow those laws to be executed. The city aided them, and it came to an open battle. The lords prevailed against the king, and took the king and his son prisoners, and upon certain conditions, the lords restored the king and his son back to their liberties. Among all the other conditions was this one: that the king would not only grant his pardon to the lords, but also to the citizens of London.

[664]

“This was granted, indeed; and the same was ratified by act of parliament. But what followed? Was it forgotten? No surely; nor forgiven during the king's life. The liberties of the city were taken away, strangers appointed to be our heads and governors, the citizens given away, body and goods, and they were most miserably afflicted with one persecution or another. Such a thing is it to enter into the wrath of a prince, as Solomon says, ‘The wrath and indignation of a prince is death.’ ^{Pro 16.14} Therefore, as this aid is required by the king's majesty, whose voice we ought to hearken to (for he is our high shepherd) rather than to the lords, yet I would not wish the lords to be clearly shaken off. My counsel is, that they with us, and we with them, may join in suit, and make our most humble petition to the king's majesty, that it would please his highness to hear such complaint against the government of the lord protector, as may be justly alleged and proved. And I do not doubt that this matter will be so pacified, that neither the king nor the lords will have cause to seek further aid, nor we to offend either of them.”

After this, the commons stayed, and the lord mayor and his brethren broke up, till they had further communed with the lords. The conclusion was that the lords (on what occasion I do not know) sat the next day in council in the star-chamber. And from there they sent Sir Philip Hobby with the letter of credence to the king's majesty, beseeching and requesting his majesty to give credit to that which Sir Philip should declare to his majesty in their names. The king gave him liberty to speak, and most gently heard all that he had to say. He so handled the matter, declaring his message in the name of the lords, that in the end the lord protector was commanded from the king's presence, and shortly was committed to the ward

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

in a tower within the castle of Windsor. Soon after, Sir Thomas Smith, Mr. Whalley, Mr. Fisher, and many other gentlemen who attended upon the lord protector, were arrested. The same day, the lords of the council resorted to the king, and the next day they brought the lord protector from there, and the others who were there arrested, and conveyed them through the city of London to the Tower, and there they left them.

And thus much concerning the *first trouble* of the lord protector, duke of Somerset. Though his enemies seemed to intend no less than the spilling of his blood, yet the Lord above, the only Disposer of all men's purposes, so ordered the matter by means of the intercession of the king, that the proclamation which had made him a traitor, within three days was called back. The duke was restored to liberty, which lasted for two years and two days.

After this time, the duke of Somerset was again apprehended and committed to the Tower, and with him also Sir Michael Stanhope, Sir Ralph Vane, Sir Partridge, and others. At length, the time of his arraignment having come, the duke was brought from the Tower. He was conveyed through London with the axe of the Tower before him, and with great preparation of bills, halberds, pikes, etc. A watch was also set and appointed before every man's door through the High street of London. And thus he was brought into Westminster-hall, where the lords of the council sitting as his judges in the middle of the hall, he was arraigned and charged with both treason and felony.

I pass over the unseemly speeches, the vile taunts and spiteful rebukes used by certain of the sergeants and justices, and of some others sitting there. All of these the duke patiently and quietly suffered. And like a lamb, following the true Lamb and example of all meekness, he was content to take all things at their hands. With no less patience than he did before, with their fulsome words and flatterings in the time of his high estate and prosperity, he now bore their ungentle and cruel railings. And as the patience of this good duke was marvellous towards his enemies, so also his discretion and temperance were no less displayed in answering the articles objected to him. He replied to these, submitting himself in the end to be tried by his peers. They framed their verdict thus: "That concerning treason, with which he was charged, they discharged him; but they accounted him guilty of felony." When the people (who were present in great numbers) heard the lords say, "Not guilty" (meaning of treason) supposing that he had been entirely acquitted by these words, and especially seeing the axe of the Tower carried away, they made an outcry for great joy and gladness, declaring their loving affection and hearty favor toward the duke, whose life they greatly desired. But the people were deceived, and the innocent duke condemned to die for felony. This act of felony had been made a little earlier against the rebels and against unlawful assemblies — anyone who would seek or procure the death of any counsellor — so that every such attempt and procurement, according to the act, would be judged a felony. By virtue of this act, the duke was accused, with others, of intending and purposing the death of the duke of Northumberland and of others beside. He was condemned of felony, and sent back to the Tower.

At his passage through the city, great exclamations and outcries were made by the people, some rejoicing that he was acquitted, some bewailing that he was condemned.

He continued in the Tower till the 22nd of January. On that day, when the letter of execution came down from the king and the council, the duke and uncle to the king, not being found a traitor but only being convicted of the act of felony, was delivered to the sheriffs; and so he was brought to the place of execution.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

The order and manner of the execution have been related to us by a certain noble personage who was present there, and near to him on the scaffold, beholding all things with his eyes, and also reporting them with his pen:

“On the 22nd of January 1552, in the sixth year of Edward VI, the noble duke of Somerset, uncle to king Edward, was brought out of the Tower of London, and delivered to the sheriffs of the city. Surrounded by a great number of armed men, both of the guard and others, he was brought to the scaffold on Tower-hill. Changing neither voice nor countenance, as calmly as if at home, he knelt down, lifted up his hands, and commended himself to God.

“After he had ended a few short prayers, standing up again, and turning himself toward the east side of the scaffold, not at all abashed either with the sight of the axe, nor of the executioner, nor of present death; but with alacrity and cheerfulness of mind and countenance, as he was accustomed before to hear the causes and supplication of others, and especially the poor (towards whom, as it were, with a certain fatherly love to his children, he always showed himself most attentive) he uttered these words to the people:

“Dearly beloved friends, I am brought here to suffer death, although I never offended against the king either by word or deed, and have been always as faithful and true to this realm as any man has been. But because I am condemned by a law to die, I acknowledge myself, as well as others, to be subject to it. Therefore, to testify my obedience, which I owe to the laws, I have come here to suffer death. I willingly offer myself to this, with most hearty thanks to God, that he has given me this time of repentance. Through sudden death, he might have taken away my life, so that I would neither have acknowledged him, nor myself.

“Moreover, dearly beloved friends, there is still something that I must put you in mind of, regarding the Christian religion which, so long as I was in authority, I always diligently set forth and furthered to my power. Nor do I repent of my doings, but rejoice in them, since now the state of the Christian religion comes much nearer to the form and order of the primitive church. This thing I esteem as a great benefit given by God both to you and me. I most heartily exhort you all, that this which is most purely presented to you, you will accept and embrace with like thankfulness, and display the same in your living. If you do not do this thing, then without doubt greater mischief and calamity will follow.’

[665] AD. 1547-1553.

“When he had spoken these words, suddenly there was a terrible noise; and a great fear came upon all men. This noise was as if it had been the noise of some great storm; as if a great deal of gunpowder enclosed in a magazine had exploded. To others it seemed as if it had been a great multitude of horsemen running together, or coming upon them. So great was the noise in the ears of all men, even though they saw nothing, that all the people were amazed without any evident cause. Men were seen running away, some into the ditches and puddles, and some into the houses. Others being afraid of the horror and noise, fell down grovelling to the ground, with their pole-axes and halberds. Most of them cried out, ‘Jesus save us, Jesus save us! Those who stood still did not know where they were. And I myself, who was present there among the rest, also being afraid in this confusion, stood still altogether amazed, expecting that someone would knock me on the head.

“In the meantime, the people by chance spied Sir Anthony Brown riding under the scaffold. This was the occasion of a new noise. For when they saw him coming, they conjectured that which was not true — but notwithstanding, that which they all wished for — that the king, by that messenger, had sent his uncle pardon. And therefore with great rejoicing and throwing their caps up, they cried out, ‘Pardon, pardon has come; God save the king! Thus this good duke, although he was destitute of man’s help, yet he saw, before his departure, what great

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

love and favor he had with all men. And truly I do not think that in so many deaths of dukes as have been in England these past few years, there were so many weeping at one time; and not without cause. For all men saw in the fall of this duke, the public ruin of England.

“But now to return. The duke standing still in the same place, modestly, and with a grave countenance, made a sign to the people with his hand, that they would keep quiet. This being done, and silence obtained, he spoke to them in this manner:

“Dearly beloved friends, there is no such matter here in hand as you vainly hope or believe. It seems thus good to Almighty God, whose ordinance it is fit and necessary that we all be obedient to. Therefore I pray you all to be quiet, and to be contented with my death, which I am most willing to suffer. And let us now join in prayer to the Lord for the preservation of the king’s majesty, to whom I have always shown myself a most faithful and true subject. I have always been most diligent about his majesty in his affairs both at home and abroad, and no less diligent in seeking the common commodity of the whole realm! ‘

At these words, all the people cried out and said, ‘It is most true!’ Then the duke proceeding, said,

‘To his majesty I wish continual health, with all felicity and all prosperous success.’

The people again cried out, ‘Amen! ‘

“Moreover, I wish to all his councilors the grace and favor of God, by which they may rule in all things uprightly with justice. I exhort you all in the Lord to show yourselves obedient to them, as it is your bounden duty under pain of condemnation, and also most profitable for the preservation and safeguarding of the king’s majesty.

“Moreover, because I have oftentimes had interactions with diverse men, and it is hard to please every man, if therefore there are any who have been offended and injured by me, I most humbly request and ask him forgiveness, but especially Almighty God, whom throughout all my life I have most grievously offended. And all others, whatever they are, who have offended me, I forgive them with my whole heart. Now I once again request of you, dearly beloved in the Lord, that you will keep yourselves quiet and still, lest through your tumult you might trouble me. For although the spirit is willing and ready, the flesh is frail and wavering, and through your quietness I will be much quieter. Moreover, I desire you all to bear me witness that I die here In the faith of Jesus Christ, desiring you to help me with your prayers, so that I may persevere constant in the same to my life’s end.’

“After this, turning himself back around like a meek lamb, he knelt down upon his knees. Then Doctor Cox, who was present there to counsel and advise him, delivered a scroll into his hand, in which was contained a brief confession to God. This being read, he stood up on his feet again, without any trouble of mind (as it appeared) and first bid the sheriffs farewell, then the lieutenant of the Tower, and others, taking them all by the hands who were upon the scaffold with him. Then he gave the hangman certain money. This done, he put off his gown, and kneeling down again in the straw, he untied his shirt-strings. After that, the hangman came to him, turned down his collar round his neck, and all other things which hindered him. Then lifting up his eyes to heaven, where alone is hope, and covering his face with his own handkerchief, he laid himself down, showing no token of trouble or fear, nor did his countenance change; but before his eyes were covered there began to appear a red color in the midst of his cheeks.

“Thus this most meek and gentle duke lying along, and looking for the stroke, because his doublet covered his neck, he was commanded to rise up and put it off; and then laying himself down again upon the block, and calling three times upon the name of Jesus, saying,

‘Lord Jesus save me!’ And as he was repeating this the third time, even as the name of Jesus was being uttered, in a moment he was bereft both of head and life, and slept in the Lord Jesus. He was taken away from all the dangers and evils of this life, and is resting now in the peace of God — in the promotion of whose truth and gospel he always showed himself an excellent instrument and member; and therefore he has received the reward of his labors.”

As to the manners, disposition, life, and conversation of the duke, what do we need to say, when he cannot be sufficiently commended according to the dignity of his virtues? There was always great humanity in him, and such meekness and gentleness, as is rarely found in so high an estate. He was prone and ready to give ear to the complaints and supplications of the poor, and no less attentive to the affairs of the commonwealth. And if he, together with King Edward, had lived, they were likely to have done much good in reforming many disorders within this realm. He was utterly ignorant of all craft and deceit, and as far void of all pride and ambition, as he was from doing of injury. He was of a gentle disposition, not coveting to be revenged; he was more apt and ready to be deceived, than to deceive. He ever showed his nobility along with love and zeal for the gospel and for religion. The proof of this was sufficiently seen in his constant standing to God’s truth, and in his zealous defense of it, against the bishops of Chichester, Norwich, Lincoln, London, and others, in the consultation at Windsor, in the first year of the king’s reign.

But as there is nothing in this world so perfect in all respects, which is not blotted or darkened with some spot of vice. So among the manifold commendations of this duke, there was one thing which greatly stained both his honor and estimation, and also more endangered his own life. This was that, in consenting to the death of his brother, he followed too rashly the persuasion of others, and weakened his own power, and also provoked the chastisement of God’s scourge.

Before we conclude the history of good king Edward VI, this place seems not unfit to mention a few other things concerning the church and religion. Religion began to grow well, and to come happily forward during this king’s days, had not the unhappy troubles of the state, owing to the lords not agreeing among themselves, disquieted the good prospect. But how subtly the malice of the devil works! So long as the lords agreed among themselves, Winchester and Bonner, with all that faction, were cut short, and they began to yield to conformity. But afterwards perceiving the nobles to be divided, the lord protector displaced, his brother the admiral beheaded, and the young king now left to himself, they began to take more heart.

[666]

And thus, though nothing else will lead us, yet experience may teach us what discord works in public weals; and contrarily, what a necessary thing concord is to the advancement especially of God’s matters pertaining to his church. For, as to the success of the gospel of peace, while public peace and the gospel joined together, it was wonderful how error and popery were confounded, and ashamed to show their faces. So that both Dr. Smith, Chadsey, Stamlish, Young, Oglethorpe, with many others, recanted their former ignorance. Bonner, with his own hand, subscribed to the king’s supremacy, and promoted his injunctions. Stephen Gardiner also did the same, subscribing with his own hand the first book of the king’s proceedings. And no doubt he would have done the same to the second book also, had not unfortunate discord fallen among the nobles in so unfortunate a time.

Disputations at Cambridge about the Sacrament

I showed before (p. 636), how in these peaceable days, Peter Martyr, Martin Bucer, Paul Phagius, with other learned men, were entertained and provided for in the two universities of this realm, Oxford and Cambridge; and how with their diligent industry there, they did much good. I likewise have in my hands the learned and fruitful disputations of these men to insert here. But the largeness of this volume compels me to make short of them, especially seeing the length of their disputations.

First, Peter Martyr was called by the king to the public reading of the divinity lecture in Oxford. Among his other learned exercises, he set up in the public schools three conclusions of divinity to be disputed and tried by argument. Those present at these disputations were the king's visitors⁸ — to wit, Henry, bishop of Lincoln; Doctor Cox, chancellor of that university; Dr. Hains, dean of Exeter; Richard Morison, Esq.; and Christopher Nevinson, doctor of civil law. The conclusions propounded were these:

“1. In the sacrament of thanksgiving there is no transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

“2. The body and blood of Christ is not carnally or corporally in the bread and wine; nor, as others used to say, under the kinds of bread and wine.

“3. The body and blood of Christ is united to bread and wine sacramentally.”

Those who were the chief disputers against him on the contrary side, were Doctor Tresham, Doctor Chadsey, and Morgan.

The like disputation was also appointed and commenced at Cambridge about the same time, concerning the matter of the sacrament. The king's visitors were directed down for the same purpose by the king. The names of these visitors were Nicholas Ridley, bishop of Rochester; Thomas, bishop of Ely; Master John Cheek, the king's schoolmaster; Doctor May, civilian; and Thomas Wendy, the king's physician. The conclusions in that disputation propounded were these:

“Transubstantiation cannot be proved by the plain and manifest words of Scripture, nor can it necessarily be collected from there, nor confirmed by the consents of the ancient fathers for these past thousand years.”

This disputation continued for three days severally. In the first, Dr. Madew answered; against him disputed Dr. Glin, Mr. Langdale, Mr. Segewick, and Mr. Young. In the second disputation, Dr. Glin answered; against him disputed Mr. Grindal, Mr. Perne, Mr. Gest, and Mr. Pilkington. In the third disputation Mr. Perne answered; against him disputed one Mr. Parker (*not* Dr. Matthew Parker), Mr. Pollard, Mr. Vavisor, and Mr. Young.

At length, the disputations being ended, the bishop of Rochester, Dr. Nicholas Ridley, in the manner of the schools, made the following determination upon the conclusions:

There has been an ancient custom among you, that after disputations in your schools there some determination should be made of the matters so disputed and debated, especially regarding the Christian religion. It has seemed good to these worshipful assistants joined with me in commission from the king's majesty, that I should perform the same at this time. I will, by your favorable patience, declare both what I think and believe myself, and what

⁸ *Visitor*: a head or overseer of an institution such as a college, who resolves disputes, etc.

also what others ought to think of the same. I wish that afterwards, every man would with diligence weigh and ponder this at home.

The principal grounds or rather head-springs of this matter are specially five:

The 1st is the authority, majesty, and truth of holy Scripture.

The 2nd is the most certain testimonies of the ancient catholic fathers, who in my judgment sufficiently declare this matter.

The 3rd is the definition of a sacrament.

The 4th is the abominable heresy of Eutiches, that may follow from transubstantiation.

The 5th is the most sure belief of the article of our faith, "he ascended into heaven."

1. This transubstantiation is clearly against the words of the Scriptures, and the consent of the ancient catholic fathers. The Scripture says, "I will not drink hereafter of this fruit of the vine," etc. Now the fruit of this vine is wine; and it is manifest that Christ spoke these words after the supper was finished, as it appears both in Matthew, Mark, and also in Luke, if they are well understood. There are not many places of Scripture that confirm this, nor is it very material: for it is enough if there is any one plain testimony for it. Nor should it be measured by the number of Scriptures, but by the authority and by the truth of the Scriptures. And the majesty of this truth is as ample in one short sentence of the Scripture as in a thousand.

Christ took bread; he gave bread. In the Acts, St. Luke calls it bread. St. Paul calls it bread after the sanctification. ^{1Cor 11.24} Both of them speak of breaking, which belongs to the substance of bread, and in no way to Christ's body. For the Scripture says, "A bone of him shall not be broken." ^{Psa 34.20} Christ says, "Do this in remembrance of me." ^{Luk 22.19} St. Paul also says, "Do you this in remembrance of me." And again, "As often as you drink of this cup, do it in remembrance of me." ^{1Cor 11.25} And our Savior Christ, in St. John sixth chapter, speaking against Capernaum, says, "Do not labor not for the food which perishes." And when they asked, "What shall we do that we might work the works of God?" He answered them, "This is the work of God, that you believe on him whom he has sent." ^{Joh 6.27-29} You see how he exhorts them to faith, "For faith is that work of God." Again, "This is the bread which came down from heaven." ^{Joh 6.50} But Christ's body did not come down from heaven. Moreover, "Whoever eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, dwells in me, and I in him. My flesh," he says, "is food indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." ^{Joh 6.54-55} When they heard this they were offended; and while they were offended, he said to them, "What if you see the Son of man ascend where he was before?" ^{Joh 6.62} By this he set about to draw them from gross and carnal eating. This body, he says, will ascend up into heaven, meaning altogether, as St. Augustine says, "It is the spirit that quickens; the flesh profits nothing. The words that I speak to you, they are spirit and they are life," ^{Joh 6.63} and must be spiritually understood. These are the reasons which persuade me to incline to this sentence and judgment.

2. Now my second ground against this transubstantiation is the ancient fathers, a thousand years past. They are so far from confirming transubstantiation, that plainly they seem to me to think and speak the contrary.

Dionysius in many places calls it "bread." The places are so manifest and plain, that I need not recite them.

Ignatius says to the Philadelphians, "I beseech you, brethren, cling fast to one faith, and to one kind of preaching, using together one kind of preaching, using together one kind of

thanksgiving; for the flesh of the Lord Jesus is one, and his blood is one which was shed for us: there is also one bread broken for us, and one cup of the whole church.”

Ireneus writes, “Even as the bread that comes of the earth receiving God’s name is now no longer common bread, but sacramental bread, consisting of two natures, earthly and heavenly. Even so, our bodies receiving the eucharist, are now no longer corruptible, having hope of the resurrection.”

[667] A.D. 1547-1553.

Tertullian is very plain, for he calls it a *figure* of his body, etc. **Chrysostom** writes to Caesarius the monk, although he is not received by some, yet will I read the place to impress it more deeply in your minds, for it seems to plainly show the substance of bread remains. His words are these:

“Before the bread is sanctified, we name it bread: but by the grace of God sanctifying the same, through the ministry of the priest, it is delivered from the name *bread*, and is counted worthy to bear the name of *the Lord’s body*, even though the very substance of bread notwithstanding remains in it, and now is not taken to be two bodies, but one body of the Son,” etc.

Cyprian says, “Bread is made of many grains. And is that natural bread, and made of wheat? Yea, it is so indeed.”

The book of **Theodoret** in Greek was recently printed at Rome. If it had not been his, it would not have been published there, seeing that it is directly against transubstantiation. For he says plainly, that bread still remains after the sanctification. **Gelasius** also is very plain in this manner, “The sacrament,” he says, “which we receive, of the body and blood of Christ, is a divine matter; because of which we are made partakers of the divine nature; yet it does not cease to be the substance of bread and wine. Therefore the representation and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the mysteries,” etc. After this he recited certain places out of Augustine and Cyril, which were not noted.

Isichus also confesses that it is bread. Also the judgment of **Bertram** in this matter is very plain and manifest. And thus much for the second ground.

3. The third ground is the nature of the sacrament, which consists of three things, which are unity, nutrition, and conversion.

Regarding unity, Cyprian writes, “Even as one bread is made of many grains, so are we one mystical body of Christ.” Therefore bread must still remain, or else we destroy the nature of a sacrament. Also those who take away nutrition, which comes by bread, likewise take away the nature of a sacrament. For as the body of Christ nourishes the soul, even so bread likewise nourishes the body of man.

Therefore those who take away the grains or the union of the grains in the bread, and deny the nutrition or substance of it, in my judgment are sacramentaries; for they take away the similitude between the bread and the body of Christ. Those who affirm transubstantiation are indeed sacramentaries and Capernaïtes.

Regarding conversion, that as the bread which we receive is turned into our substance, so we are turned into Christ’s body. **Rabanus** and **Chrysostom** are sufficient witnesses.

4. Those who say that Christ is carnally present in the eucharist, take from him the truth of man’s nature. **Eutyches** granted the divine nature in Christ, but he denied his human nature. So too, those who defend transubstantiation ascribe to the human nature, that which belongs only to the divine nature.

5. The fifth ground is the certain persuasion of this article of faith: “He ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand,” etc. **Augustine** says, “The Lord is above, even to the end of the world; yet the truth of the Lord is here also. For his body in which he rose again must be in one place; but his truth is spread abroad everywhere.” Also in another place, he says,

“Let the godly also receive that sacrament, but let them not be anxious (speaking there of the presence of his body). For as to his majesty, his providence, his invisible and unspeakable grace, these words are fulfilled which he spoke, ‘I am with you to the end of the world.’ ^{Mat 28.20} But according to the flesh which he took upon himself, according to that which was born of the Virgin, was apprehended by the Jews, was fastened to a tree, taken down again from the cross, wrapped in linen clothes, was buried and arose again, and appeared after his resurrection, so ‘you shall not always have me with you.’ ^{Mat 26.11} And why? Because as concerns his flesh, he was conversant with his disciples for forty days, with them accompanying him, seeing him, but not following him. He went up into heaven, and *is not here*, for he sits at the right hand of his father. And yet he is here, because he has not departed from here, as concerns the presence of his Divine Majesty.”

Mark and consider well what St. Augustine says: “He is ascended into heaven, and is not here.” Do not believe them, therefore, who say that he is still here on the earth. Moreover, the same Augustine says,

“Do not doubt that Jesus Christ, as concerns the nature of his manhood, is there [in heaven] from where he shall come. And remember well and believe the profession of a Christian man, that he arose from death, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of his Father, and from that place and no other (not from the altars) he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And he shall come, as the angel said, as he was seen going into heaven; ^{Act 1.11} that is to say, in the same form and substance to which he gave immortality, but did not change his nature. In this form (meaning his human nature) we may think that it is everywhere.”

In the same epistle, he says, “Take away from our bodies the limitation of places, and they shall be nowhere; and because they are nowhere, they shall not be at all.” **Virgilius** ⁹ says,

“If the word and the flesh are both of one nature, seeing that the word is everywhere, why then is not the flesh also everywhere? For when it was on earth, then truly it was not in heaven; and now when it is in heaven, it is surely not on earth. And it is so certain that it is not on earth, that as concerning the same, we look for him *from* heaven, whom, as concerning the word, we believe to be with us on earth.”

“Seeing that these things are so, the course of the Scriptures must be searched by us, and many testimonies must be gathered, to show plainly what a wickedness and sacrilege it is to refer those things to the property of the divine nature, which only belong to the nature of the flesh. And contrarywise, to apply those things to the nature of the flesh, which properly belong to the divine nature.”

This is what the transubstantiators do. While they affirm Christ’s body is not contained in any one place, and ascribe to his humanity what properly belongs to his divinity, just as those do who would have Christ’s body limited in no one certain place. Now, in the latter conclusion concerning the sacrifice, because it depends on the first, I will declare in a few words what I think. For if we agree on that, the whole controversy in the other would soon be at an end. There are two things which persuade me that this conclusion is true: certain places in the Scriptures, and also certain testimonies of the fathers. St. Paul says,

⁹ Presumably Virgil of Salzburg (c. 700-784), Irish astronomer and churchman, bishop of Salzburg.

“Christ having become a high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; nor by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us,” etc. And “now once at the end of the world, he has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” (Heb 9.11-12) And again, “Christ was offered once to bear the sins of many.” ^{Heb 9. 28} Moreover, he says, “For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are being sanctified.” ^{Heb 10.14}

These Scriptures persuade me to believe that there is no other oblation of Christ (though I am not ignorant there are many sacrifices), except that which was made once on the cross.

The testimonies of the ancient fathers, which confirm this, are out of *Augustine ad Bonif.* epistle 23. Again in his *Book of Forty-three Questions*, in the Forty-first Question.

[668]

Also in his *Twentieth Book against Faustus the Manichaeon*, cap. xxi. And in the same book against Faustus, cap. xxviii. **Augustine** writes: “Now the Christians keep a memorial of the sacrifice past, with a holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ.”

Fulgentius, in his Book “De Fide,” calls the same oblation a commemoration. These things are sufficient at this time, for a scholastical determination of these matters.

Disputations on “This is my body.”

Beside these disputations, others were also held at Cambridge shortly after, by Martin Bucer, upon the following conclusions:

1. The canonical books of holy Scripture alone sufficiently teach the regenerated all things necessarily belonging to salvation.
2. There is no church on earth which does not err in manners (practice) as well as in faith.
3. We are so justified freely by God, that before our justification, all our works are *sin*, and it provokes God’s wrath against us, whatever good work we seem to do. Then being justified, we do *good* works.

In these three propositions, Bucer disputed against Mr. Sedgewick, Young, and Perne. Because these disputations are long, I am minded to reserve them to some other convenient place. In the meantime, because there has been, and still is, great controversy among the learned, and much effusion of Christian blood about the words and meaning of the sacrament — to the intent that the truth of it may be explained more openly, and all doubtful scruples be discussed — it will not be out of place to adjoin a certain learned treatise in the form of a dialogue. It pertains to the argument compiled, it seemed, out of the writings of **Peter Martyr** and other authors, by a learned and reverend person of this realm. Under the personae of *Custom* and *Truth*, he lays before our eyes, and teaches all men, not to measure religion by custom, but to test custom by the truth and the word of God. For otherwise, custom may soon deceive, but the word of God abides forever.

A Dialogue explaining the Words of Christ: “This is my Body.”

Custom. — I greatly marvel what madness is creeping into those men’s hearts, who are not ashamed now-a-days to so violently tread down the lively word of God, yes, and impudently deny God himself.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Truth. — God forbid there should be any such men. Indeed I remember that the Romish bishop usually had the Bible for his footstool, so as to tread down God's word when he stood at his mass. But thanks be to God he is now revealed, and his abominations opened and blown throughout the world. And I hear of no others who oppress God's word.

Custom. — No more? Yes, doubtless there are a hundred thousand more, and it is your duty to withstand them.

Truth. — As to my duty, you know it does not agree with my nature to bear with falsehood. But who are they? Disclose them if you would have them reprov'd.

Custom — What! Are you so great a stranger in these quarters? Do you not hear how men daily speak against the sacrament of the altar, denying it to be the real body of Christ?

Truth. — In good truth I have been abroad a great while, and returned but recently into this country. So you must pardon me if my answer is to seek in such questions. But go on with your tale. You have been here longer, and are better acquainted than I am. What more do they say than this?

Custom. — Than this? Why, what more can they possibly say?

Truth. — Yes, there are many things worse than this: for this seems to be tolerable in some respects.

Custom. — What! I think you toy with me. Does it seem tolerable to deny the sacrament.?

Truth. — They do not deny it, so far as I can gather by your words.

Custom. — No, then fare you well: I perceive you will take their part.

Truth. — I am not partial, but indifferent to all parties: for I never go further than the truth.

Custom. — I can scarcely believe you. But what is truer than Christ, who is truth itself? Or who was ever so hardy before, as to charge Christ with a lie for saying these words, "This is my body?" The words are evident and plain: there is not so much as one obscure or dark letter in them; there is no cause for any man to cavil. And yet, though Christ himself affirmed it to be his body, men now-a-days are not abashed to say, "Christ lied, it is *not* his body." The evangelists all agree; the old writers stand on our side; the universal and catholic church has been of this mind these fifteen hundred years and more. And will we think that Christ himself, his evangelists, and the whole catholic church, have been deceived for so long, and the truth is now at length begotten and born in these days?

Truth. — You have moved a matter of great force and weight, and without many words, I can make no full answer to it. Notwithstanding, because you provoke me to it, I will take part with those of whom you have made false report, for none of them ever approved Christ of any lie. But on the other hand, they say that many men in recent days, not understanding Christ's words, have built and set up many fond lies in his name. Therefore, I will first declare the meaning of these words, "This is my body;" and next, in what sense the church and the old fathers have evermore taken them. First therefore you will understand that Scripture is not to be taken always as the letter sounds, but as the intent and purpose of the Holy Spirit was, by whom the Scripture was uttered. For if you follow the bare words, you will soon shake down and overthrow the greatest part of the Christian faith. What is plainer than these words, "My Father is greater than I?" From those plain words sprang up the heresy of the Arians, who denied that Christ is equal with his Father. What is more evident than this saying, "I and my Father are one?" Yet from there arose the heresy of those who denied three distinct persons. "They all had one soul and one heart," was spoken by the

apostles; and yet each of them had a soul and heart particular to himself. "They are now not two, but one flesh," is spoken of the man and his wife; and yet both the man and his wife have their own bodies. Reuben said of his brother, "He is our very flesh," ^{Gen 37.27} Yet notwithstanding, he was not their real flesh. "I am bread," said Christ, yet he was flesh, and *not* bread. "Christ was the stone," ^{1Cor 10.4} says St. Paul; and yet was not material stone. "Melchizedek had neither father nor mother," and yet indeed he had both. "Behold the Lamb of God," says John the Baptist of Christ; notwithstanding, Christ was a man, and not a lamb. Circumcision was called the *covenant*, whereas it was but a *token* of the covenant. The lamb was named the *Passover*, and yet it was eaten only in *remembrance* of the Passover. Jacob raised up an altar, and called it "The mighty God of Israel." ^{Gen 33.20} Moses, when he had conquered the Amalekites, set up an altar, and called it by the names of God, Jehovah, and Tetragrammaton. ^{Exo 17.15} "We are all one bread," ^{1Cor 10.17} says St. Paul; yet they were not thereby turned into a loaf of bread. Christ hanging on the cross, pointed out St. John to his mother, saying, "Behold your son," ^{Joh 19.26} and yet was he not her son. "As many as are baptized into Christ," says St. Paul, "have put on Christ," ^{Gal 3.27} and as many as are baptized into Christ, are washed with the blood of Christ. ^{Rev 1.5} Notwithstanding, no man took the font water to be the natural blood of Christ. "The cup is the new testament," ^{1Cor 11.25} says St. Paul, and yet the cup is not indeed the very new testament. You see, therefore, that it is not strange, nor an unusual thing in the Scriptures, to call one thing by another's name. So that you can no more prove the changing of the bread into Christ's body in the sacrament, because of the words, "This is my body," than prove the change of the wife's flesh into the natural and real body and flesh of the husband, because it is written, "They are not two, but one flesh;" or the altar of stone to be very God, because Moses pronounced it to be the mighty God of Israel.

[669] A.D. 1547—1553.

However, if you must stick to the letter, you will make for my argument, and hinder yours. For I will reason thus, and use your own weapon against you: The Scripture calls it "bread." The evangelists agree in calling it "bread." St. Paul names it "bread" five times in one passage. Therefore I conclude by your own argument, that we should not only say, but also believe that bread remains in the sacrament.

Custom. — I think your answer is reasonable, yet I cannot be satisfied. Therefore, declare more at large, what moves you to think this about the sacrament. For I think you would not withstand a doctrine so long held and taught, unless you were forced by some strong reasons.

Truth. — First, in examining the words of Christ, I look to the meaning and purpose for which they were spoken. I see that Christ meant to have his death and passion kept in remembrance. For men of themselves are forgetful of the benefits of God. And therefore it was necessary that they should be admonished and stirred up with some visible and outward tokens, as with the Passover lamb, the bronze serpent, and the like. For the bronze serpent was a token, that when the Jews were stung and wounded with serpents, God restored them and made them whole. The Passover lamb was a memory of the great benefit of God, which saved the Jews when he destroyed the Egyptians, for their doors were sprinkled with the blood of a lamb. So likewise Christ left us a memorial and remembrance of his death and passion in outward tokens, so that when the child demands of his father, what the breaking of the bread and drinking of the cup means, he might answer him that just as the bread is broken, so Christ was broken and rent upon the cross, to redeem the soul of man. And likewise, just as wine restores and comforts the body, so the blood of Christ

cherishes and relieves the soul. And this I gather by the words of Christ, and by the institution and order of the sacrament. For Christ charged the apostles to do this in remembrance of him. I therefore argue that just as nothing is done in mere remembrance of itself; and just as the sacrament is used in remembrance of Christ, therefore the sacrament is not Christ, or it would be a memorial of itself. And again I argue that Christ never devoured himself, and yet Christ ate the sacrament with his apostles; and therefore we may conclude that the sacrament is not Christ himself. Besides this, I see that Christ did not ordain his body, put a *sacrament* of his body. And a sacrament, as St. Augustine declares, is an outward sign of an invisible grace. His words are. *Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visibile signum*. Out of these words I gather two arguments. The first is this; the sign of the body of Christ is not the thing signified; therefore they are not one. And again, one thing cannot be both visible and invisible; but the sacrament we know is visible, and the body of Christ invisible; and we may therefore conclude that they are not one and the same.

I remember that Christ ministered this sacrament not to great and deep philosophers, but to a sort of ignorant and unlearned fishermen, who notwithstanding, understood Christ's meaning right well, and delivered it, even as they took it from Christ's hand, to the people, and fully declared to them the meaning. But neither those people, nor scarcely the apostles themselves, could understand what is meant by transubstantiation, impanation,¹⁰ dimensions, accidents, without subjects, etc. This is no learning for the unlearned and rude people, and therefore it is likely that Christ meant some other thing than has been taught in recent days. Further, Christ's body is food, not for the body, but for the soul; and therefore it must be received with the instrument of the soul, which is faith. For just as you receive sustenance for your body by the mouth, so the food of your soul must be received by faith, which is the mouth of the soul. And St. Augustine sharply rebukes them those who think to eat Christ with their mouth, saying, "Why do you make ready your tooth and your belly? Believe, and you have eaten Christ." Likewise speaking of eating the same body, Christ says to the Capernaïtes, who understood him grossly as men do now a-days: "The words that I speak are spirit and life. It is the spirit that quickens, the flesh profits nothing." Joh 6.63

Custom. — What do you mean by this *spirit*, and by *spiritual* eating? I pray you utter your mind more plainly. For I know well that Christ has a body, and therefore must be eaten, as I think, with the mouth of the body. For the spirit and the soul, as it has no body and flesh, so it has no mouth.

Truth. — You must understand, that a man is shaped of two parts — of the body and of the soul. And each of them has its life and its death, its mouth, its teeth, its food, and its abstinence. For as the body is nourished and fostered with bodily foods, or else it cannot live; so must the soul have its cherishing, otherwise it will decay and pine away. And therefore we justly say that the Turks, Jews, and heathen are dead, because they lack the lively food of the soul. But how then, or by what means will you find the soul? Doubtless not by the instrument of the body, but of the soul. For that which is received into the body, has no passage from there into the soul. For Christ says, "Whatever enters at the mouth goes into the belly, and is cast out into the stream." And whereas you say that the spirit has no mouth, as it has no body or bones; you are deceived. For the spirit has a mouth, or else how could a man eat and drink justice? For undoubtedly his bodily mouth is not a fit instrument for it. Yet Christ says, that he is blessed who hungers and thirsts for righteousness. If he hungers and thirsts for righteousness, he must both eat and drink it; for otherwise he

¹⁰ Impanation refers to the doctrine that Christ's body is present in the Eucharist *alongside* the substance of the bread; similar to consubstantiation.

neither abates his hunger, nor quenches his thirst. Now, if a man may eat and drink righteousness with his spirit, no doubt his spirit has a mouth. From this I argue that just as the mouth of the soul is spiritual, so the food must be spiritual.

And in like manner Christ, speaking of eating his body, calls himself “the bread” — not bread for the body, but “the bread of life,” for the soul. And he says, “He who comes to me shall never hunger; and he who believes in me shall never thirst.” Therefore, whoever will be relieved by the body of Christ, must receive him as he will be received, with the instrument of faith, and not with his teeth or mouth. And whereas I say that Christ’s body must be received and taken with faith, I do not mean that you will pluck down Christ from heaven, and put him in your faith, as in a visible place; but that with your faith you must rise and spring up to him, and leaving this world, dwell above in heaven — putting all your trust, comfort, and consolation in Him who suffered grievous bondage to set you at liberty — creeping into his wounds which were so cruelly pierced and wounded for your sake. So you will feed on the body of Christ; so will you suck the blood that was poured out and shed for you. This is the spiritual, the very true, the only eating of Christ’s body. And, therefore, St. Gregory calls it, “The food of the mind, and not of the stomach.” And St. Cyprian says likewise: “We do not sharpen our tooth, nor prepare our stomach.”

Now to return. Seeing it is plain that Christ’s body is food for our spirit, and has nothing to do with our body, I will say that the sacrament is bodily food and increases the body; and therefore the sacrament is not the very body of Christ. It is evident that it nourishes the body; for Christ calls it the fruit of the vine, whose duty is to nourish. And as a proof, if you consecrate a whole loaf, it will feed you as well as your table bread. And if a little mouse gets a host (a piece of consecrated bread), he will crave no more food for his dinner. Therefore, as I said before, seeing that Christ’s body is spiritual food, and the bread of the sacrament bodily food, I may conclude that the sacrament is not Christ’s body. Besides this, where it was forbidden in the old law that any man should eat or drink blood, the apostles notwithstanding took the cup from Christ’s hands, and drank of it, and never staggered or shrunk at the matter. From this it may be gathered that they took it as a mystery, as a token, and as a remembrance, far otherwise than it has been taken recently.

[670]

Again, when the sacrament was given, none of them crouched down and took it for his God, forgetting the one who sat there present before their eyes; but they took it, and ate it, knowing that it was a sacrament and remembrance of Christ’s body. Yes, the old councils commanded that no man should kneel down at the time of the communion, fearing that it might be an occasion of idolatry. And long after the Apostles’ time, as Tertullian writes, women were allowed to take it home with them, and store it in their chests. And the priests many times sent it to sick persons by a child, which no doubt would have given more reverence to it, if they had taken it for their God. But a great while after, about 300 years ago, Honorius III, bishop of Rome, took him and hung him up, and caused men to kneel and crouch down, and all to deify him.

If the bread is turned and altered into the body of Christ, doubtless it is the greatest miracle that God ever wrought. But the apostles saw no miracle in it. Nazianzen, an old writer, and St. Augustine, treating all the miracles in the Scripture, do not include the sacrament among them. As for the apostles, it appears that they took it for no marvel, for they never mused at it, nor demanded how it might be. Whereas in other things they were ever full of questions. As for St. Augustine, he not only skipped over it, as no wonder, but by plain and express words, he testifies that there is no marvel in it.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

A little before the institution of the sacrament, Christ spoke of his ascension, saying. "Yet a little while, and the world will see me no more." Joh 14.19 "Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid," Joh 14.27 because I go from you;. "I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away; for if I do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send Him unto you:" Joh 16.7 with many other like warnings of his departure. St. Stephen saw him sitting at the right hand of his Father, and thought it a special revelation of God; but he never said that he saw him at the communion, or that he made him every day himself. And in the Acts of the Apostles, St. Peter says that, "the heaven must receive Christ until the times of restitution of all things." Act 3.21 Isaiah, Solomon, and St. Stephen say, "That God dwells not in temples made with man's hand." Act 17.24 St. Paul wishes that he were dissolved and dead, and were with Christ; Phi 1.23 — not in the altar, doubtless, where he might be daily, but in heaven. And to be brief, it is in our creed, and we constantly believe that Christ had ascended into heaven, and sits at his Father's right hand; and we have no promise that he will come down at every priest's calling.

Custom. — O my, you are far deceived; I can in no way brook these words. You shut up Christ too straitly, and imprison him in one corner of heaven, not allowing him to go at large. He has deserved more gentleness at your hand, than to be tied up so short.

Truth. — I neither lock up nor imprison Christ in heaven, but according to the Scriptures I declare that he has chosen a blessed place, and one most worthy to receive his majesty. Whoever is enclosed in this place, does not think he is a prisoner; but if you take it for so heinous a thing that Christ should sit in heaven in the glory of his Father, what do you think of those who imprison him in a little box — yes, and keep him in captivity so long, until he is moldy and overgrown with vermin, and when he is past men's feeding on. They are not content to hang him till he stinks, but would they have him put to a new execution, and burn him too? This is wonderful and extremely cruel imprisoning. But to return to the matter, we are certainly persuaded by the word of God, that Christ, the very Son of God, granted to take upon himself the body and shape of man, and that he walked and was conversant among men in that one body, and not in many bodies; and that he suffered death, rose again, and ascended to heaven in the self-same body; and that he sits at his Father's right hand in his manhood, in the nature and substance of that body. This is our belief; this is the very word of God. Therefore they are far deceived who, leaving heaven, would grope for Christ's body on earth.

Custom. — No, sir, but I see now you are far out of the way. For Christ does not have so gross and fleshly a body as you think, but a spiritual and ghostly body, and therefore without repugnance it may be in many places at once.

Truth. — You say right well, and grant that Christ's body is spiritual. But I pray you answer me by the way: can any other body than that which is spiritual be in various places at one time?

Custom. — No, truly.

Truth. — Do we have that self-same sacrament that Christ gave to his disciples, or not?

Custom. — Doubtless we have the same one.

Truth. — When was Christ's body spiritual? Was it spiritual even from his birth?

Custom. — No; for doubtless before he arose from death, his body was earthly, as other men's bodies are.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

Truth. — Well, but when did Christ give the sacrament to his disciples? Before he rose from the dead, or afterwards?

Custom. — You know yourself he gave it before his resurrection, the night before he suffered his passion.

Truth. — Why then, I think he gave the sacrament at that time when his body was not spiritual.

Custom — Even so.

Truth. — And was every portion of the sacrament dealt to the apostles, and did they receive into their mouths the very real and substantial body of Christ?

Custom. — Yes, doubtless.

Truth. — Mark well, what you have said; for you have granted me a great contradiction. First you say that no body which is not spiritual, can be in several places at once. Then you say that Christ's body, at the last supper was not spiritual. And yet you hold that he was visibly present there before the apostles' eyes, and in each of their hands and mouths all at once.

Custom. — Indeed you have driven me into the straits before I was aware of you; and I do not know how I may escape your hands honestly. But the best refuge that I have is this, that I will not believe you.

Truth. — I desire you not to give credit to me. Believe the word of God; indeed, believe your own creed. For they both witness against you, that Christ's body is taken up into heaven, and it shall remain there until he comes to judge.

Custom. — Tush, what are you speaking from the word of God? There are many dark sayings in it which every man cannot attain to.

Truth. — I grant you there are obscure places in the Scripture, yet not so obscure that a man with the grace of God may not perceive them. For it was not written for angels, but for men. But as I understand it, custom meddles very little with the Scripture. What would you say from St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose? What if they stand on our side?

Custom. — No, no, I know them well enough.

Truth. — Well, as you know them, if they are called to witness it, they will give evidence against you. For St. Augustine, in all his books declares that Christ's body is placed in one room, Dei, i. he says, "Do not doubt the man Jesus Christ to be there, from where he shall come. And remember well, and faithfully believe the Christian confession, that he is risen, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Father, and from there he shall come, and from no other place, to judge the quick and the dead. And he shall come in the same substance of body to which he gave immortality, and did not take the nature from it. In this form, he is not thought to be dispersed in all places; for we must beware to so defend his divinity that we do not destroy his humanity." All the old fathers witness the same.

Now, to return to the matter. Seeing that the word of God in many and sundry places, the creed, and all the old fathers agree, that the body of Christ has ascended into heaven, and there it remains at the right hand of the Father, and cannot be in more than in one place, I conclude that the sacrament is not the body of Christ.

[671] A.D. 1547-1553.

First, because the sacrament is not in heaven, nor does it sit at the Father's right hand; moreover, because it is in a hundred thousand boxes. Whereas Christ's body fills but one place. Furthermore, if the bread were turned into the body of Christ, then it would necessarily follow that sinners and impenitent persons receive the body of Christ.

Custom. Indeed, and so they do. For St. Paul says plainly, that they receive the body of Christ to their own confusion.

Truth. — No, not so. These are not St. Paul's words. Rather, he says,

“Therefore whoever eats this bread, and drinks this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. For he that eats and drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.” (1Cor 11.27-29)

Here he calls it *bread* in plain words. And although the sacrament is truly bread, yet the injury redounds to the body of Christ. As if a man breaks the king's mace, or treads the broad seal under his foot, even if he has broken and defaced nothing but silver and wax; yet the injury is the king's, and the doer shall be taken as a traitor. He that reads the gospel, in which the passion and death of Christ is declared, and lives contrary to the gospel, will doubtless be even more guilty of the death of Christ, because he hears and reads the word of God, and does not regard it. In a certain country the manner is that when the gospel is read, the king will stand up with a bare sword in his hand, declaring thereby that he bears his sword in defense of the gospel. But if he himself oppresses the gospel, he bears the sword against himself; for the gospel will turn to his judgment and condemnation. Thus Christ will so much more extremely punish a man who, knowing himself to be wicked and without repentance, and therefore none of the flock of Christ, yet notwithstanding will impudently creep into the company of Christian men, and receive the sacraments with them as though he were one of their number. And this is what St. Paul meant by the unworthy receiving of the sacrament of Christ's body. Therefore a man may unworthily take the sacrament, and be guilty of the death of Christ, even if he does not receive Christ's body into his mouth, and chews it with his teeth. But what if I prove that every priest at the mass is guilty of the body and blood of Christ?

Custom. — I dare say, you cannot prove it.

Truth. — But if I do prove it, will you believe me?

Custom. — I may well enough, for it is impossible to do it. For priests commonly are confessed before they go to mass; and how can they then take the sacrament unworthily?

Truth. — Indeed confession, if it is discreetly used, is a laudable custom, and to the unlearned man and feeble conscience it is as good as a sermon. But because it was never commanded by Christ, nor received by the apostles, nor much spoken of by the old doctors, it cannot do much for the due receiving of the sacrament. But how do you like these words of St. Ambrose: “He takes it unworthily, who takes it otherwise than Christ ordained it”?

Custom. — That I like very well. But what do you gather from it?

Truth. — I will gather this. The priest at mass takes the sacrament otherwise than Christ either commanded or taught, and thus he takes it unworthily; consequently he takes it to his condemnation.

Custom. — That is not so, for he does entirely as Christ commanded him.

Truth. — That will appear. For Christ commanded it to be done in remembrance of *Him*; the priest does it in remembrance of *dead men*. Christ took bread, and left it bread; the priest takes bread and conjures it away. Christ took bread and gave thanks; the priest takes bread and breathes upon it. Christ took bread and broke it; the priest takes bread and hangs it up. Christ took bread and dealt it to his apostles; the priest, because he is an apostle himself, takes bread and eats every whit of it alone. Christ in the sacrament gave his own body to be eaten in faith; the priest for lack of faith receives accidents ¹¹ and dimensions. Christ gave a sacrament to strengthen men's faith; the priest gives a sacrifice to redeem men's souls. Christ gave it to be *eaten*, the priest gives it to be *worshipped*. And to conclude, Christ gave *bread*; the priest says he gives a *God*. Here is difference enough between Christ and the priest. Yet moreover, Christ at his supper spoke his words in a plain tongue; the priest speaks nothing but Latin or Greek, which he often does not understand; and he whispers, lest any poor man perhaps perceives him. So it comes to pass, that the priest often knows no more what he *says*, than what he *does*. Thus you may see that in the mass, the priest receives the sacrament of Christ's body far otherwise than ever Christ minded, and so he receives it unworthily and to his condemnation.

Now, if you think yourself satisfied, I will return to my former question, and prove more at large, that Christ's body cannot be eaten by the wicked, which must necessarily ensue if the bread were turned into the body of Christ. Christ in the sixth of St. John, speaking of eating his body, says, "He who eats of this bread shall live forever." (verse 58) But sinful men take the sacrament to their condemnation, and do not live forever; therefore in the sacrament they do not receive the body of Christ.

The sacrament in holy Scripture is named "the breaking of bread." ^{Act 2.42} This would truly be but a cold breaking if there remained no bread to break, except certain fantasies of *white* and *round*; whereas they can scarcely make one God with words, crossings, blessings, breathings, leapings, and much ado. They have such virtue in their fingers, that at one cross they are able to make twenty gods; for if they break the sacrament, every portion, yes, every mite, must be a God. After the apostles' time heretics arose who said that Christ, walking here among men bodily upon the earth, had no real body, but only a thing *like* a body; and so they dimmed men's sight with this. Against them the old fathers used these arguments: Christ increased in growing; he fasted, hungered, ate, wept, sweated, was weary, and in conclusion he died, and had all other properties of a true body; therefore he had a body. I will use the same kind of reasoning. It feeds, it tastes like bread, it looks like bread, the silly little mouse takes it for bread, and to be short, it has all the properties and tokens of bread. The old fathers, when any part of the sacrament remained more than was spent at the communion, they used to burn it, and from it came ashes. But there is nothing in the sacrament that can turn to ashes except bread (for I do not think they burned Christ's body to ashes). The emperor Henry VI, was poisoned in the host; and Victor the bishop of Rome in the chalice. But poison cannot hang in God's body and blood. What need is there for many words in a matter so evident? If you demand either God's word, or the doctors and the ancient writers, or your reason, or your eyes, or nose, or tongue, or fingers, or the mouse — all these agree in one thing, and answer together, "There is *bread*."

Therefore, if you reject so many and such constant witnesses, and that so well agree in their tale, especially being such as will not lie for any man's pleasure, I will appeal from you, and take you as no indifferent judge. If all these witnesses do not suffice you, I will call the

¹¹ An *ascident* is an incidental element of something, rather than essential. The bread may be white and round. Those are incidentals and not necessary elements of the bread, which may be brown and square.

sacrament itself to record: it cries to you, and plainly notifies you what you should think of it: "I am," it says, "grated with the teeth; I am conveyed into the belly; I perish; I can live no time; I canker; I suffer green mold; blue mold, red mold; I breed worms; I am kept in a box for fear of rats; if you leave me out all night, I will be devoured before morning, for if the mouse gets at me I am gone; I am bread, I am no God; do not believe them." Thus cries the sacrament daily, and bears witness itself.

Custom. — The devil on such reasons! and therefore I will never trouble my brains to make you answer. But if what you have said is true, why is the sacrament called *the body of Christ* by Christ himself, by his apostles, and by the old fathers?

[672]

Truth. — Because it is no strange thing in Scripture to speak this way, as I declared before. But will you stand to St. Augustine's arbitration in this matter?

Custom. — To no man sooner.

Truth. — St. Augustine, in an epistle to his friend Boniface, gives a good reason why the sacrament, though it is not the body of Christ, it is notwithstanding called the body of Christ His words are these: "If sacraments did not have a certain similitude to those things of which they may be sacraments, then they would not be sacraments. Many times they take their name from this similitude. Therefore, in a certain way the *sacrament* of the body of Christ is the body of Christ; and the *sacrament* of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ," etc. Now, I think you are satisfied concerning the meaning of these words, "This is my body."

Custom. — Yet one thing moves me very much.

Truth. — What is that.'

Custom. The doctors and old writers, men inspired with the Holy Spirit, have ever been against your doctrine; yes, and in these days, the wisest men and best learned call you heretics, and your learning heresy.

Truth. — As to the old writers, I remember well they speak reverently of the sacraments, as every man ought to do. But where they deliver their mind with their right hand, you receive it, Custom, with the left. For where they say that it is the body of Christ, and that it must be truly eaten — meaning that it effectually lays Christ's body before the eyes, and that to the faithful man it is no less than if it were Christ himself, and that Christ must be eaten in faith, not torn nor rent with the teeth — *you* say that however it is taken, it is Christ's body, and that there is no other type of eating than with the mouth.

And that the fathers meant nothing other than I have said, will appear by their words. But regarding the learned and wise men of these days, I cannot blame them if they call my doctrine heresy. For they would condemn all the ancient writers of heresy, if they were now alive. But I will answer you as I would to them directly. In the meanwhile, mark how well their learning agrees. They say you must follow the letter; you must stick to the letter. But **Origen** says, "If you follow the letter, that which is written ('unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, there is no life in you') this letter kills." **Augustine** says, "If the commanding speech is such that it commands a wicked and horrible thing to be done, or a charitable thing to be undone, then this is *figurative speech*: 'unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, there is no life in you,' because he seems to command a wicked thing in this speech. It is therefore *figurative speech*, commanding that we should have communion with the passion of our Lord, and sweetly retain it in our remembrance."

Athanasius says, on John 6, “The words that Christ speaks here are not carnal, but spiritual. For what body might have sufficed for all who would eat it, to be nourishment for the whole world.’ But he therefore mentions the ascension of the Son of Man into heaven, with the intent to pluck them away from that corporal cogitation.” And it is in this way that all the ancient fathers explain these words.

But why do I need to speak of the old fathers? It is not long since the sacrament grew out of its right understanding. For this word *transubstantiation*, by which they signify the bread turning into the body of Christ, was never spoken, or heard, or thought of among the ancient fathers, or in the old church. But about 500 years past, Pope Nicholas II (about 1059), confirmed that opinion about the changing of the bread, and he would have it made an article of faith. But this was not done until it was so declared by the Council of Lateran in Rome (A.D. 1215). After that time ensued *Corpus Christi* day, masses of *Corpus Christi*, reserving the sacrament with honor, with canopies, with incensing, with kneeling, with worshipping and adoration, etc. For they thought they could not do too much for him after the bishop of Rome had allowed him as a God.

But it was not quite 200 years before that time, that this doctrine first began to bud. It had not so prevailed, that a great number of learned and good men did not know the sacrament was a *sacrament*, and not Christ himself. Charles the Great, king of France, and emperor of Germany, demanded of a learned man, whose name was Bertram, what he thought of that strange kind of calling down Christ from heaven, and turning a little bit of bread into his natural body? Bertram answered in this way:

“We say that there is a great difference between the body in which Christ suffered, the blood which he shed upon the cross, and this body which is celebrated every day in the mystery of the passion of Christ. For this body is a pledge and similitude; but the other is the very truth itself. It appears that these are separated by no less difference than between a pledge and the thing for which the pledge is given; or between an image of a thing and the thing itself; or between the form of a thing, and the truth itself.”

Thus wrote Bertram, Druthmar, and many others; and yet in all their time they were never once reprov'd of heresy. John Scotus also wrote thus, but about 200 years after his death, he was judg'd and condemn'd as a heretic, and his books were burned. Since that time, even till this day, though idolatry had great increase, there never lacked some good men who would boldly profess and set forth the truth, even though they were well-assured that their worldly reward should be spite, malice, imprisonment, sword, fire, and all kinds of torments.

Thus, in so few words as I could, I have declared to you what Christ meant by these words, “This is my body;” what the apostles taught about it, and in what way they delivered them to their successors — in what sense and meaning the holy fathers and old writers, and the universal and catholic church has evermore taken them.

The Death of King Edward VI – July 1553.

Thus having discours'd about the events in the reign of king Edward, we will now draw to the end and death of this blessed king, our young Josiah. About a year and a half after the death of the duke of Somerset, his uncle, in the year 1553, he entered into the 17th year of his age, and the 7th year of his reign. In the month of June, he was taken from us, for our sins no doubt. If it had so pleased the good will of the Lord to have spared him with longer life, it was not unlikely that he would have so reformed the commonwealth here in the realm of England, as it might have been said of him, for good cause, what was said in the olden

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

time of the noble emperor Augustus: in reforming and advancing the empire of Rome, he received it of brick, but left it of fine marble. But the condition of this realm, and the behavior of the English people, did not deserve the benefit of so blessed a reformation, but rather such a plague of deformation as happened after Edward's reign, as will appear in the history of his successor, Mary I.

The time having now approached when it pleased Almighty God to call this young king from us. we are told that about three hours before his death, this godly child, his eyes being closed, speaking to himself, and thinking none were near him, was heard to pray thus:

The Prayer of King Edward before his Death.

“Lord God, deliver me out of this miserable and wretched life, and take me among your chosen: however, not my will, but your will be done. Lord, I commit my spirit to you. O Lord, you know how happy it would be for me to be with you: yet for your chosen's sake send me life and health, that I may truly serve you. O my Lord God, bless your people, and save your inheritance. O Lord God, save your chosen people of England. Oh my Lord God, defend this realm from papistry, and maintain your true religion, that I and my people may praise your holy name, for your Son Jesus Christ's sake.”

Then he turned his face, and seeing who was by him, said to them, “Are you so near? I thought you had been farther off.”

[673] A.D. 1547-1553.

Then Dr. Owen said, “We heard you speak to yourself. He then smilingly said, “I was praying to God.” The last words of his pangs were these, “I am faint; Lord have mercy upon me, and take my spirit.” And thus he yielded up the ghost on the 6th of July 1553, and left a woeful kingdom behind to his sister. Although in his will he had excluded his sister Mary from the succession of the crown, because of her corrupt religion, yet the plague which God had destined for this sinful realm, could not so be avoided, unless she, being the elder daughter to King Henry, succeeded in possession of the crown. It now remains to discourse about her dreadful and bloody government. It may suffice to briefly understand this, that for all the writing, sending, and practicing with the lady Mary, by the king and his council, and also by bishop Ridley, she would yet not be reclaimed from her own opinion to give any hearing to the word and voice of truth. Both this young king Edward, and also his father Henry before him, knew right well this positive will of the lady Mary, and were both much displeased against her for it. So that not only did her brother Edward utterly sequester her in his will, but also her own father, considering her inclination, conceived such heart against her, that for a long time he secluded her from the title of princess. Indeed, he seemed so eagerly incensed against her, that he was fully inclined to proceed further with her, had not the intercession of Thomas Cranmer, the archbishop, reconciled the king to again favor and pardon his own daughter.

You have already heard about the stout courage of the lady Mary toward her father, and also by her letters to her brother King Edward and his council. So now let us infer something about the stout talk and demeanor of the lady Mary toward Doctor Ridley, bishop of London, who gently coming to her of mere good will, had this communication with her, and she with him, as follows.

About the 8th of September 1552, Dr. Ridley, then bishop of London, lying at his house at Hadham in Hertfordshire, went to visit the lady Mary, then at Hunsden, two miles off. He was gently entertained by Sir Thomas Wharton, and others of her officers, till it was almost eleven o'clock, about which time the lady Mary came forth into her chamber of presence.

Bk. IX. The Reign of King Edward VI

The bishop saluted her grace, and said that he had come to do his duty to her grace. She thanked him for his pains, and for a quarter of an hour she talked with him very pleasantly, and said that she knew him in the court when he was chaplain to her father, and could well remember a sermon that he gave before king Henry her father, at the marriage of my lady Clinton to Sir Anthony Brown, etc. And so she dismissed him to dine with her officers. After dinner was done, the bishop, being called for by Mary, resorted again to her grace. This was the communication between them. The bishop begins in the following manner:

Bishop. — “Madam, I came not only to do my duty to see your grace, but also to offer myself to preach before you on Sunday next, if it will please you to hear me.” Her countenance changed at this; and after her silence for a time, she answered thus:

Mary. — “My lord, as for this last matter I pray you to give the answer to it yourself.”

Bishop. — “Madam, considering my office and calling, I am bound in duty to make this offer to your grace, to preach before you.”

Mary. — “Well, I pray you to give the answer (as I have said) to this matter yourself; for you know the answer well enough. But if there is no remedy, and I must make you answer, this shall be your answer: the door of the parish church adjoining shall be open for you if you come, and you may preach if you wish; but neither I nor any of mine shall hear you.”

Bishop. — “Madam, I trust you will not refuse God’s word.”

Mary. — “I cannot tell what you call God’s word; that is not God’s word’s now, that was God’s word in my father’s days.”

Bishop. — “God’s word is all one in all times, but has been better understood and practiced in some ages than in others.”

Mary. — “You dared not, for your ears have avowed that God’s word in my father’s days, is not what you do now. And as for your new books, I thank God I never read any of them; I never did, and never will.”

And after many bitter words against the form of religion then established, and against the government of the realm, and the laws made in the youth of her brother, which she said she was not bound to obey till her brother came to maturity, when she affirmed she would obey them. She asked the bishop whether he was one of the council. He answered, “No.” “You might well enough,” she said, “as the council goes now a-days.” And so she concluded with these words: “My lord, for your gentleness to come and see me, I thank you; but for your offering to preach before me, I thank you never a whit.”

Then the bishop was brought by Sir Thomas Wharton to the place where they dined, and was asked to drink. And after he had drunk, he paused a while, looking very sadly, and suddenly broke out into these words: “Surely I have done amiss.” “Why so?” said Sir Thomas Wharton. “For I have drunk,” he said, “in that place where God’s word offered, has been refused. Whereas, if I had remembered my duty, I should have departed immediately, and shaken the dust off my shoes for a testimony against this house.” These words were spoken by the bishop with such vehemence, that some of the hearers afterwards confessed their hair to stand upright on their heads. This done, the bishop departed, and so returned to his own house.

THE END OF THE NINTH BOOK

ACTS AND MONUMENTS

BOOK X.

CONTAINING

The entrance of Queen Mary to the crown, with the alteration of religion in the realm.

During the time of his sickness, when King Edward began to appear more feeble, a marriage was solemnized in the month of May, between the lord Guilford, son to the duke of Northumberland, and the lady Jane Grey, the duke of Suffolk's daughter. Her mother, then alive, was daughter to Mary, king Henry's second sister, who was first married to the French king, and afterwards to Charles duke of Suffolk. The marriage being concluded, and king Edward growing sicker every day, there seemed to be no hope of recovery. It was brought to pass by the consent not only of the nobility, but also of the chief lawyers of the realm, that the king by his testament should appoint the lady Jane, daughter to the duke of Suffolk, to be inheretrix to the crown of England, passing over his two sisters, Mary and Elizabeth.

The king's whole council subscribed to this, and the chief of the nobility, the mayor and city of London, and almost all the judges and chief lawyers of this realm, except justice Hales of Kent, a man favoring true religion, and also as upright a judge as any in this realm. He gave his consent to lady Mary, and would in no case subscribe to lady Jane. You shall hear more of this man (God willing) in the sequel of this history.

The causes laid against lady Mary, were that it was feared she would marry a foreigner, and thereby entangle the crown; and also that she would alter the religion used both in the days of King Henry her father, and also in the days of her brother King Edward, and so bring in the pope, to the utter destruction of the realm. This indeed afterwards came to pass, as will well appear by the sequel of this history.

When king Edward was dead, lady Jane Grey was established in the kingdom by the consent of the nobles, and was immediately proclaimed queen at London, and in other cities. There was little difference in age between this young damsel and king Edward, though in learning and knowledge of the tongues, she was not only equal, but also superior to him, being instructed by a master right nobly learned.

In the meantime, while these things were working at London, lady Mary, who knew of her brother's death, wrote to the lords of the council, as follows:

A letter of the Lady Mary, sent to the Lords of the Council, in which she claims the crown after the decease of King Edward.

“ My lords, we greet you well, and have received sure notice, that our dearest brother the king, our late sovereign lord, is departed to God's mercy; how woeful this news is to our heart. He only knows, to whose will and pleasure we must, and do humbly submit ourselves and our wills. But in this so lamentable a case, that is to wit, now after his majesty's departure and death, concerning the crown and governance of this realm of England, with the title of France, and all things belonging to it, what has been provided by act of parliament, and the testament and last will of our dearest father, besides other circumstances advancing our right, you know — the realm and the whole world knows. The rolls and records appear by the authority of the king our father, and the king our brother, and the subjects of this realm. So that we truly trust that there is no good true subject, who is, can, or would pretend to be ignorant of it, and of our part that we have caused of ourselves. And as God shall aid and strengthen us, we shall cause our right and title in this behalf to be published and proclaimed accordingly. And even if this

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

so weighty a matter seems strange, that our brother dying on Thursday night last past, we up to now had no knowledge from you about it. Yet we consider your wisdom and prudence to be such, that having oftentimes among you debated, pondered, and well weighed this present case with our estate, with your own estate, the commonwealth, and all our honors, we shall and may conceive great hope and trust, with much assurance in your loyalty and service, and therefore for the time interpret and take things not for the worst — and that you will, like noblemen, work the best. Nevertheless, we are not ignorant of your consultations, to undo the provisions made for our preferment, nor of the great bands and forcible provisions with which you are assembled and prepared, by whom and to what end, God and you know, and nature cannot but fear some evil. But if some political consideration, or whatever else has moved you to this, yet do not doubt, my lords, that we can take all these doings of yours in gracious part, being also right ready to remit and fully pardon the same, and do it freely to eschew bloodshed and vengeance against all those who can or will intend the same.

[675] A.D. 1553.

I also trust assuredly that you will take and accept this grace and virtue in good part as it pertains, and that we will not be forced to use the service of others, our true subjects and friends, which in this our just and right cause, God shall send us, in whom our whole affiance is. Therefore, my lords, we require you, and charge you, and each of you, that from your allegiance which you owe to God and us, and to no other, employ yourselves only for our honor and the safety of our person, and immediately upon receipt of this, cause our right and title to the crown and government of this realm to be proclaimed in our city of London, and other places, as seems good to your wisdom, and as pertains to this case, not failing of this as our very trust is in you. And this our letter, signed with our hand, shall be your sufficient warrant in this behalf.

“Given under our signet, at our Manor of Kenning
Hall, the 9th of July 1553.”

To this letter of the lady Mary, the lords of the council answered as follows:

Answer of the Lords to the Lady Mary's Letter.

“Madam, we have received your letter, dated the 9th of this month, declaring your supposed title, which you judge yourself to have to the imperial crown of this realm, and all the dominions belonging to it. For our answer to it, this is to notify you that, after the death of our sovereign lord Edward VI, a prince of most noble memory, our sovereign lady queen Jane is invested and possessed with the just and right title to the imperial crown of this realm, not only by good order of the ancient laws of this realm, but also by our late sovereign lord's letters patent, signed with his own hand, and sealed with the great seal of England, in the presence of most of the nobles, councilors, judges, with several others, grave and sage personages, assenting and subscribing to it. We must therefore, as the most bounden duty and allegiance, assent to her grace, and to none other, except we should (which faithful subjects cannot) fall into grievous and unspeakable enormities. Therefore we can do no less, but for the quiet both of the realm and you also, to notify you, that because the divorce made between the king of famous memory, king Henry VIII, and the lady Catharine your mother, was necessary to be had both by the everlasting laws of God, and also by the ecclesiastical laws, and by most of the noble and learned universities of Christendom, and confirmed also by the sundry acts of parliaments yet remaining in force, and thereby you were justly made illegitimate and unhereditary to the crown imperial of this realm. And the rules, and dominions, and possessions of the same, you will upon just consideration of this, and of diverse other causes, lawfully alleged for the same, and for the just inheritance of the right line and godly order taken by the late king our sovereign lord king Edward VI, and agreed upon by the nobles and

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

great personages aforesaid, cease by any pretense to vex and molest any of our sovereign lady queen Jane's subjects from their true faith and allegiance due to her grace: Assuring you, that if you will, out of respect, show yourself quiet and obedient (as you should) you will find us all and several ready to do you any service that we may with duty, and be glad with your quietness to preserve the common state of this realm in which you may otherwise be grievous to us, to yourself, and to them. And thus we bid you most heartily farewell.

“From the Tower of London, this 9th of July 1553.
“ Your ladyship's friends, showing yourself an obedient subject.

Thomas Canterbury.
The marquis of Winchester.
John Bedford.
R. Rich.
Huntington.
Darcy.
Cheyney.
William Northampton.
Thomas Ely, chancellor
Northumberland.
Henry Suffolk.
Henry Arundel.

Shrewsbury.
Pembroke.
Cobham.
R. Cotton.
John Gates.
W. Petre.
W. Cecil.
John Cheke.
John Mason.
Edward North.
R. Bowes.

After this answer, the lady Mary stole secretly away from the city, resting chiefly upon the good will of the commons, and yet perhaps not altogether destitute of the secret advice of some of the nobles. When the council heard of her sudden departure, they speedily gathered an army, and assigned the duke of Suffolk to take that enterprise in hand. But afterwards, changing their minds, they thought it best to send the duke of Northumberland, with other lords and gentlemen — and that the duke of Suffolk should keep the Tower, where the lord Guilford and the lady Jane Grey were lodged.

Meanwhile Mary withdrew into Norfolk and Suffolk, where she understood the duke's name was in much hatred, for the service he had done there under king Edward, in subduing the rebels. There she gathered to her aid whichever of the commons she could. at the same time keeping herself close within Framlingham Castle. There resorted to her, first of all, the Suffolk men. Always forward in promoting the gospel, they promised her their aid and help, provided she would not attempt an alteration of the religion, which her brother king Edward had previously established by publicly enacted law, and which was received by the consent of the whole realm.

She soon agreed to this condition, with such promises to them that no innovation would be made in the matter of religion, so that no man would or could then have doubted her. This promise, if she had as constantly kept it, as they willingly preserved her with their bodies and weapons, she would have done a deed both worthy of her blood, and would also have made her reign more stable for herself. For though a man is ever so mighty of power, breach of promise is an evil upholder of quietness, fear is worse, but cruelty is the worst of all.

Thus Mary, being guarded by the power of the protestants of Suffolk, vanquished the duke of Northumberland, and all those who came with him. In return for their aid it was (I think) a heavy word that she answered to the Suffolk men afterwards, who made supplication to her grace to perform her promise: “In that you, being but members, desire to rule your head, you shall one day well perceive that members must obey their head, and not look to bear rule over it.” And not only that, but also to cause more terror to others, a certain

gentleman named Master Dobbe, was punished for reminding her of her promise, being set three times on the pillory to be a gazing stock to all men. Others delivered books and supplications to her, drawn from the Scriptures, to exhort her to continue in the true doctrine then established; these were sent to prison. But such is the condition of man's nature that, for the most part, we are always more ready to seek friendship when we stand in need of help, than ready to requite a benefit once it is past and received.

Lady Mary Proclaimed Queen

The greatest help for the cause of the lady Mary, was the short journeys of the duke, which were previously assigned to him by commission. For the longer the duke lingered on his voyage, the more the lady Mary increased in power; and the more the hearts of the people were mightily bent to her. After the council at London perceived this, and understood how the common multitude withdrew their hearts from them to stand with her, and that certain noblemen began to go over to her, they also changed, and proclaimed the lady Mary, queen.

Thus the duke of Northumberland was left destitute and forsaken at Cambridge with some of his sons and a few others, among whom was the earl of Huntington. They were arrested there and brought to the Tower of London, as traitors to the crown. Thus Mary was made queen, and the sword of authority was put into her hand.

[676]

When she had thus been advanced by the Protestants of Suffolk, and saw all things quiet, as her enemies were conquered, and the duke sent to the Tower, she followed not long after. On the 3rd of August she was brought to London, to the great rejoicing of many men, but with a greater fear by many. Thus coming up to London, she took her first lodging at the Tower, where the lady Jane, with her husband the Lord Guilford, were imprisoned a little before her coming. There they remained waiting the queen's pleasure for more than six months. But the duke of Northumberland, within a month after his coming to the Tower, being adjudged to death, was brought forth to the scaffold and beheaded, August 22. Having received a promise and hope of pardon that if he would recant and hear mass, he consented, and denied in words that true religion which before, in king Henry VIII and in king Edward VI's days, he had declared himself both to favor and promote. He also exhorted the people to return to "the Catholic faith," as he termed it.

At the same time, the duke of Northumberland, with Sir John Gates, and Sir Thomas Palmer, were put to death. This Palmer, on the other side, confessed his faith, which he had learned in the gospel, and lamented that he had not lived more gospel-like. In the meantime queen Mary entering thus upon her reign with the blood of these men, besides hearing mass in the Tower, gave a sad sign that she would not stand to what she had promised so faithfully to the Suffolk men, concerning not altering the state of religion — especially by delivering Stephen Gardiner out of the Tower.

Other things also followed, which every day more and more discomfited the people, showing that the queen bore no good will to the present state of religion. She not only released Gardiner, but made him lord chancellor of England and bishop of Winchester (doctor Poynt being put out). Also, Bonner was restored to his bishopric, and Doctor Ridley was displaced. Doctor Day was appointed to the bishopric of Chichester; J. Scory was put out. Doctor Tunstall to the bishopric of Durham; Doctor Heath to the bishopric of Worcester (Hooper being committed to the Fleet.) Doctor Veysey was appointed to Exeter, and Miles Coverdale was put out. These things being perceived, great heaviness and discomfort grew more and more among all good men; so that there was now to be seen a miserable face of

things in the whole commonwealth of England. Those who could dissemble, took no great care in how the matter went; but those whose consciences were joined with the truth, perceived already the coals to be kindled, which would be the destruction of many a true Christian man. In the meanwhile, queen Mary moved from the Tower to Hampton Court, and caused a parliament to be summoned for the 10th of October.

You just heard how several bishops were removed, and others placed in their sees. Among them was Doctor Ridley, bishop of London, a worthy man both of fame and learning. This Doctor Ridley, in the time of queen Jane, had given a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, declaring his mind to the people as to the lady Mary, and dissuading them from favoring her. He alleged the incommunities and inconveniencies which might arise by receiving her as their queen, prophesying as it were, before that which afterwards came to pass, that she would bring in a foreign power to reign over them, besides subverting the Christian religion then established. He showed too, that Mary being in his diocese, according to his duty, he had labored much with her to turn her to his religion. Notwithstanding that in all other points of civility she showed herself sensible and tractable, yet in matters that concerned true faith and doctrine, she showed herself so stiff and obstinate that there was no other hope of her, but that she would disturb and overturn all that had been confirmed and planted by her brother before her. Shortly after this sermon, queen Mary was proclaimed, upon which Ridley repaired to Framingham to salute the queen, but had such cold welcome that, being spoiled of all his dignity, he was sent back upon a lame and halting horse to the Tower.

Queen Mary seeing things not yet going on according to her mind as she desired, devised with her council to bring that to pass by other means which she could not accomplish by open law. She set forth a prohibition by proclamation, besides other things, that no man should preach or read openly in churches the word of God.

A Prohibition of the Queen for Preaching, Printing, etc.

“The queen's highness well remembering what great inconveniencies and dangers have grown in her highness' realm in times past, through the diversity of opinions in questions of religion, and also hearing that since the beginning of her most gracious reign, the same contentions are again much revived, through certain false and untrue reports and rumors spread by some light and evil-disposed persons, has thought it good to make known to all her highness' most loving subjects, her most gracious pleasure in the following manner:

“First, her majesty now being, by the goodness of God alone, settled in her just possession of the imperial crown of this realm, and other dominions belonging to it, cannot now hide that religion which God and the world knows she has ever professed from her infancy. As her majesty is minded to observe and maintain this for herself by God's grace during her time, so her highness much desires, and would be glad that the same were quietly and charitably embraced by all her subjects.

“And yet she signifies to all her majesty's loving subjects, that of her most gracious disposition and clemency her highness does not mind to compel any of her subjects to it, until such time as further order may be taken in this by common assent. Nevertheless, forbidding all her subjects of all degrees, at their perils, to promote seditions, or stir unquietness in her people, by interpreting the laws of this realm according to their brains and fancies, but to quietly continue for the time, till (as said before) further order may be taken. And therefore she wills and straitly charges and commands all her good loving subjects to live together in a quiet way with Christian charity, leaving those new found devilish terms of *papist* or *heretic*, and such like ones, and applying their whole care, study, and travel to live in the fear of God, exercising their conversations in such charitable and godly doing, as their lives may indeed express that

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

great hunger and thirst of God's glory and holy word, which by rash talk and words many have pretended. And in so doing they shall best please God, and live without danger of the laws, and maintain the tranquility of the realm. As her highness shall be most glad of this, so if any man rashly presumes to make any assemblies of people, or at any public assemblies, or otherwise goes about stirring the people to disorder or disquiet, she minds, according to her duty, to see the same most severely reformed and punished according to her highness' laws.

"And furthermore, it is also well known that sedition and false rumors have been nourished and maintained in this realm, by the subtlety and malice of some evil-disposed persons who take it upon themselves, without sufficient authority, to preach and to interpret the word of God according to their own heads in churches, and in other places both public and private, and also by playing interludes, and printing false-found books, ballads, rhymes, and other improper treatises in the English tongue, concerning doctrine in matters now in question and controversy, regarding the high points and mysteries of Christian religion. These books, ballads, rhymes, and treatises are chiefly put up for sale by the printers and stationers to her grace's subjects, from an evil zeal for lucre and covetousness of vile gain. Her highness therefore straitly charges and commands all and each of her said subjects, of whatever state, condition, or degree they are, that none of them presume from now on to preach, or by way of reading in churches, or other public or private places, except in schools of the university, to interpret or teach any Scriptures, or any manner of points of doctrine concerning religion, nor to print any books, matter, ballad, rhyme, interlude, process or treatise, nor to play any interlude, unless they have her grace's special license in writing for the same, upon pain of incurring her highness' indignation and displeasure.

[677] A.D. 1553.

"And her highness also further charges and commands all and each of her subjects, that none of them, from their own authority, presume to punish and to rise against any offender in the causes aforesaid, or any other offender in words or deeds in the recent rebellion committed or done by the duke of Northumberland or his accomplices, or to seize any of their goods, or to violently use any such offender by striking, imprisoning, or threatening the same, but wholly to refer the punishment of all such offenders to her highness and the public authority, of which her majesty minds to see due punishment according to the order of her highness' laws.

"Nevertheless, as her highness does not intend hereby to restrain and discourage any of her loving subjects, to give from time to time true information against any such offenders in the causes aforesaid, to her grace or her council, for the punishment of every such offender, according to the effect of her highness' laws provided in that part. So her highness exhorts and strictly charges her subjects to observe her commandment and pleasure in every part aforesaid, as they will avoid her highness' indignation and most grievous displeasure. The severity and vigor of which, as her highness will be most sorry to have cause to put into execution, so she utterly determines not to permit such unlawful and rebellious doings of her subjects to remain unpunished, from which may ensue the danger of her royal estate, but to see her laws regarding these points to be thoroughly executed. Such extremities she trusts all her said subjects will foresee, dread, and avoid accordingly. Her highness straitly charges and commands all mayors, sheriffs, justices of peace, bailiffs, constables, and all other public officers and ministers, to diligently see to the observing and executing of her commandments and pleasure, and apprehend all those who willfully offend in this part, committing the same to the nearest jail, there to remain without bail or bond, till certificate is made to her highness, or her privy council, of their names and doings; and upon examination of their offenses, some further order shall be taken for their punishment to the example of others, according to the effect and tenor of the laws aforesaid.

"Given at our manor of Richmond, the 18th of August,
in the first year of our most prosperous reign."

Master Bourne Preaching at St. Paul's Cross.

About this time, or not long before, Bonner, bishop of London, being restored, appointed Master Bourne (a canon of St. Paul's) to preach at the Cross. Afterwards he was made bishop of Bath and Wells. Bourne taking occasion of the gospel of that day to say something largely justifying Bonner who was then present. "This Bonner," he said, "had preached upon the same text in that place, on that day four years earlier, and was most cruelly and unjustly cast into the most vile dungeon of the Marshalsea for the same; and there he was kept during the time of king Edward." His words sounded so badly in the ears of the hearers, that they could not keep silence, and began to murmur and stir, so that the mayor and aldermen who were then present, greatly feared an uproar. One person hurled a dagger at the preacher, but who it was could not then be proved; though afterwards it became known.

Indeed, the stir was such, that the preacher drew in his head, and dared appear no more in that place. The matter of his sermon tended much to the dispraise of king Edward, which the people could not bear. Then Master Bradford, at the request of the preacher's brother and others, stepped up and spoke so mildly, Christianly, and effectually, that with a few words he appeased all. Afterwards, he and Master Rogers conducted the preacher between them from the pulpit to the grammar school, where they left him safe. But for this they were shortly after both rewarded with long imprisonment, and last of all, with fire in Smithfield!

Because of this tumult at St. Paul's Cross, an order was made by the lords of the council, and sent to the mayor and aldermen of London, desiring that they call the next day a common council of the city, and charge every householder to have their children, apprentices, and other servants, keep their own parish churches on the holydays, and not allow them to attempt to break the peace. They were also commanded to signify to the assembly the queen's determination — which was that her grace did not mean to compel other men's consciences otherwise than God puts into their hearts a persuasion of the truth that she herself believed in.

It was also ordered that every alderman in his ward should immediately send for the curates of every parish, and warn them not only to forbear preaching themselves, but also not to allow any others to preach or make any open or solemn reading of the Scriptures in their churches, unless the preachers were licensed by the queen.

The next day after this sermon at St. Paul's Cross, the queen's guard was at the Cross with their weapons to guard the preacher. And when the people withdrew themselves from the sermon, an order was given by the mayor, that the elders of all companies should be present so as to make a congregation, lest the preacher be discouraged by his small auditory.

On the 15th of August A.D. 1553, one William Butler was committed to the Marshalsea, for uttering words against Master Bourne, for his sermon at St. Paul's Cross.

On the 16th of August, Humfrey Palden was committed to the Compter, for words against Bourne's sermon at St. Paul's Cross.

A letter was sent to the sheriffs of Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, to apprehend Fisher, parson of Ammersham, a preacher.

Another letter was sent to the bishop of Norwich, not to allow any preacher or other to preach or expound the Scriptures openly without special license from the queen.

The same day, Master Bradford, Master Vernon, and Master Beacon, preachers, were committed to the charge of the lieutenant of the Tower.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

The same day also, Master John Rogers, preacher, was commanded to keep himself prisoner in his own house at St. Paul's, without having any conference with any others than those of his own household.

On the 22nd of August, two letters were directed to Master Coverdale, bishop of Exeter, and Master Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, to immediately repair to the court, and there attend the council's pleasure.

The same day, Fisher, parson of Ammersham, made his appearance before the council, according to their letter of the 16th of August, and was appointed the next day to bring in a note of his sermon.

On the 24th of August, one John Melvin, a Scotchman and preacher, was sent to Newgate, in London, by the council.

On the 28th of August, a letter was sent to the mayor of Coventry and his brethren, for the apprehension of one Sanders, then vicar of St. Michael's in Coventry, and to send him up to the council, with his examinations and other matters they could charge him with; and with a commission to punish all those who had, by means of his preaching, used any talk against the queen's proceedings.

On the 26th of August, Master Hooper, bishop of Worcester, made his personal appearance before the council, according to their letters of the 22nd of August.

On the 31st of August, Master Coverdale, bishop of Exeter, made his appearance before the council, according to their letters of the 22nd of August.

On the 1st of September, Master Hooper and Master Coverdale appeared again before the council. Master Hooper was committed to the Fleet, and Master Coverdale commanded to attend the lords' pleasure.

On the 2nd of September, Master Hugh Sanders, vicar of St. Michael's in Coventry, was before the council for a sermon, and was commanded to appear again on the Monday following.

[678]

The 4th of September, a letter was directed from the council to Master Hugh Latimer for his appearance before them.

About the 5th of September, Peter Martyr came to London from Oxford, where for a time he had been commanded to keep to his house, and found there the archbishop of Canterbury, who offered to defend the doctrine of the book of Common Prayer, both by the scriptures and the doctors, assisted by Peter Martyr and a few others, as you will hear later. But while they were in hope of coming to disputations, the archbishop and others were imprisoned; Peter Martyr was allow to return.

The same day a letter was sent to the mayor of Coventry to set Hugh Symonds at liberty, if he would recant his sermon, or if not, to detain him in prison.

On the 13th of September, Mr. Hugh Latimer appeared before the council, according to their letter of the 4th of September, and was committed as a close prisoner to the Tower.

The same day, the archbishop of Canterbury appeared before the council, and was commanded to appear the next day before them in the star-chamber.

On the 14th of September, the archbishop of Canterbury made his appearance before the lords in the star-chamber; where they charged him with treason and spreading abroad seditious bills to the disquieting of the state. They committed him to the Tower of London, there to remain till further sentence, or order, at the queen's pleasure.

On the 15th of September, a letter was sent to Master Horn, dean of Durham, for his appearance before them; another was sent to him on the 7th of October, for his speedy appearance.

On the 16th of September, letters were sent to the mayors of Dover and Rye, to permit all French protestants to pass out of this realm, except those who were signified to them by the French ambassador.

Queen Mary's Coronation

On the first day of October, queen Mary was crowned at Westminster, and on the tenth day of the same month the parliament began with the solemn mass of the Holy Spirit, in the popish manner, which was celebrated with great pomp in the palace of Westminster. According to the custom, the bishops should have come to this mass, among the other lords. Those bishops who remained undeposed were the archbishop of York; Doctor Taylor, bishop of Lincoln; and John Harley, bishop of Hereford. Of these bishops, Taylor and Harley presented themselves according to their duty. They took their places among the lords. But after they saw the mass begin, and not being able to bear the sight, they withdrew. For this, the bishop of Lincoln being examined, and protesting his faith, he was commanded to attend; but not long afterwards he died by sickness. Harley, because he was married, was excluded both from the parliament and from his bishopric.

Mass being done, the queen, accompanied by the estates of the realm, was brought into the parliament house, to enter and begin the consultation. At this consultation or parliament, all statutes were repealed that were made in the time of king Henry VIII for *praemunire*, and statutes made by king Edward VI for the administration of common prayer and the sacrament in the English tongue. And further, the attainder of the duke of Northumberland was confirmed by this parliament. In the meantime, many men were forward in erecting altars and masses in churches. And of those persons who would adhere to the laws made in king Edward's time, till others were established, some were marked and some apprehended. Among them was Sir James Hales, a knight of Kent and justice of the Common Pleas. Although he had risked his life in queen Mary's cause — in that he would not subscribe to disinheriting her by the king's will — yet because at a quarter sessions he charged people upon the statutes made in the time of king Henry VIII and Edward VI for the supremacy and religion, he was imprisoned. He was so cruelly handled and put in fear by the talk that the warden of the Fleet used to have in his hearing, of the torments being prepared for heretics (or for what other cause God knows), he sought to rid himself of this life by wounding himself with a knife. Afterwards he was content to say whatever they desired of him. Upon this he was discharged; but he never rested till he had drowned himself in a river, half a mile from his house in Kent.

During the time of this parliament, the clergy likewise held a convocation, with a disputation also appointed by the queen's command, at St. Paul's church in London. In the convocation, Master John Harpsfield, bachelor of divinity, gave a sermon to the clergy. After the sermon, it was agreed by the bishops, that those of the clergy-house, to avoid confusion of words, should choose a prolocutor. Doctor Weston, dean of Westminster, was named to this office by common assent, and presented to the bishops with an oration by Master Pye,

dean of Chichester, and Master Wimbisley, archdeacon of London. Doctor Weston being chosen and brought to the bishops, he made his oration to the house, with a response by Bishop Bonner.

Disputations at London about the Sacrament

After these things were arranged in the convocation-house, they proceeded next to the disputation appointed by the queen's command, about the matter of the sacrament. This disputation lasted six days. In this, Doctor Weston was chief on the pope's part. He behaved himself outrageously in taunting and checking. Some of those who disputed on the other side were compelled to flee, some to deny, and some to die, though to most men's judgments who heard the disputation, they had the advantage. This may appear by the report of the disputation, a copy of which we annex here:

*The true Report of the Disputation had and begun in the
Convocation-house at London, the 18th of Oct. A.D. 1553,
written by one who was present at it.*

Act of the First Day.

First, on Wednesday, the 18th of October, Doctor Weston the prolocutor certified to the house, "that it was the queen's pleasure, that they, being learned men, should debate on matters of religion, and constitute laws which her grace and the parliament would ratify. And as there is a book recently set forth, called *the Catechism* bearing the name of this honorable synod, and yet put out without your consent as I have learned, being a very pestiferous book, and full of heresies, and likewise a very abominable Book of Common Prayer, I thought it therefore best to begin with the articles of the catechism concerning the sacrament of the altar, to confirm the natural presence of Christ in the same, and also transubstantiation. Therefore, it shall be lawful on Friday next ensuing for all men to freely speak their conscience on these matters, so that all doubts may be removed, and they be fully satisfied in them."

Act of the Second Day,

On Friday, the 20th of October, when men thought they should have entered upon the disputation of the questions proposed, the prolocutor exhibited two bills to the house. One was for the natural presence of Christ in the sacrament of the altar; the other concerned the catechism, that they did not agree to it. He required all to subscribe to the bills, as he himself had done. The whole house immediately assented, except six, who were Philips, dean of Rochester; Haddon, dean of Exeter; Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester; Cheyney, archdeacon of Hereford; Ailmer, archdeacon of Stow; and Young, chanter of St. David's. While the rest were about to subscribe these two articles, John Philpot stood up and spoke concerning the articles of the catechism, that it bears the title of the synod of London last before this, even though many of them who were then present, were never made privy to it in setting it forth. That was because this house had granted authority to make ecclesiastical laws to certain persons appointed by the king's majesty. Therefore it might well be said to be done in the synod of London, even if those who are of this house now, had no notice of it before its promulgation.

[679] A.D. 1553.

And he said, concerning the article of the natural presence in the sacrament, that it was against order, and also very prejudicial to the truth, that men should be moved to subscribe before the matter was thoroughly examined. He therefore made this request to the prolocutor; that as there were so many learned men present on that side, and as on the other side there were no more than five or six who had not subscribed, and so that equality might therefore be

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

had in this disputation, he desired that the prolocutor would arrange that some of those who set forth the catechism, might be brought to the house to show what moved them to set it forth; also that Doctor Ridley and Master Rogers, with two or three more, might have leave to be present at this disputation, and be associated with them. This request was thought reasonable, and was proposed to Bishop Bonner, but he refused to allow it.

The Act of the Third Day.

On Monday the 23rd of October, at the time appointed, in the presence of many earls, lords, knights, gentlemen, and others of the court and of the city, the prolocutor made a protestation, that the house had appointed this disputation, not to call the truth into doubt, but that these challengers might be resolved of their argument.

Then he demanded of Master Haddon, whether he would reason against the questions proposed or not. He answered that he had certified before in writing, that he would not, since the request of such learned men as were demanded to assist them would not be granted. Master Ailmer likewise was asked, who gave the prolocutor the same answer. He added that they had already done too much prejudice to the truth, to subscribe before the matter was discussed: and that it would avail little or nothing to reason for the truth, since they were now determined to the contrary. After this, he demanded of Master Cheyney whether he would propose his doubts concerning transubstantiation or not. "Yes," he said, "I would gladly have my doubts resolved, which do not move me to believe transubstantiation.

"The first is out of St. Paul to the Corinthians, who, speaking of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, often calls it 'bread' *after* the consecration.

"The second is out of Origen, who, speaking of this sacrament, says that, 'the material part goes down to the excrements.'

"The third is out of Theodoret, who, mentioning the sacramental bread and wine *after* the consecration, says that, 'they do not go out of their former substance, form, and shape.'"

Then the prolocutor assigned Doctor Moreman to answer him. As to St. Paul, he answered that, "The sacrament is indeed called *bread* by him; but it is to be understood thus: that it is the *sacrament* of bread, that is, the *form* of bread."

Then Master Cheyney alleged that Hesychius called the sacrament both bread and flesh.

"Yes," said Moreman, "Hesychius calls it bread, because it was bread, and not because it is so." And passing over Origen, he came to Theodoret, and said, "Men mistook his authority, by interpreting a general into a special, as Peter Martyr has done, interpreting *ousia* as substance, which is a special signification of the word; whereas *ousia* is a general word, referring to accidents as well as substance. And therefore I answer thus to Theodoret: that the sacramental bread and wine do not go out of their former substance, form, and shape; that is to say, not out of their accidental substance and shape."

After this Master Cheyney sat down, and Master Ailmer stood up as one who could not bear to hear such an answer to so grave an authority. He reasoned upon the authority of Theodoret alleged before by Master Cheyney, and declared that, "Moreman's answer to Theodoret was not a just or sufficient answer, but an illusion and subtle evasion, contrary to Theodoret's meaning. For, if *ousia*, 'substance,' signified an accident in the place alleged, then it was a superfluous word there, as there two other words follow which sufficiently signify the accidents of the bread, which are 'shape' and 'form.'

After this John Philpot stood up and said that, "Doctor Moreman's interpretation was incorrect, and that it could not be taken to signify an accidental substance, as he would interpret it. For the occasion of Theodoret's writing plainly showed that was a vain cavil; for

the dispute was with Eutyches, a heretic, whether the body and human nature of Christ had an existence distinct from the divine nature? Eutyches said that Christ, in his human nature, having ascended into heaven, and being joined there to the divinity, was absorbed or swallowed up, so that Christ became of one divine substance only. Theodoret writes against this opinion, and by the similitude of the sacrament, he proves the contrary against the heretic. He proves that, just as in the sacrament of the body of Christ, after the consecration, there is the substance of Christ's humanity, with the substance of bread, remaining as it was before, not being absorbed by the humanity of Christ, but joined by the divine operation. Even so in the person of Christ, now being in heaven, of whom this sacrament is a representation, there are two substances, that is, his *divinity* and *humanity* united in one person, which is Christ, the humanity not being absorbed by the conjunction of the divinity, but remaining in his former substance.

"And this similitude," said Philpot, "brought in by Theodoret to confound Eutyches, would have proved nothing at all, if the very substance of the sacramental bread did not remain as it did before. But if Doctor Moreman's interpretation for transubstantiation took its place, then the heretic would have made a strong argument to maintain his heresy, and to prove himself a good Christian man. He might well say to Theodoret, that just as after the consecration in the sacrament, the substance of the bread is transubstantiated into the human body of Christ, so in the sacrament it is now but the one substance of humanity, and not the substance of bread as it was before. Even so, Christ's humanity ascending up by the power of God into heaven, and joined to the Deity, was likewise turned into one substance with the Deity; so that now there remains but one divine substance in Christ. This is no more than saying in the sacramental signs of the Lord's Supper, after the consecration, there remains but one substance, according to that construction."

In answering this, Doctor Moreman staggered. Philpot perceiving his defect, said, "Well, Master Moreman, if you have no answer ready at present, I pray you devise one, if you can conveniently, against our next meeting here again."

The prolocutor was grievously offended by that, telling him that he should not boast there; but that he would be fully answered. Then Philpot said, "It is the thing that I desire, to be answered directly in this behalf; and I desire of you, and of the whole house, that I may be sufficiently answered, which I am sure you are not able to do." No other answer was then made to Philpot's argument, except that he was commanded to silence. Then the dean of Rochester stood up, offering to argue against the natural presence, wishing that the Scriptures, and the ancient doctors, might be weighed and followed in this point. And against this natural presence, he thought the saying of Christ, in St. Matthew, was sufficient. He said of himself, "The poor you will always have with you, but me you will not always have." ^{Mat 26.11} This," he said, "was spoken concerning the natural presence of Christ's body. Therefore we should believe as he taught, that Christ is not naturally present on earth in the sacrament of the altar."

To this it was answered by the prolocutor that, "we would not always have Christ present to bestow alms upon him, but upon the poor, which is all that was intended there."

But the dean prosecuted his argument, and further showed it out of St. Augustine, that this interpretation of the Scriptures was not a sufficient answer. Augustine writes in his fiftieth Treatise upon St. John, in this way, on the same sentence: "When Jesus said, 'Me you will not always have with you,' he spoke of the presence of his body. For by his *majesty*, by his *providence*, by his unspeakable and invisible *grace*, that is fulfilled which is said by him, 'Behold I am with you until the consummation of the world.' ^{Mat 28.20}

[680]

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

But in the *flesh* which the Word took upon himself, in that which was born of the Virgin, in that which was apprehended by the Jews, which was crucified on the cross, which was let down from the cross, which was wrapped in grave clothes, which was hid in the sepulcher, which was manifested in the resurrection, ‘You will *not* always have me with you. Why? For he was conversant with his disciples in a bodily presence for forty days, and they accompanying him, seeing and not following him, He ascended, and is not here. ^{Act 1.9} For *there* he sits at the right hand of the Father; and yet *here* he is, because he is not departed in the presence of his majesty. In another manner, we always have Christ by the presence of his majesty, but in the presence of his flesh it is rightly said, ‘You shall not truly have me always with you.’ For the church had him in the presence of his flesh a few days; and now it apprehends him by faith, and does not see him with eyes.”

Doctor Watson took it upon himself to answer to this authority, and said he would answer St. Augustine by St. Augustine. Having a book of notes in his hand, he alleged out of the seventieth Treatise upon St. John, that we do not now have Christ on earth in that mortal condition and manner, as he was before his passion.”

Against his answer John Philpot replied, and said that, “Master Watson had not fully answered St. Augustine by St. Augustine, as he would seem to have done; for in the place mentioned above by the Dean of Rochester, he not only teaches the mortal state of Christ’s body before his passion, but also the immortal condition of that body after his resurrection. St. Augustine plainly seems to affirm that Christ is not present on the earth in this mortal body, neither in visible form, nor invisibly in corporal substance.”

Nothing else being answered to this, the dean of Rochester proceeded in his argument, and read out of a book of annotations, sundry authorities to confirm it. Moreman, who was appointed to answer him in this, gave no direct answer, but bid him to make an argument, saying, “The Dean recited many words of doctors, but he has not made one argument.”

Then the dean said, “The authorities of the doctors recited by me, are sufficient arguments to prove my intent; my desire is to be answered by you.” But still Moreman cried out to make an argument, to shift away from the authority which he could not answer. After this, the dean made this argument out of the institution of the sacrament: “‘Do this in remembrance of me: and thus you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.’ ^{1Cor 11.25-26} The sacrament is the remembrance of Christ; and therefore the sacrament is not truly Christ; for he has not yet come — for these words, ‘Until he comes,’ plainly signify the absence of Christ’s body.” Then the prolocutor went about to show that these words, “Until he comes,” did not import any absence of Christ on the earth; but he answered nothing directly to the purpose.

In conclusion, the dean fell to questioning with Moreman, whether Christ ate the paschal lamb with his disciples or not? Moreman answered, “Yes.” Further, the dean demanded whether he likewise ate the sacrament with them, as he instituted it? Moreman answered, “Yes.” Then he asked what he ate, and whether he ate his own natural body, as they imagine it or not? When Moreman had affirmed this, the dean then said, “It is a great absurdity;” and so he sat down. Philpot stood up and argued against this absurdity, saying that he could prove by good reason deduced out of the Scriptures, that Christ did not eat his own natural body at the institution of the sacrament. And the reason is this: receiving Christ’s body has a promise of remission of sins annexed to it; but Christ’s own eating of the sacrament had no promise of remission of sin; and therefore, in the sacrament Christ did not eat his own body.

Moreman denied this reasoning, that the sacrament had a promise of remission of sins annexed to it.

Then Philpot showed the promise in the sacrament, “Which is given for you, which is shed for you, for the remission of sins.” But Moreman would not acknowledge that this was any

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

promise. He drove Philpot to the sixth of St. John, to confirm his saying with these words: "The bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

Moreman answering nothing directly to this argument, Harpsfield stood up in his behalf, to supply what was lacking. Thinking to answer Philpot, he confirmed his argument more strongly, saying, "You mistake the promise which is annexed to the body of Christ in the sacrament. For it did not pertain to Christ, but to his disciples, to whom Christ said, 'This is my body which is broken for you,' and not broken for Christ himself."

"You have said well in my favor," replied Philpot, "for *that* is my argument. The promise of the body of Christ had no effect in Christ. I therefore conclude, Christ did not eat his own body."

Then the prolocutor said the argument was null. For by a like argument he might go about to prove that Christ was not baptized, because the remission of sin, which is annexed to baptism, had no effect in Christ. To which Philpot replied, that as Christ was baptized, so he ate the sacrament; but he took baptism on himself, not that he needed it, or that it had any effect on him, but that our Master gave the church an example to follow him in the administration of the sacrament, and thereby to exhibit himself *to us*, and not to give himself *to himself*.

No more was said in this point. But afterwards the prolocutor demanded of Philpot, whether he would argue against the natural presence or not? He answered, "Yes, if he would hear his argument without interruption. and assign some *one* to answer him, and not *many*, which is a confusion to the opponent, especially for him who had a bad memory." By this time the night had come on. Therefore the prolocutor broke up the disputation for that time, and appointed Philpot to be the first who would begin the disputation the next day, concerning the presence of the sacrament.

The Act of the Fourth Day.

On Wednesday, the 20th of October, John Philpot was ready for the disputation, intending first to make a certain oration, and a true declaration in Latin, of the matter of Christ's presence, which was then in question. The prolocutor perceiving this, forbade Philpot to make any oration or declaration of any matter, commanding him also that he should make no argument in Latin, but to conclude his argument in English.

Then Philpot said. "This is contrary to your order taken at the beginning of this disputation. For then you appointed that all the arguments should be made in Latin, and upon that I have drawn and devised all my arguments in Latin." But the prolocutor still bid him to form an argument in English, or else hold his peace.

Then Philpot said, "You have sorely disappointed me, to go thus suddenly from your former order. But I will comply with your command, leaving my oration apart; and I will come to my arguments. But before I submit any argument, I will in one word declare what manner of presence I disallow in the sacrament, so that the hearers may better understand to what end and effect my arguments will tend — not to utterly deny the presence of Christ in his sacrament, truly ministered according to his institution; but only to deny that gross and carnal presence, which you of this house have already subscribed to, is in the sacrament of the altar, contrary to the true and manifest meaning of the Scriptures; that by transubstantiation of the sacramental bread and wine, Christ's natural body should, by virtue of the words pronounced by the priest, be contained and included under the forms or accidents of bread and wine. I deny this kind of presence imagined by men," continued Philpot, "and I will reason against it." But before he could make an end of what he would have said, he was interrupted by the prolocutor, and commanded to come to his argument.

[681] A.D. 1553.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Philpot being offended, fell down upon his knees before the earls and lords who were present there, some of whom were of the queen's council, beseeching them that he might have liberty to prosecute his arguments without interruption by any man. This was gently granted him by the lords. But the prolocutor would not permit him, and still cried, "Hold your peace, or else make a short argument." "I am about it," said Philpot; "if you will let me alone. But first I must ask a question of my respondent (who was Doctor Chedsey) concerning a word or two of your supposition, that is, of the sacrament of the altar — what he means by it, and whether he takes it as some of the ancient writers do, terming the Lord's Supper *the sacrament of the altar*; partly because it is a sacrament of that lively sacrifice which Christ offered for our sins upon the altar of the cross, and partly because Christ's body, crucified for us, was that bloody sacrifice which the blood-shedding of all the beasts offered upon the altar in the old law, prefigured and signified to us. Or whether you take it otherwise, such as for the sacrament of the altar, which is made of lime and stone, over which the sacrament hangs, and to be all one with the sacrament of the mass, as it is at present in many places. This done, I will direct my arguments accordingly, as your answer gives me occasion.

Then Chedsey made this answer, that it is their supposition they took the sacrament of the *altar*, and the sacrament of the *mass*, to be all one.

"Then," said Philpot, "I will speak plain English, as Master Prolocutor wishes me to, and make a short resolution about it — that the sacrament of the altar, which you reckon to be all one with the mass, once justly abolished, and now put in full use again, is no sacrament at all; nor is Christ in any way present in it." He offered to prove this statement before the whole house, if they chose to call him to it. Likewise he offered to confirm the same before the queen's grace, and her most honorable council, before the face of six of the best learned men of the house of the contrary opinion, and would except none. "And if I am not be able," he said, "to maintain by God's word what I have said, and to confound those who will take it upon themselves to withstand me in this point, let me be burdened with as many faggots as are before the court gates in London." He uttered this with great vehemency of spirit.

The prolocutor, with others, were very much offended at this, demanding of him whether he knew what he said, or not? "Yes," said Philpot, "I know well what I say," desiring no man to be offended with his saying; for he spoke no more than he was able to prove by God's word. "And praised be God," he continued, "that the queen's grace has granted us this house (as our prolocutor has informed us) so that we may *freely utter* our consciences in these matters of controversy in religion. And therefore I will freely speak my conscience here, grounded upon God's holy word, for the truth, even if some of you here present dislike it."

Then several of the house, beside the prolocutor, taunted and reprehended him for speaking this way against the sacrament of the mass; and the prolocutor threatened him, that he would send him to prison if he would not cease speaking in that manner.

Philpot seeing himself thus abused, and not permitted to declare his mind with free liberty, fell into an exclamation, casting his eyes up towards heaven, and said, "O Lord, what a world is this, that the truth of your holy word may not be spoken and adhered to?" And for very sorrow and heaviness, the tears trickled from his eyes.

After this, the prolocutor being moved by some who were about him, was content that Philpot should make an argument, provided he would be brief. "I will be as brief," said Philpot, "as I may conveniently be in uttering all that I have to say. And I will begin to ground my arguments upon the authority of the Scriptures, upon which all the building of our faith ought to be grounded; and I shall confirm the same by ancient doctors of the church. I take the first argument out of the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, from the saying of the angel at the sepulcher,

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

saying, 'He is risen, he is not here;' and in St. Luke, in the 23rd chapter, the angel asks why they sought the living among the dead?

Likewise the scripture testifies that Christ is risen, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father: all of which is spoken of his natural body; and therefore his natural body is not included in the sacrament on earth.

"I will confirm this yet more effectually, by the saying of Christ in the sixteenth chapter of St. John; 'I came from the Father, and have come into the world.' Again, 'I leave the world, and go to the Father.' ^{Joh 16.28} By this coming and going he meant of his natural body. Therefore we may affirm that his body is not found in the world.

"But here I expect," he continued, "to be answered with a distinction of visibly and invisibly; that he is visibly departed in his humanity, but notwithstanding, he remains invisibly in the sacrament. I will prove that no such distinction ought to take away the force of that argument, by the answer which Christ's disciples gave to him, speaking these words; 'Now you speak plainly and utter no proverb.' ^{Joh 16.29} St. Cyril interpreting these words, said that, 'Christ spoke without any manner of ambiguity or obscure speech.' And therefore I conclude that if Christ spoke plainly, and without parable, saying, 'Again, I leave the world and go to the Father;' then that obscure, dark and imperceptible presence of Christ's natural body in the sacrament upon earth invisibly, *contrary* to the plain words of Christ, should not be allowed. For nothing can be more uncertain or more parabolical and insensible, than to say so."

Then Doctor Chedsey took it upon himself to reply. First, to the saying of the angel, "That Christ is not here;" ^{Mat 28.6} and, "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" ^{Luk 24.5} He said that these sayings did not pertain to the presence of Christ's natural body in the sacrament, but that they were spoken of Christ's body in the sepulcher, when they thought he was still in the grave. And therefore the angel said: "Why do you seek the living among the dead?" And as to the authority of the sixteenth chapter of St. John, where Christ says, "Now I leave the world and go to the Father;" he meant that of his ascension. And so likewise did Cyril, interpreting the saying of the disciples, who knew plainly that Christ would visibly ascend into heaven; but that does not exclude the *invisible* presence of his natural body in the sacrament. For St. Chrysostom, writing to the people of Antioch, affirms the same, comparing Elijah and Christ, and Elijah's cloak and Christ's flesh. "Elijah," he said, "when he was taken up in the fiery chariot, left his cloak behind him, for his disciple Elisha. Christ, ascending into heaven, took his flesh with him, and also left his flesh behind him." Whereby we may right well gather that Christ's flesh has visibly ascended into heaven, and still invisibly abides in the sacrament of the altar.

To this Philpot replied, "You have not directly answered the saying of the angel: 'Christ is not here, but is risen,' because you have omitted what was the chief point of it all. For I proceed further, as thus: He is risen, ascended, and sits at the right hand of God the Father, ^{Col 3.1} and therefore he is not remaining on the earth. Neither is your answer to Cyril sufficient. But by and by I will return to your interpretation of Cyril, and more plainly declare it, after I have first disposed of the authority of Chrysostom. His is one of the chief arguments that you allege, to affirm your gross carnal presence in the sacrament — being well weighed and understood, it does not pertain to it at all."

The prolocutor startled at this, that one of the chief pillars in this point should be overthrown. And therefore he recited the authority in Latin first, and afterwards in English, willing that all who were present, should note that saying of Chrysostom, which he thought invincible on their side. "But I will make it appear," said Philpot, "that it does little for your purpose." And as he was about to declare his mind, the prolocutor interrupted him, as he did almost continually. Philpot, not being content, said; "Mr. Prolocutor thinks that he is in a sophistry school, where

he knows right well the manner is that, when the respondent perceives that he is likely to be forced with an argument to which he is not able to answer, he does what he can with cavil and interruption to drive him from it.”

[682]

Philpot’s statement was badly taken by the prolocutor and his adherents. The prolocutor said that Philpot could bring nothing to avoid that authority, but his own vain imagination. “Hear,” said Philpot, “and afterwards judge. For I will do with this, as in all other authorities with which you charge me, in refuting any of my arguments, answering either by sufficient authorities of Scripture, or else by some other testimony with yours, and not of my own imagination. And concerning the saying of Chrysostom, I have two ways to drive him from your purpose — the one out of the Scriptures, the other out of Chrysostom himself, in the place alleged by you.

“First, where he seems to say that Christ ascending took his flesh with him, and also left his flesh behind him, it is truth. For we all confess and believe that Christ took on him our human nature in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and through his passion he has united us to his flesh. And thereby we have become one flesh with him, so that Chrysostom might right well say that Christ ascending took his flesh away with him, which he received from the Virgin Mary; and also left his flesh behind him, His flesh is we who are his elect in this world; we who are the members of Christ, and flesh of his flesh. St. Paul, in the fifth chapter to the Ephesians, testifies of this saying, ‘We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.’ ^{Eph 5:30} If any man replies that he treats the *sacrament* there, so that this interpretation cannot so aptly be applied to him in that place, then I will interpret Chrysostom yet another way, by himself. For in that place, a few lines before those words recently read here, are these words: ‘that after Christ ascended into heaven, he left his flesh to us, indued with his sacraments in mysteries, that is, *sacramentally*.’ And Christ leaves that mystical flesh to his church in the sacrament of baptism, as well as in the sacramental bread and wine. St. Paul justly witnesses to this, saying; ‘As many of us as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ.’ ^{Gal 3:27} And thus you may understand that St. Chrysostom does nothing for your carnal and gross presence in the sacrament, as you wrongfully take him.”

Now, in the meanwhile Master Pye whispered to the prolocutor in the ear, to silence Philpot, and to appoint some other, lest he shake their carnal presence if he held on long, seeing that in the beginning he gave one of their chief foundations such a blow. Then the prolocutor said to Philpot that he had reasoned enough, and that some other should now take his place. But Philpot was not well content, saying, “Why, sir, I have a dozen arguments concerning this matter to be proposed, and I have scarcely gone over my first argument.”

“Well,” said the prolocutor, “you will speak no more now; and I command you to hold your peace.” “You perceive,” replied Philpot, “that I have stuff enough for you, and am able to withstand your false supposition, and therefore you command me to silence.” “If you will not give way,” said the prolocutor, “I will send you to prison.” “This is not,” answered Philpot, “according to your promise made in this house; nor yet according to your boast made at St. Paul’s Cross, that men would be answered in this disputation, with whatever they can say, since you will not allow me to prosecute one out of a dozen arguments.”

Then Master Pye took it upon himself to promise that he might answer another day. Philpot, seeing that he might not proceed in his purpose, and being justly offended, ended. He said, “A number of you here, who up to now have lurked in corners, and dissembled with God and the world, are now gathered together to suppress the sincere truth of God’s holy word, and to set forth every false device, which you are not able to maintain by the catholic doctrine of the Scriptures.”

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Then Master Ailmer stepped forward, chaplain to the duke of Suffolk, whom Master Moreman took it upon himself to answer. Master Ailmer objected several authorities to confirm the argument he took in hand the day before, to prove that “substance” in the sentence of Theodoret, brought in by Master Cheyney, must signify ‘substance,’ and not ‘accidents.’ His reasons, because they were all grounded and brought out of the Greek, I pass over, because they lack their grace in English, and also their proper understanding. But his allegations so encumbered Doctor Moreman, that he desired a day to reply to them; for at that instant he was without a convenient answer.

Then the prolocutor called Master Haddon, dean of Exeter, and chaplain to the duke of Suffolk, who prosecuted Theodoret’s authority in confirming Master Ailmer’s argument. Doctor Watson took it upon himself to give an answer. He was confounded that he was not able to answer to the word ‘Mysterium.’ But as he seemed to have doubts in this, Master Haddon took out of his bosom a Latin author to confirm his saying, and showed it to Master Watson, asking him whether he thought that translation was true, or that the printer was in any fault. “There may be a fault in the printer,” said Watson, “for I do not remember this word.” Then Master Haddon took out of his bosom a Greek book, in which he showed with his finger the same words, which Master Watson could not deny.

Then Mr. Perne stepped forth, and declared his mind against transubstantiation, whom the prolocutor answered, saying, “I much marvel, Mr. Perne, that you will say thus; for on Friday last you subscribed to the contrary.” Master Palmer disliked this, saying to the prolocutor that “he was to blame to so reprehend any man, partly because this house is a house of free liberty for every man to speak his conscience, and partly because you promised yesterday, that notwithstanding what any man had subscribed, he would have free liberty to speak his mind.”

The Act of the Fifth Day.

On Friday, the 27th of October, Dr. Weston, the prolocutor, first propounded the matter, showing that the convocation had already spent two days in disputation about one only doctor (who was Theodoret), and only about one word, which was “substance.” Yet they had come the third day to answer all things that could be objected, so that they would shortly put together their arguments. So Master Haddon, dean of Exeter, desired leave to oppose Master Watson who, with two others (that is, Morgan and Harpsfield), was appointed to answer. Master Haddon demanded this of him, whether any substance of bread or wine remained after the consecration? Then Master Watson asked him again, whether he thought there was a real presence of Christ’s body or not? Master Haddon said, “It was not fitting or order-like that the one appointed to be respondent should be opponent, and he whose duty was to object should answer.” Yet Master Watson for a long while would not agree to answer. But that being granted, at last an order was set, and Master Haddon had leave to proceed with his argument.

Then he proved by Theodoret’s words, that the substance of bread and wine remained. For these are his words, “They were the same before the sanctification, which they are after.” Master Watson said that Theodoret did not mean the same substance, but the same essence. Whereupon they were driven again to discussing the Greek word “substance.” Then Master Watson answered that it did not have that signification only. But Master Haddon proved that it must signify so in that place. Then he asked Master Watson, when did the bread and wine become symbols? He answered, “after the consecration, and not before.” Then Master Haddon argued that Theodoret says, that what the bread and wine were before they were symbols, they remain the same in nature and substance after they are symbols; and as they were bread and wine before, therefore they are still bread and wine afterwards.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Then Mr. Watson fell to the denial of the author, and said he was a Nestorian. He desired that he might answer Master Cheyney who stood by, because he was more fit to dispute in the matter, because he had granted and subscribed to the real presence.

[683] A.D. 1553.

Master Cheyney desired patience of the honorable men to hear him, trusting that he would so open the matter, that the truth would appear; that he would be no author of schism, nor hold anything contrary to the holy mother church, which is Christ's spouse. Doctor Weston liked this well, and commended him highly, saying that he was a well-learned and sober man, and well exercised in all good learning and in the doctors; and finally, a man fit for his knowledge to dispute in that place. "I pray you hear him," he said. Then Master Cheyney desired those who were present to pray two words with him to God, and to say, *vincat Veritas*, "may truth prevail," and have the victory. And all who were present cried with a loud voice, "*Vincat Veritas, vincat Veritas.*"

Then Doctor Weston said to him, that it was hypocritical. Men may better say, *vicit Veritas*, "truth has got the victory." Master Cheyney said that if he would give him leave, he would bring it to that point, that he might well say so.

Then he began with Master Watson in this way: "You said that Master Haddon was unfit to dispute, because he does not grant the natural and real presence. But I say you are much more unfit to answer, because you take away the substance of the sacrament"

Master Watson said. "He had subscribed to the real presence, and would not go away from that." So Weston said also, and the rest of the priests. So that for a great while he could have no leave to say any more, till the lords spoke, and desired that he should be heard.

Then he told them what he meant by his subscribing to the real presence, far otherwise than they supposed. So then he went forward, and prosecuted Master Haddon's argument, and said that when they could not answer, they went to deny the author; and therefore he proved the author to be a catholic doctor; and that being proved, he further confirmed what was said of the nature and substance.

Then Master Watson was forced to say that the substance of the body, in the former part of the similitude of Theodoret, signified quantity, and other *accidents* of sacramental tokens, and not the very *substance* of the same. For according to philosophy, the accidents of things are seen, and not their substances.

Then Master Cheyney appealed to the honorable men, and desired that they would give no credit to them in so saying. For if they were to think as they teach, after their lordships had rode forty miles on horseback, they would not be able to say at night, that they saw their horses all day, but only the *color* of their horses. And by this reasoning, Christ must go to school, and learn from Aristotle to speak. For when he saw Nathanael under the fig-tree, if Aristotle had stood by, he would have said, "No, Christ, you did not see him, but only *the color of him.*"

Then it was said by Watson: "Suppose that Theodoret is with you, who is someone that we never heard of till two or three years ago. Yet he is only one, and what is one against the whole consent of the church?" After this, Master Cheyney inferred that not only Theodoret was of that mind (that the substance of bread and wine remain), but others also.

Then Master Harpsfield was called in to see what he could say in the matter. He told a fair tale of the omnipotence of God, and of the imbecility and weakness of man's reason. He said that "it was convenient, whatever we saw, felt, or tasted, not to trust our senses." And he told a tale out of St. Cyprian, how a woman saw the sacrament burning. "And that which burned there," said Harpsfield, "burns here, and becomes ashes; but what was burnt he could not tell." But

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Master Cheyney continued and forced them with this question: "What was burnt? It was either the substance of bread, or else the substance of the body of Christ, which was too great an absurdity to grant." At length they answered, "it was a miracle." Master Cheyney smiled and said, "he could at that rate say no more."

Then Master Weston asked of the company present whether those men were sufficiently answered or not? Certain priests cried, "Yes;" but they were not heard at all for the great multitude, who cried "No, no." This cry was heard almost to the end of St. Paul's. Doctor Weston being much moved, answered bitterly that, "he did not ask for the judgment of the rude multitude and unlearned people, but of those who are of the house. Then he asked of Master Haddon and his fellows, whether they would answer them three other days? Haddon, Cheyney, and Ailmer said, "No." But Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester, stood up and said that they should not say so, for they should be answered. And though all others refused to answer them, yet he would not. He offered to answer them all, one after another. The prolocutor was not content with his proffer, but railed on him, saying "he should go to Bedlam." The archdeacon soberly answered him that, "he was more worthy to be sent there, who used himself so ragingly in that disputation." Then Dr. Weston rose and said,

"All the company have subscribed to our article, except these men. What their reasons are you have heard. We have answered them for three days, on the promise (it pleased him to descant, without truth, for no such promise was made) that they would answer us as long as the order of disputation requires, and if they are able to defend their doctrine, let them do so,"

Then Master Ailmer stood up, and proved how vain a man Weston was; for he affirmed that they never promised to dispute, but only to open and testify to the world what they believed in their consciences. For when they were required to subscribe, they refused, and said that they would show good reasons which moved them, as they had done partly already, and were still able to do more sufficiently, so that they could not in their consciences subscribe. "Therefore," he said, "it has been wrongly called a disputation, and they were worthy to be blamed who were the authors of that name. For we did not mean to dispute, nor do we now mean to answer, till our arguments which we have to propound, are solved as it was appointed. For by answering, we would but encumber ourselves, and profit nothing; since the matter is already decreed upon and determined, whatever we prove to the contrary."

The Act of the Sixth Day.

On Monday following, the 30th of October, the prolocutor demanded of John Philpot, archdeacon of Winchester, whether he would answer to the questions previously propounded to their objections or not? He gave this answer, that he would willingly do so, if according to their former determination, they would first answer some of his arguments, as they promised to do, of which he had a dozen, not half of which had yet been decided. And if they would answer fully and sufficiently to one of his arguments, he promised that he would answer all the objections that they might bring forth.

Then the prolocutor bade him to propound his argument, and it would be answered by one of them. Master Morgan was appointed to this. "On last Wednesday," he said, "I was forced to silence before I had prosecuted half my argument. The sum of it was this (as was gathered by the just context of the Scripture), that the human body of Christ had ascended into heaven, and placed at the right hand of God the Father. Therefore it could not be situated upon earth in the sacrament of the altar, invisible, according to the imagination of man." The argument was denied by Morgan. Philpot said this was the one with which he had to confirm his first argument, if they would have allowed him the other day, as he now trusted they would. It was to this effect: that to be bodily present, and to be bodily absent; to be on earth, and to be in heaven; and all at one and the same time, are things contrary to the nature of a human body.

And therefore it cannot be said of the human body of Christ, that the self-same body is both in heaven and also on earth at one instant, either visibly or invisibly.

[684]

In his answer, Morgan denied the first part of the argument. Philpot said that one of our bodies cannot receive in itself anything contrary to the nature of a body, such as to be in St. Paul's Church and at Westminster at one instant, or to be at London visibly and at Lincoln invisibly, at one time — for that is contrary to the nature of a body. So too, he concluded that the body of Christ could not be in more places than one; it is in heaven, and therefore it cannot be contained in the sacrament of the altar.

Philpot added that St. Peter in the sermon that he made in the third chapter of the Acts, mentioning Christ, used these words, "Whom the heavens must receive until the restitution of all things," etc. ^{Act 3.21} These words are spoken of his humanity. If heaven must hold Christ, then he cannot be here on earth, in the sacrament, as it is pretended.

Morgan laughed at this, and gave no answer. Harpsfield stood up, one of the bishops of London's chaplains, and took it upon himself to answer to the statement of St. Peter, and demanded of Philpot, whether he would of necessity force Christ to any place, or not?

Philpot said, that he would not otherwise force Christ of necessity to any place, than he is taught by the words of the Holy Spirit, which say that Christ's human body must abide in heaven until the day of judgment.

"Why," said Harpsfield, "do you not know that God is omnipotent?" "Yes," said Philpot, "I know that right well; nor do I doubt anything at all of his omnipotence. But of Christ's omnipotence. what he *may* do is not our question, but rather what he *does*. I know he may make a stone in the wall into a man, if he will, and also that he may make more worlds, but does he therefore do so? It would not be a good consequent to so conclude, that he may do this or that, and therefore he does it."

"Why," said the prolocutor, "then you would put Christ in prison in heaven." To which Philpot answered, "Do you reckon heaven to be a *prison*? God grant us all to come to that prison."

After some further arguing, Morgan asked Philpot whether he would be ruled by the universal church, or not?

"Yes," he said, "if it is the true catholic church. And since you speak so much of the church, I would be glad if you would declare what the church is."

"The church," replied Morgan, "is diffused and dispersed throughout the whole world." "That is a diffuse definition," said Philpot, "for I am as uncertain as I was before, what you mean by *the church*. I acknowledge no church but that which is grounded and founded on God's word, as St. Paul said, 'Upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets,' and upon the scriptures of God."

"What," asked Moreman, "was the Scripture before the church?" "Yes," said Philpot. "But I will prove no," replied Moreman. "The church of Christ was before any Scripture was written."

Philpot said that, "All prophecy uttered by the Spirit of God, was counted to be Scripture before it was written in paper and ink, because it was written in the hearts, and graven in the minds — yes, and inspired in the mouths of good men, and of Christ's apostles by the Spirit of Christ; just as the salutation of the angel was the Scripture of Christ, and the word of God, before it was written." At that Moreman cried, "Fie, fie!" wondering that the Scripture of God should be considered Scripture before it was written, and affirmed that he had no knowledge who could speak so.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Philpot answered that, "Concerning knowledge for the testing of the truth about the questions in controversy, he would wish himself no worse matched than with Moreman."

The prolocutor was grievously offended at this, saying that it was arrogantly spoken by Philpot, to compare himself with such a worshipful learned man as Moreman, being himself an unlearned man, indeed a madman, more fit to be sent to Bedlam than to be among such learned and grave men as were assembled there, and a man who would never be answered, and one that troubled the whole house. And therefore he commanded him to come into the house no more, demanding of the house whether they would agree to this. A great company answered, "Yes." Then Philpot said again, that he might think himself a happy man who was out of this company.

After this Morgan rose up and whispered to the prolocutor in the ear. And then the prolocutor spoke to Philpot, and said, "Lest you slander the house, and say that we will not allow you to declare your mind, we are content that you should come into the house as you have done before, provided you are apparelled with a long gown and a tippet, as we are, and that you shall not speak but when I command you." "Then," Philpot said. "I would rather be absent altogether." Weston concluded all by saying, "You have the *word*, but we have the *sword*;" which showed the opinion in which this disputation was carried on.

They carried on reasoning in this manner until at length, about the 13th of December, queen Mary sent her commands to Bonner bishop of London, that he should dissolve and break up the convocation.

During the time of this disputation, on the 20th of November, the mayor of Coventry sent up to the lord's of the council, Baldwin Clarke, J. Carelesse, Thomas Wilcocks, and Richard Estelin, for their behavior upon Allhallows-day. Carelesse and Wilcocks were committed to the Gatehouse, and Clarke and Estelin to the Marshalsea.

On the same day, a letter was directed to Sir Christopher Heydon, and Sir William Farmer, knights, for the apprehension of John Huntington, preacher, for making a rhyme against Dr. Stokes and the sacrament. Appearing before the council on the 3rd of December, he was again allowed to depart, upon his humble submission and promise to amend himself in doctrine as well as in living.

In the days of king Henry VIII, and also king Edward VI after him, some noblemen, bishops, and others, were cast into the Tower. Some were charged with treason, such as Lord Courtney and the Duke of Norfolk; some for the pope's supremacy, and suspicious letters tending to sedition, such as Tunstall, bishop of Durham; and others for other things, all of whom continued prisoners till queen Mary ascended the throne. The queen granted their pardon, and restored them to their former dignities. Gardiner bishop of Winchester, she not only delivered out of captivity, but also advanced to be high chancellor of England. To the lord Courtney she showed such favor, that she made him Earl of Devonshire, so that there was a suspicion that she would marry him; but that proved otherwise.

At the same time, Bonner also had been prisoner in the Marshalsea; Queen Mary likewise delivered him, and restored him to the bishopric of London, displacing Dr. Ridley, with other good bishops, as is mentioned above; namely, Cranmer, from Canterbury; the archbishop of York; Poinet from Winchester; John Hooper from "Worcester; Barlow from Bath; Harley from Hereford; Taylor from Lincoln; Ferrar from St. Davids; Coverdale from Exeter; Scory from Chichester, etc., with a great number of archdeacons, deans, in brief, all such beneficed men who were married, or adhered to their profession. All were removed

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

from their livings, and others of the contrary sect were placed in them; such as Cardinal Pole, who was then sent for; Gardiner, Heath, White, Day, Troublefield, etc.

As for Cranmer, rumor was spread about him in London, that he had recanted, and caused mass to be said at Canterbury. To clear himself, he published a declaration of his constancy, protesting that he neither had done so, nor intended to do so. He added that if it would so please the queen, he, with Peter Martyr and others, would in open disputation sustain the cause of the doctrine taught and set forth in the days of king Edward VI, against all persons. But while he was in expectation to have this disputation, he was laid fast in the Tower with other bishops, and Peter Martyr was permitted to depart the realm.

After this, in the month of November, archbishop Cranmer, though he had refused to subscribe to the king's will in disinheriting Mary (alleging many grave reasons for her legitimacy), was arraigned in the Guildhall of London, and attainted of treason, with the lady Jane Grey, and three of the duke of Northumberland's sons.

[685] A.D.1554.

At the entreaty of certain persons, they were again taken to the Tower, and kept there. Cranmer being pardoned of the treason, stood only in the action of doctrine, which they called heresy, of which he was right glad.

This being done in November, the people, and especially the churchmen, perceiving the queen so eagerly set upon her old religion, likewise began in their quires to set up the pageant of St. Catharine, and of St. Nicholas, and of their processions in Latin, in all their old solemnity.

When the month of December had come, the parliament broke up. In this parliament, the queen's marriage with king Philip, the emperor's son, had been moved.

In the meanwhile, cardinal Pole being sent for by queen Mary, was requested by the emperor to stay with him, so that his presence in England would not be a hindrance to the marriage which he intended between his son Philip and queen Mary. For this marriage, he sent a most ample embassy, with full power to contract the marriage.

On the 13th of January, A.D. 1554, Dr. Crome, for preaching on Christmas-day without a license, was committed to the Fleet.

On the 21st of January, Master Thomas Wootton, for matters of religion, was committed a close prisoner to the Fleet.

The Death of Lady Jane Grey.

The death of the lady Jane Grey had now been determined. Two days before her death, the queen sent Master Fecknam, afterwards abbot of Winchester, to commune with her, and to turn her from the doctrine of Christ to queen Mary's religion, the effect of which follows:

The Communication had between the Lady Jane and Fecknam.

Fecknam. — Madam, I lament your heavy case, and yet I do not doubt that you bear out this sorrow of yours with a constant and patient mind.

Jane. — You are welcome to me, sir, if your coming is to give Christian exhortation. And as for my heavy case (I thank God) I do so little lament it, that I rather account it a more manifest declaration of God's favor to me, than He ever showed me at any time before. And therefore

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

there is no cause why either you, or others who bear me good will, should lament or be grieved with my case, being a thing so profitable for my soul's health.

Fecknam. — I have come to you, sent from the queen and her council, to instruct you in the true doctrine of the right faith; although I have such great confidence in you, that I will have, I trust, little need to labor with you much in this.

Jane. — I heartily thank the queen's highness, who is not unmindful of her humble subject. And I hope likewise that you will no less do your duty both truly and faithfully, according to what you were sent for.

Fecknam — What is then required of a Christian man?

Jane. — That he should believe in God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, three persons in one Godhead.

Fecknam. — What? Is there nothing else to be required or looked for in a Christian, but to believe in Him?

Jane. — Yes, we must love Him with all our heart, with all our soul, and with all our mind, and our neighbor as ourself.

Fecknam. — Why, then faith does not justify nor save.

Jane. — Yes, truly, faith alone justifies (as St. Paul says).

Fecknam. — Why, St. Paul says, If we have all faith without charity, it is nothing.

Jane. — It is true; for how can I love him whom I do not trust? or, how can I trust him whom I do not love? Faith and love go together, and yet love is comprehended in faith.

Fecknam. — How shall we love our neighbor?

Jane. — To love our neighbor is to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, and give drink to the thirsty, and to do to him as we would do to ourselves.

Fecknam. — Why, then it is necessary to salvation to do good works also, and it is not sufficient only to believe.

Jane. — I deny that, and I affirm that faith alone saves. But it is fit for a Christian, in token that he follows his Master, Christ, to do good works; yet we may not say that they profit to our salvation. For "when we have done all, yet we are all unprofitable servants," and faith alone in Christ's blood saves us.

Fecknam. — How many sacraments are there?

Jane. Two. The one is the sacrament of baptism, and the other is the sacrament of the Lord's supper.

Fecknam. — No, there are seven.

Jane. — By what Scripture do you find that?

Fecknam. — Well, we will talk of that later. But what is signified by your two sacraments?

Jane. — By the sacrament of baptism I am washed with water, and regenerated by the Spirit, and that washing is a token to me that I am the child of God. The sacrament of the Lord's supper offered to me, is a sure seal and testimony that I am, by the blood of Christ, which he shed for me on the cross, made partaker of the everlasting kingdom.

Fecknam. — Why, what do you receive in that sacrament? Do you not receive the very body and blood of Christ?

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Jane. — No, surely, I do not believe so. I think that at the supper I neither receive flesh nor blood, but bread and wine, which bread when it is broken, and the wine when it is drunk, puts me in remembrance that the body of Christ was broken for my sins, and his blood shed on the cross, and with that bread and wine I receive the benefits that come by the breaking of his body, and shedding of his blood for our sins on the cross.

Fecknam. — Why, does Christ not speak these words, “Take, eat, this is my body?” Do you require you any plainer words? Does he not say it is his body?

Jane. — I grant that he says so; and so he says, “I am the vine,” “I am the door:” but he is never the more the door nor the vine. Does not St. Paul say, “He calls things that are not as though they were?” God forbid that I should say that I eat the very natural body and blood of Christ. For then either I would pluck away my redemption, or else there were two bodies, or two Christs. One body was tormented on the cross, and if they ate another body, then he had two bodies. Or if his body were eaten, then it was not broken upon the cross, or if it was broken upon the cross, then it was not eaten by his disciples.

Fecknam. — Why, is it not just as possible that Christ by his power could make his body to be both eaten and broken, and to be born of a woman without the seed of a man, as to walk upon the sea, and other such miracles as he wrought by his power only?

Jane. — Yes, if God wished to have performed any miracle at his supper, he might have done so. But I say that then he intended no work nor miracle, but only to break his body, and to shed his blood on the cross for our sins. But I pray you to answer me this one question — Where was Christ when he said, “Take, eat, this is my body?” Was he not at the table when he said so? He was alive at that time, and did not suffer till the next day. What did he take but bread, what did he break but bread ‘And what he give but bread? Look, what he took, he broke; and look, what he broke, he gave; and look, what he gave, they ate. And yet all this while he himself was alive, and at supper before his disciples, or else they were deceived.

Fecknam. — You ground your faith upon those authors who say and unsay both in a breath, and not upon the church, to which you ought to give credit.

Jane. — No, I ground my faith on God’s word, and not upon the church. For if the church is a good church, the faith of the church must be tried by God’s word, and not God’s word by the church, nor yet my faith. Shall I believe the church because of antiquity? Or shall I give credit to the church that takes away from me half of the Lord’s supper, and will not let any man receive it in both kinds?

[686]

If they refuse these things to us, then they refuse to us part of our salvation. And I say that it is an evil church, and not the spouse of Christ, but the spouse of the devil, that alters the Lord’s supper, and both takes from it, and adds to it. To that church say, God will add plagues, and from that church He will take their part out of the book of life. (Rev 22.18-19) Do they learn that from St. Paul, when he administered both kinds to the Corinthians? Shall I believe this church? God forbid.

Fecknam. — That was done with a good intent for the church, to avoid a heresy that sprung up from it.

Jane. Why, shall the church alter God’s will and ordinance for good intent? What did king Saul do? The Lord God forbids it.

With these and such like persuasions he would have had her lean to the church of Rome, but he could not prevail. There were many more things of which they reasoned, but these were the chief.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

After this, Fecknam took his leave, saying that he was sorry for her: “For I am sure,” he said, “that we two shall never meet.”

“It is true,” she said, “that we shall never meet, unless God turns your heart. For I am assured, unless you repent and turn to God, you are in an evil case. And I pray God, in his infinite mercy, to send you his Holy Spirit. For he has given you His great gift of utterance, if it pleased Him also to open the eyes of your understanding.”

A Letter of the Lady Jane sent to her Father.

“Father, although it has pleased God to hasten my death by you, by whom my life should rather have been lengthened, yet I can so patiently take it, as I yield God more hearty thanks for shortening my woeful days, than if all the world had been given to my possession with life lengthened at my own will. And although I am well assured of your impatient temper, redoubled manifold ways, both in bewailing your own woe, and especially (I hear) my unfortunate state, yet, my dear father (if I may, without offense, rejoice in my own misfortunes), I think I may account myself blessed in this, that washing my hands with the innocence of my fact, my guiltless blood may cry before the Lord, “Mercy to the innocent.” And yet, though I must acknowledge that being constrained, and as you know well enough, continually assayed, I seemed to consent in taking it upon me, and in this I grievously offended the queen and her laws. Yet I assuredly trust that my offense towards God is so much the less, in that, being in so royal estate as I was, my forced honor never blended with my innocent heart. And thus, good father, I have opened to you the state in which I stand at present. Though death is at hand, which to you, perhaps, it may seem right woeful, to me there is nothing that can be more welcome, than from this vale of misery to aspire to that heavenly throne of all joy and pleasure with Christ our Savior. In his steadfast faith (if it may be lawful for the daughter to so write to the father) the Lord who up to now has strengthened you, so continue you, that at the last we may meet in heaven with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.”

A Letter written by the Lady Jane, in the end of the New Testament in Greek, which she sent to her sister, the Lady Catharine, one night before she suffered.

“I have here sent to you, good sister Catharine, a book, which although it is not outwardly trimmed with gold, yet inwardly it is more worth than precious stones. It is the book, dear sister, of the law of the Lord. It is his testament and last will which he bequeathed to us wretches. It will lead you to the path of eternal joy. And if with a good mind you read it, and with an earnest mind purpose to follow it, it will bring you to an immortal and everlasting life. It will teach you to live, and learn you to die. It will win you more than you would have gained by the possession of your woeful father’s lands. For as, if God had prospered him, you would have inherited his lands, so if you diligently apply this book, seeking to direct your life after it, you shall be an inheritor of such riches, as neither the covetous shall withdraw from you, nor thief shall steal, nor yet the moths corrupt. Desire with David, good sister, to understand the law of the Lord God. Live still to die, so that by death you may purchase eternal life. And do not trust that the tenderness of your age will lengthen your life; for if God calls, the young go as soon as the old; and labor also to learn to die. Defy the world, deny the devil, and despise the flesh, and delight yourself only in the Lord. Be penitent for your sins, and yet do not despair; be strong in faith, and yet do not presume; and desire with St. Paul to depart, and to be with Christ, with whom even death is life. Be like the good servant, and wake even at midnight, lest when death comes and steals upon you as a thief in the night, you are, with the evil servant, found sleeping; and lest for lack of oil, you be found like the five foolish virgins; and like the one who did not wear the wedding garment, and then you are cast out from the marriage. Rejoice in Christ, as I do. Follow the steps of your Master, Christ, and take up your

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

cross. Lay your sins on his back, and always embrace him. And as to my death, rejoice as I do, good sister, that I shall be delivered from this corruption, and put on incorruption. For I am assured, that for losing a mortal life, I shall win an immortal life, which I pray to God to grant to you, and to send you of His grace to live in his fear, and to die in the true Christian faith, from which, in God's name, I exhort you, that you never swerve, neither for hope of life, nor for fear of death. For if you will deny his truth to lengthen your life, God will deny you, and yet shorten your days. But if you will cling to him, he will prolong your days to your comfort and his glory. To this glory God brings me now, and you hereafter, when it pleases him to call you. Fare you well, good sister, and put your only trust in God, who alone must help you."

We give here a certain prayer, made by the lady Jane, in the time of her trouble:

"O Lord, you God and Father of my life, hear me, a poor and desolate woman, who flies to you alone, in all troubles and miseries. You, O Lord, are the only defender and deliverer of those who put their trust in you. And therefore, being defiled with sin, encumbered with affliction, unquieted with troubles, wrapped in cares, overwhelmed with miseries, vexed with temptations, and grievously tormented with the long imprisonment of this vile mass of clay, my sinful body, I come to you, O merciful Savior, craving your mercy and help, without which so little hope of deliverance is left, that I may utterly despair of any liberty. Although it is expedient, seeing that our life stands upon trying, we should be visited sometime with some adversity, whereby we might both be tried whether we are of your flock or not, and also know you and ourselves the better. Yet you who say you would not suffer us to be tempted above our power, be merciful to me now, a miserable wretch, I beseech you; who with Solomon cries to you, humbly desiring you, that I may neither be too much puffed up with prosperity, nor too much pressed down with adversity, lest being too full, I might deny you my God, or being brought too low, I might despair, and blaspheme you my Lord and Savior. O merciful God, consider my misery, best known to you; and now be to me a strong tower of defense, I humbly request of you. Suffer me not to be tempted above my power; but either be a deliverer to me out of this great misery, or else give me grace to patiently bear your heavy hand and sharp correction. It was your right hand that delivered the people of Israel out of the hands of Pharaoh, which for four hundred years oppressed them, and kept them in bondage. Let it therefore likewise seem good to your Fatherly goodness, to deliver me, a sorrowful wretch, for whom your Son Christ shed his precious blood on the cross, out of this miserable captivity and bondage in which I am now. How long will you be absent? forever?

[687] A.D. 1554.

"Lord, have you forgotten to be gracious, and have you shut up your loving-kindness in displeasure? Will you no longer be entreated? Has your mercy clean gone forever, and your promise come utterly to an end forevermore? Why do you make so long tarrying? Shall I despair of your mercy, O God? Far be that from me. I am your workmanship created in Christ Jesus; give me grace therefore to tarry your time, and to patiently bear your works, assuredly knowing that as you *can*, so you *will* deliver me when it pleases you, not at all doubting or mistrusting your goodness towards me; for you know better what is good for me than I do. Therefore do with me in all things what you will, and plague me whatever way you will. Only in the meantime arm me, I beseech you, with your armor, that I may stand fast, my loins being girded about with truth, having on the breastplate of righteousness, and shod with the shoes prepared by the gospel of peace; above all things, taking to myself the shield of faith, with which I shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked; and taking the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is your most holy word; praying always with all manner of prayer and supplication, that I may refer myself wholly to your will, abiding your pleasure, and comforting myself in those troubles that it pleases you to send me. Seeing such troubles are profitable for me, and seeing I am assuredly persuaded that all that you do cannot

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

be but well. Hear me, O merciful Father, for His sake, whom you would be a sacrifice for my sins. To whom with you, and the Holy Spirit, be all honor and glory. Amen. “

It remains now to describe the manner of her execution, with her words and behavior at the time of her death.

When she ascended the scaffold, she said to the people standing thereabout; “Good people, I have come here to die, and by a law I am condemned to the same. The fact against the queen’s highness was unlawful, and consenting to it by me. But regarding the procurement and desire of this by me or on my behalf, I wash my hands of it in innocence before God, and the face of you, good Christian people, this day.” And with that she wrung her hands, in which she had her book. Then she said, “I pray you all, good Christian people, to bear me witness that I die a true Christian woman, and that I look to be saved by no other means than by the mercy of God in the blood of his only Son Jesus Christ. And I confess, that when I knew the word of God, I neglected it, loved myself and the world, and therefore this plague and punishment has happily and worthily happened to me for my sins. And yet I thank God, that of his goodness he has thus given me a time and respite to repent. And now, good people, while I am alive, I pray you to assist me with your prayers.” And then kneeling down, she turned her to Fecknam, saying, “Shall I say this psalm?” And he said, “Yes.” Then she repeated the psalm “Have mercy on me, O God,” etc., in English, in the most devout manner throughout to the end; and then she stood up, and gave her maiden Mistress Ellen her gloves and handkerchief, and her book to Master Bruges; after which she untied her gown, and the hangman pressed upon her to help her off with it. But desiring him to let her alone, she turned towards her two gentlewomen, who helped her off with it; and also with her frowes, paaft, and neckerchief, giving to her a fair handkerchief to fold about her eyes.

Then the hangman knelt down and asked her forgiveness, whom she forgave most willingly. Then he desired her to stand upon the straw; which doing so, she saw the block. Then she said, “I pray you dispatch me quickly.” Then she knelt down, saying, “Will you take it off before I lay me down?” And the hangman said, “No, madam.” Then she tied the handkerchief about her eyes, and feeling for the block, she said, “What shall I do? Where is it? Where is it? One of the standers-by guiding her, she laid her head down upon the block, and then stretched forth her body, and said, “Lord, into your hands I commend my spirit,” and so finished her life, in the year 1554, on the 12th of February.

Thus the lady Jane was beheaded, and with her also the lord Guilford her husband, one of the duke of Northumberland’s sons, two innocents in comparison with those who sat in judgment upon them. For they ignorantly accepted what the others had willingly devised, and by open proclamation, they consented to take from others, and give to them.

Not long after the death of the lady Jane, on the 21st of the same month, Henry Duke of Suffolk was also beheaded at Tower Hill, on the 4th day after his condemnation. About this time also were condemned for this conspiracy, many gentlemen and yeomen, some of which were executed at London, and some in the country. Among their number was also the lord Thomas Grey, brother to the duke. Sir Nicholas Throgmorton barely escaped.

Queen Mary Assails the Reformation

The 24th of the same month (A.D. 1554) Bonner, bishop of London sent down a commission, directed to all the curates and pastors of his diocese, for taking the names of those who would not come during the following Lent to auricular confession, and to the receiving at Easter. A copy of this monition follows here:

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

A Monition of Bonner Bishop of London, sent down to all and singular Curates of his Diocese, for certifying the Names of those who would not come to Confession in Lent, and receiving at Easter.

“Edmund by the permission of God, bishop of London, to all parsons, vicars, curates, and ministers of the church within the city and diocese of London, sends grace, peace, and mercy, in our Lord everlasting. Because by the order of the ecclesiastical laws and constitutions of this realm, and the laudable usage and custom of the whole catholic church, by many hundreds of years ago, duly and devoutly observed and kept, all faithful people being of lawful age and discretion, are bound once a year at least, unless reasonable cause excuses them, to be confessed to their own proper curate, and to receive the sacrament of the altar, with due preparation and devotion. And also because we are credibly informed, that sundry evil-disposed and undevout persons, given to sensual passions and carnal appetites, following the lusts of their body and utterly neglecting the health of their souls, forbear to come to confession according to the said usage, and to receive the sacrament of the altar accordingly, thereby giving a pernicious and evil example to the younger sort, to neglect and contemn the same. Minding the reformation of this for our own discharge, and desirous of good order to be kept, and good example to be given, we will and command you by virtue of this, that immediately upon the receipt of this our commandment, you and every one of you within your cure and charge, use all your diligence and dexterity to declare the same, straitly charging and commanding all your parishioners, being of lawful age and discretion, to come to confession before next Easter, according to the said ordinance and usage, with due preparation and devotion to receive the said sacrament of the altar; and that you note the names of all those who are not confessed to you, and do not receive from you the said sacrament, certifying to us or our chancellor or commissary of this, before the 6th of April next ensuing from the date of this. So that knowing thereby who did not come to confession, and receiving the sacrament accordingly, we may proceed against them, as being culpable persons, and transgressors of the said ecclesiastical law and usage. Further, also certifying us, our said chancellor, or commissary, before the aforesaid day, whether you have your altars set up, chalice-book, vestments, and all things necessary for mass, and the administration of sacraments and sacramentals, with procession, and all other divine service prepared and in readiness, according to the order of the catholic church, and the virtuous and godly example of the queen’s majesty.

[688]

And if you have not, then you with the churchwardens, cause the same to be provided for signifying by whose fault and negligence the same lack or fault proceeded, and generally of your parishioners not coming to church, undue walking, talking, or being irreverent during divine service, and of all other open faults and misdemeanors, not omitting to do this, and certify as before, as you will answer upon your peril for the contrary.

“Given at London, 23rd of February, in the year 1554.”

The month following, which was the month of March, on the 4th day of the month, a letter was sent from the queen to Bonner, bishop of London, with certain articles annexed, to be put into speedy execution, requiring among other things, that all the clergy who had married should be removed from their parishes, unless they abandoned their wives and did penance for their marriage, as may appear by these articles:

“Every bishop, and all other persons aforesaid, proceeding summarily, and with all celerity and dispatch, may and shall deprive, or declare deprived, and remove, according to their learning and discretion, all such persons from their benefices and ecclesiastical promotions, who contrary to the state of their order, and the laudable custom of the church, have married and used women as their wives, or otherwise notably and slanderously disordered or abused

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

themselves — sequestering also, during the said process, the fruits and profits of the said benefices and ecclesiastical promotions.

“The said bishop, and all other persons aforesaid, shall use more lenity and clemency with those who have married, whose wives are dead, than with others whose wives remain alive. And likewise, those priests are to be used more favorably who, with the consent of their wives or women openly in the presence of the bishop, profess to abstain. In this case, after the penance is effectually done, the bishop may, according to his discretion and wisdom, upon just consideration, receive and admit them back to their former administration, if it is not in the same place, appointing them such a portion to live upon, to be paid out of their benefice of which they are deprived, by discretion of the said bishop or his officer, as he shall think may be spared of the said benefice.

“Every bishop, and all other persons aforesaid, shall foresee that they do not allow any religious man, having solemnly professed celibacy, to continue with his woman or wife, but that all such persons after deprivation of their benefice or ecclesiastical promotion, also be divorced every one from his said woman, and due punishment otherwise taken for the offense in this.”

The queen also sent her rescript to the lord mayor of London to the same effect, who issued the following letter accordingly to the aldermen, etc.:

“On the queen’s behalf, our most gracious and most benign sovereign, we most straitly charge and command you, that you, the said aldermen, do not fail to personally call before your own person in such a place within your said ward, as seems to you most convenient and fitting, upon next Wednesday, which shall be the 7th day of this present month, at seven o’clock in the morning of the same day, all and each of the householders both poor and rich of your said ward, and then and there openly and plainly for your own discharge, and for eschewing the perils that might otherwise be justly imputed and laid to you, not only straitly admonish, charge, and command, in the queen our said sovereign lady’s name and behalf, all and each of the said householders, that both in their own persons, and also their wives, children, and servants, being of the age of twelve years and upwards, and every one of them, at all and every time and times from now on, and namely at the holy time of Easter now approaching, honestly, quietly, obediently, and catholicly, use and behave themselves like good and faithful Christian people, in all and every thing and things touching and concerning the true faith, profession, and religion of his catholic church, both according to the laws and precepts of Almighty God, and also their bounden duty of obedience towards our sovereign lady the queen, her laws, and statutes, and her highness’ most good example and gracious proceeding according to the same, and according to the right, wholesome, charitable, and godly admonition, charge, and exhortation, recently set forth and given by the right reverend father in God, the bishop of London, our diocesan and ordinary, to all the parsons, vicars, and curates within his diocese, but also that they and every one of them truly, without delay, notify you of the names and surnames of all and every person and persons that they or any of them can or may at any time hereafter know, perceive, or understand to transgress or offend in any point or article concerning the premises at their utmost perils. That you immediately after such notice of this given to you, immediately notify us of it. Do not fail to do this with all circumspection and diligence, as you will answer to our said most dread sovereign lady the queen for the contrary, at your peril.

“Given at the Guildhall of the city of London, the 5th of March in the first year of the reign of our said sovereign lady and queen.

“And likewise give to each of the said house-holders straitly in commandment, that they or their wives not depart from the said city, until this holy time of Easter is past.

“BLACKWELL.”

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

About the same time, when Doctor Bonner set forth this prescript, another proclamation came from the queen, against strangers and foreigners within this realm.

Upon this proclamation, not only the strangers in king Edward's time received into the realm for religion — among whom was Peter Martyr and John Alasco, uncle to the king of Poland — but also many Englishmen fled, some to Friesland, some to Cleveland, some to Germany, where they were scattered into companies and congregations at Wesel, Frankfort, Embden, Markpurgh, Transborough, Basel, Arow, Zurich, Geneva, and other places. There, by the providence of God, they were all sustained, and there they were entertained with greater favor among strangers abroad, than they could be in their own country at home, amounting to nearly 800 persons, students, and others together.

In the month of March, the lord Courtney, earl of Devonshire, whom the queen had delivered from the Tower, and the lady Elizabeth also, the queen's sister, were both apprehended and committed to the Tower, on suspicion of having consented to Wyatt's conspiracy a short time before.¹²

Touching the imprisonment of the lady Elizabeth and lord Courtney, note here for your learning, good reader, a politic point of practice in Steven Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, not unworthy to be considered. Gardiner, who was always an enemy to the lady Elizabeth, thought now by the occasion of Master Wyatt's disturbance in Kent, to pick out some matter against the lord Courtney, and thus in the end to entangle the lady Elizabeth. So he devised a pestilent practice of conveyance,¹³ as may appear in the following history.

The story is this. The same day that Sir Thomas Wyatt died, he desired the lieutenant to bring him into the presence of the lord Courtney. There before the lieutenant and the sheriffs kneeling down, Wyatt besought the lord Courtney to forgive him, for he had falsely accused both the lady Elizabeth and him. And so, being brought from there to the scaffold to suffer there openly in the hearing of all the people, he cleared the lady Elizabeth and the lord Courtney, to be free and innocent from all suspicion of that commotion. At this confession, Doctor Weston, standing by, cried out to the people, "Do not believe him, good people, for he previously confessed otherwise to the council.

Not long after this, Queen Mary, partly fearing the Londoners on account of Wyatt's conspiracy, and partly perceiving that most of the city, for religion's sake, did not greatly favor her proceedings, summoned a parliament to be held at Oxford, as if to gratify that city. There the university, town, and country had shown themselves very obedient, especially in restoring the popish religion.

[689] A.D. 1554.

For this purpose, great provision was made, both by the queen's officers, as well as by the townsmen and inhabitants of Oxford, and the surrounding countryside.

But the queen's mind soon changed, and the parliament was held at Westminster the following April. Then the queen proposed her marriage with king Philip; and restoring the pope's supremacy. Her marriage was agreed upon; but the other request could not then be obtained.

¹² Wyatt's Rebellion in early 1554, was sparked by opposition to Mary's marriage to Philip II of Spain. Thomas Wyatt the Younger led a force from Kent to depose Mary in favor of her half-sister, Elizabeth, as part of a wider conspiracy that also involved the Duke of Suffolk, father of Lady Jane Grey.

¹³ *Conveyance*: a manner of conveying one's thoughts, a style of communication, or of interrogation.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

When this parliament was summoned, she also summoned a convocation of the bishops, and of the clergy, writing to Bonner (whom she had made vicegerent in place of Cranmer, who was then in the Tower). The tenor and form of a new style, differed from the old style of king Henry and king Edward, in the omission of the title of “Supreme Head” of the church of England and Ireland.

In this convocation, **Bonner**, Catholic bishop of London, being vicegerent and president, made an oration to the clergy, in which he seems to show a piece of profound and deep learning, in setting forth the most incomparable and super-angelical order of priesthood, as may appear by this parcel or fragment of his oration:

“Therefore it is to be known, that priests and elders are worthy to be worshipped by all men, for the dignity which they have from God; as in Matthew 16, ‘Whatever you loose upon earth,’ etc.; and ‘whatever you bind,’ etc. For a priest by some means is like the Virgin Mary, and this is shown ‘by three points. As the blessed Virgin conceived Christ by five words, as it is said, *fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum*; that is, ‘Be it unto me according to your word’ (Luk 1.38), so the priest by five words makes the very body of Christ. Even as immediately after the consent of Mary, Christ was all whole in her womb, so immediately after the speaking of the words of consecration, the bread is transubstantiated into the very body of Christ. *Secondly*, as the Virgin carried Christ in her arms, and laid him in an ox-stall after his birth; even so the priest after the consecration lifts up the body of Christ, and places it, and carries it, and handles it with his hands. *Thirdly*, as the blessed Virgin was sanctified before she had conceived, so the priest is ordained and anointed before he consecrates; because without orders, he could consecrate nothing. Therefore the layman cannot do that thing, however holy he is, and even if he speaks the self-same words of consecration. Therefore, here it may be seen that the dignity of priests, by some means, surpasses the dignity of angels, because there is no power given to any of the angels to make the body of Christ. Thereby the least priest on earth may do that which the greatest and highest angel in heaven cannot do. As St. Bernard says, ‘O worshipful dignity of priests, in whose hands the Son of God is, as in the womb of the Virgin he was incarnate.’ St. Augustine says that angels in the consecration of the sacred host serve him, and the Lord of heaven descends to him. Whereupon St. Ambrose says, upon Luke, ‘Do not doubt the angels to be where Christ is present upon the altar.’ Therefore priests are to be honored before all kings of the earth, princes, and nobles. For a priest is higher than a king, happier than an angel, maker of his Creator,” etc.

On the 10th of March, a letter was sent to the lieutenant of the Tower to deliver the bodies of Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, and bishops Ridley and Latimer, to Sir John Williams, to be conveyed by him to Oxford.

On the 26th of March, a letter was directed to Sir Henry Doell, and one Foster, to attach the bodies of Taylor, parson of Hadley, and of Henry Askew, and to send them up to the council.

About the 10th of April, Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, Ridley, bishop of London; and Hugh Latimer, sometime bishop of Worcester, were conveyed as prisoners from the Tower to Windsor; and from there to the University of Oxford. They were to dispute with the divines and learned men of both the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, about the presence, substance, and sacrifice of the sacrament. The names of the doctors and graduates appointed to dispute against them, were these: from Oxford, Weston, prolocutor, Tresham, Cole, Oglethorpe, Pye, Harpsfield, and Fecknam; from Cambridge, Young, vice-chancellor, Glin, Seaton, Watson, Sedgewick, Atkinson, etc. The articles or questions upon which they would dispute were these:

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

1. Whether the natural body of Christ was really in the sacrament, after the words were spoken by the priest, or not?
2. Whether in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, any other substance remained than the substance of the body and blood of Christ?
3. Whether in the mass, there was a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead?

After those from Cambridge were incorporated into the University of Oxford on the 12th, and after a convocation on the 14th, and a solemn mass, they signed the articles.

The mass being done, they went in procession: First, the choir in their surplices followed the cross; then the first-year regents and proctors; then the doctors of law, and their beadles ¹⁴ before them; then the doctors of divinity of both universities intermingled, the divinity and arts-beadles going before them; the vice-chancellor and prolocutor going together. After them the bachelors of divinity, regents and non-regents, in their array; and last of all, the bachelors of law and art. After whom followed a great company of scholars and students who had not graduated. And thus they proceeded through the street to Christ's church; and there the choir sang a psalm, and after that a collect was read.¹⁵ This being done, the commissioners, doctors, and many others, departed to Lincoln college, where they dined with the mayor of the town, one alderman, four beadles, Master Say and the Cambridge notary. After dinner they went all back to St. Mary's church. There, after a short consultation in a chapel, all the commissioners came into the choir, and sat on seats before the altar, numbering thirty-three persons. They sent to the mayor, that he should bring in Cranmer, who was brought to them by a number of billmen. ¹⁶

Thus the reverend archbishop Cranmer, when he was brought before the commissioners, revered them with much humility, and stood with his staff in his hand; a stool was offered him, but he refused to sit. Then the prolocutor, sitting in the midst in a scarlet gown, began with a short oration in praise of unity, and especially in the church of Christ. He spoke of Cranmer's upbringing, and of his taking degrees in Cambridge, and also how he was promoted by king Henry VIII, and had been his counsellor and a catholic man — one of the same unity, and a member of it in times past. But in recent years he had separated and cut himself off from it, by teaching and setting forth erroneous doctrines, making a new faith every year. And therefore it pleased the queen's grace, to send those of the convocation and other learned men, to bring Cranmer to this unity again, if possible. Then the prolocutor informed him how those of the convocation-house had agreed upon certain articles to which they wished him to subscribe.

The archbishop answered to the preface very ably, modestly, and learnedly, showing that he was very glad of a unity, because it was "the preserver of all commonwealths, of the heathen as well as of the Christians," And so he dilated the matter with one or two stories of the Roman commonwealth. When he had done this, he said that he was very glad to come to a unity, provided it were in Christ, and agreeable to his holy word.

When he had thus spoken, the prolocutor had the articles read to him, and asked him if he would subscribe to them. The archbishop of Canterbury, after having read them over three or four times, and touching the first article, he asked what they meant by the term, "natural

¹⁴ *Beadle*: A minor church official, especially one who serves a ceremonial function.

¹⁵ *Collect*: A short prayer preceding the lesson in the Church of Rome or Church of England.

¹⁶ *Billmen*: English infantry soldiers who used the bill, a polearm weapon.

body," "Do you not mean," he says, "a *sensible* body." Some answered, "The same that was born of the Virgin," but they said it very confusedly; some saying one thing, some another.

[690]

Then the archbishop denied it utterly. And when he had looked upon the other two articles, he said they were false, and against God's holy word; and therefore he could not agree in a unity with them. The prolocutor assigned him to answer the articles on Monday next (April 16th), and so he committed him to the mayor again, permitting him to name whatever books he wished for, and he would have them brought to him. The archbishop was greatly commended by everybody for his modesty: so that some masters of art of the university were seen to weep for him, even though they were contrary to him in judgment.

Then Dr. Ridley was brought in. Hearing the articles read, he answered without any delay, saying, "They were all false; and they sprang out of a bitter and sour root." His answers were sharp, witty, and very earnest. Then they laid to his charge a sermon that he gave when he was bishop of Rochester, in which (they said) he spoke in favor of transubstantiation. He denied it utterly, and asked whether they could bring anyone who heard him, who would say and affirm it; but they could bring no proof of it at all.

Then he was asked whether he would dispute or not. He answered that as long as God gave him life, he would not only have his heart, but also his mouth and pen to defend God's truth; but he required time and books. They said he would dispute on Tuesday, and till that time he would have books. He said it was not reasonable that he should not have his *own* books, and also time to look for his [prior] disputations. Then they gave him the articles, and bade him write his mind about them that night.

Last of all, Latimer came in, with a handkerchief, and two or three caps on his head, his spectacles hanging by a string at his breast, and a staff in his hand; he was sat in a chair. And after his denial of the articles, Wednesday was appointed for his disputation, but he alleged age, sickness, disease, and lack of books, saying that he was almost as fit to be a captain of Calais as to dispute. But he would, he said, declare his mind, either by writing or by word of mouth, and would stand to all they could lay upon his back. He complained that he was permitted to have neither pen nor ink, nor books, except the New Testament there in his hand, which he said he had read over seven times deliberately; and yet could not find the mass in it; nor the marrow-bones or sinews of it. At these words, the commissioners were not a little offended. Dr. Weston said that he would *make* him grant that the mass had both marrow-bones and sinews in the New Testament. Master Latimer said, "That you will never do, Master Doctor." Immediately they silenced him; so that when he desired to tell what he meant by those terms, he was not allowed.

Archbishop Cranmer Disputes at Oxford.

On Monday, the 16th of April, 1554, Doctor Weston, with the visitors, censors, and opponents, repairing to the divinity school, installed themselves in their places. Doctor Cranmer was brought there, and set in the answerer's place, with the mayor and aldermen sitting by him. Doctor Weston, prolocutor, following the custom of the university, began the disputation with an oration. His words were these: "You are assembled here, brethren, this day, to confound the detestable heresy of the truth of the body of Christ in the sacraments," etc. At these words, thus pronounced by the prolocutor unawares, many of the learned men there present burst out into laughter, as even in the entrance of the disputations, he had betrayed himself and his religion, in calling the opinion of the truth of Christ's body in the sacrament a detestable heresy. The rest of his oration tended all to this effect, that it was not

lawful by God's word to call these questions into controversy. Doctor Cranmer answered in this way: "We are assembled to discuss these doubtful controversies, and to lay them open before the eyes of the world, of what you think it is unlawful to dispute. It is indeed not reasonable to dispute about that which is determined *before* the truth is tried. And if these questions are not called into controversy, surely my answer is looked for in vain."

Then **Chedsey**, the first opponent, began to dispute in this way:

"Reverend Master doctor, these three conclusions are put forth to us at present to dispute upon:

"1. In the sacrament of the altar, is the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, and also his blood present really under the forms of bread and wine by virtue of God's word pronounced by the priest.

"2. There remains no substance of bread and wine after the consecration, nor any other substance, but the substance of God and man.

"A. The lively sacrifice of the church is in the mass propitiatory, for the living as well as for the dead.

"These are the conclusions propounded, upon which our controversy rests. Now, so that we might not doubt how you take them, you have already given us your opinion. I term it your *opinion*, because it disagrees from the catholic opinion. I argue that as your opinion differs from the Scripture, you are therefore deceived."

Cranmer. — "I deny that my opinion differs from scripture."

Chedsey. — "Christ, when he instituted his last supper, spoke to his disciples, saying, 'Take, eat, this is my body which is broken for you.' This is his true body."

Cranmer. — "His true body is truly present to those who truly receive him; but *spiritually*. And so it is taken in a *spiritual* way. For when he said, 'This is my body, it is the same as if he had said, 'This is the breaking of my body; this is the shedding of my blood. As often as you do this, it will put you in remembrance of the breaking of my body, and the shedding of my blood. So that, as truly as you receive this sacrament, so truly you shall receive the benefit promised by receiving the same worthily.'

Chedsey. — "Your opinion differs from the church, which says that the true body is in the sacrament, and therefore your opinion is false."

Cranmer. — "I say and agree with the church, that the body of Christ is in the sacrament effectually, because the passion of Christ is effectual."

Chedsey. — "Christ, when he spoke these words, 'This is my body,' spoke of the *substance*, but not of the *effect*."

Cranmer. — "I grant that he spoke of the substance, and in a way not of the effect. And yet it is most true that the body of Christ is effectually in the sacrament. But I deny that he is truly present there in bread, or that his organic body is under the bread. It is still that bread which is taken out of the fruit of the ground, and brought to that visible shape by man's hand, being round in form and without sense or life, nourishing the body, and strengthening the heart of man. The old fathers say of this bread, and not of any uncertain and wandering substance, as you say, that Christ spoke these words, 'Eat, this is my body,' and likewise of the wine, which is the fruit of the vine pressed out of grapes, making man's heart merry — of the very same wine, I say, Christ said, 'Drink, this is my blood.' And so the old doctors call

this speaking of Christ tropical, figurative, anagogical, allegorical. They interpret it thus: that although the substance of bread and wine remain, and are received by the faithful, yet notwithstanding, Christ changed the name of it, and called the bread by the name of his flesh, and the wine by the name of his blood, 'Not that it is so in very deed, but *signified in a mystery*.' So that we should consider, not what they are in their own nature, but what they import to us and signify. We should not understand the sacrament carnally, but spiritually, and should not attend to the visible nature of the sacraments, nor have respect only to the outward bread and cup, but that lifting up our minds, we should look up to the blood of Christ with our faith, touch him with our mind, and receive him with our inward man. And being like eagles in this life, we should fly up into heaven in our hearts, where that Lamb is resident at the right hand of his Father, 'who takes away the sin of the world;'

[691] AD. 1554.

'by whose stripes we are healed,' by whose passion we are filled at his table, and whose blood, receiving it out of his holy side, we live forever, being made the guests of Christ, "having him dwelling in us through the grace of his true nature, and through the virtue and efficacy of his whole passion. We are no less assured and certified that we are fed spiritually unto eternal life by Christ's flesh crucified, and by his blood shed — the true food of our minds — than our bodies are fed with food and drink in this life. And this mystical bread on the table of Christ, and the mystical wine, being administered and received after the institution of Christ, are a memorial, a pledge, a token, a sacrament, and a seal to us.

"As for your third article, which declares the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice or oblation, I do not hold it to be an oblation of Christ. He offered himself to God the Father, once to death upon the altar of the cross for our redemption, which was of such efficacy, that there is no more need of any sacrifice for the redemption of the whole world. For he took away all the sacrifices of the old law, performing in himself that in very deed, which they only signified and promised. Whoever, therefore, fixes the hope of his salvation in any other sacrifice, he falls from the grace of Christ, and is disrespectful against the blood of Christ. For 'He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.' Isa 53.5 'Neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.' Heb 9.12 'For Christ has not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us. Nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high priest enters into the holy place every year with blood of others; For then he must often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once, in the end of the world, has he appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was offered once to bear the sins of many; and to those who that look for him, he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.' Heb 9.24-28 'Who, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down at the right hand of God. For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified. Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.' Heb 10.12,14,18

"Whoever seeks any other propitiatory sacrifice for sin, than this one sacrifice of Christ, makes the sacrifice of Christ of no validity, force, or efficacy. For if it is sufficient to remit sins, what need is there of any other? For the necessity of another argues and declares that this is insufficient. Almighty God grant that we may truly trust in one sacrifice of Christ, and that we again may repay to him our sacrifices of thanksgiving, of praise, of confessing his name, of true amendment, of repentance, of mercifulness towards our neighbors, and of all

other good works of charity! For by such sacrifices we will declare ourselves neither ungrateful to God, nor altogether unworthy of this holy sacrifice of Christ. And thus you have the true and sincere use of the Lord's holy supper, and the fruit of the true sacrifice of Christ. However, through captious or wrested interpretations, or by men's traditions, whoever goes about otherwise than Christ ordained them, to alter or transubstantiate, he shall answer to Christ in the latter day, when he will understand (but then too late) that he has no participation with the body and blood of Christ; but that out of the supper of eternal life, he has eaten and drank eternal condemnation unto himself."

Chedsey. — "The Scriptures in many places affirm, that Christ gave his natural body, Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22."

Cranmer. — "If you understand by the natural body, one that has such proportion and members as he had when living here, then I answer in the negative."

Chedsey. — "The Scripture makes against you, for the circumstance teaches us not only that there is the body, but it also teaches us what manner of body it is, and so it says, 'The body shall be given which was not bread, but that which was crucified.'" ^{Luk 22.18}

Cranmer — "I grant he said it was his body, which would be given. 'The body,' he says, 'that will be given for you.' It was as if he said, 'This bread is the breaking of my body, and this cup is the shedding of my blood.' What will you say then? is the bread *the breaking of his body*, and the cup *the shedding of his blood* really?"

After some further disputation Chedsey withdrew, and Oglethorpe began in his stead to question Cranmer.

Oglethorpe. — "Your judgment differs from all churches."

Cranmer. — "No, I disagree with the papistical church."

Oglethorpe. — "This you do through ignorance of logic."

Cranmer. — "No, this you say through the ignorance of the doctors."

Weston. — "I will go plainly to work by the Scriptures. What did he take?"

Cranmer. — "Bread."

Weston. — "What did he give?"

Cranmer. — "Bread."

Weston. — "What did he break?"

Cranmer. — "Bread."

Weston, — "What did he eat?"

Cranmer. — "Bread."

Weston. — "He gave bread, therefore he did not give his body."

Cranmer. — "I deny the argument."

Cole. — "This argument holds good: It is bread, therefore it is not the body."

Cranmer. — "The same argument may be made, He is a Rock; therefore he is not Christ."

There was much further disputation on this question, chiefly confined to the ascertaining the opinions of the primitive church, which would be too long to insert here.

This disorderly disputation, sometimes in Latin, sometimes in English, continued almost till two o'clock. When it was finished, and the arguments written and delivered to Master Say, the prisoner was taken away by the mayor, and the doctors dined together at the university college.

Bishop Ridley Disputes at Oxford.

*Disputation at Oxford between Doctor Smith, with his other
Colleagues and Doctors, and Bishop Ridley.*

The following day (April 17) Doctor Ridley was brought forth to dispute, with Doctor Smith for his principal opponent.

Besides this Smith, there was Weston, Tresham, Oglethorpe, Glin, Seaton, Cole, Ward, Harpsfield, Watson, Pye, Harding, Curton, and Fecknam. Ridley answered all these opponents very learnedly. He made a preface to the questions, but they would not let him go on with it, saying it was blasphemy; and they would not allow him to speak his mind. Smith could get nothing at his hands; so that others took his arguments and prosecuted them. He showed himself to be learned, and a great divine. They could bring nothing but what he knew as well as they.

Weston, prolocutor. — “Good Christian people and brethren, we have begun our school this day, by God’s good speed I trust, and are entering into a controversy, of which no question ought to be raised concerning the truth of the body of our Lord Jesus Christ in the eucharist. Christ is true, who said the words. The words are true, which he spoke; indeed, truth itself, which cannot fail. Let us therefore pray to God to send down to us his Holy Spirit, which is the true interpreter of his word; which may purge away errors, and give light, that truth may appear.”

Smith. — “This day three questions are propounded, of which no controversy among Christians ought to be raised, to wit:

“1. Whether the natural body of Christ our Savior, which was conceived of the Virgin, and offered for man’s redemption upon the cross, is truly and really in the sacrament by virtue of God’s word spoken by the priest, etc.

[692]

“2. Whether, in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there is any other substance. etc.

“3. Whether there is in the mass a propitiatory sacrifice, etc.

“Touching these questions, you have publicly and partly professed your judgment. Yet not being satisfied with your answer, I will demand your opinion on the first question, whether the true body of Christ, after the words are pronounced, are really in the eucharist, or only the figure.”

The Answer of Ridley.

“In matters pertaining to God we may not speak according to the sense of man, nor of the world. This first proposition is framed in another manner of phrase or kind of speech than the Scripture uses; and it is very obscure and dark, by means of words that are of doubtful signification.

“First, there is a double sense in these words: ‘by virtue of God’s word;’ for it is doubtful what word of God this is.

“Again, there is a doubtfulness in these words: ‘of the priest;’ whether any man may be called a priest, but someone who has authority to make a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.”

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Weston. — “Let this be sufficient.”

Ridley. — “If we lack time at present, there is time enough hereafter.”

Weston. — “These are but evasions; you consume the time in vain.”

Ridley. — “I cannot start far from you, I am captive and bound.”

Weston. — “Fall to it, my masters.”

Smith. — “That which you have spoken may suffice at present.”

Ridley. — “Let me alone, I pray you, for I do not have much to say.”

Weston. — “Go forward.”

Ridley. — “Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word ‘really,’ which may be variously interpreted, so that the whole proposition is formed of phrases that are not scriptural, but are of doubtful signification.

“Now the error and falseness of the proposition, in the sense in which the Romish church takes it, may appear in that they affirm the bread to be transubstantiated and changed into the flesh assumed by the word of God, and that too is by virtue of a phrase which they have devised themselves, and which cannot be found in any of the Scriptures. This position is the foundation of transubstantiation, a monstrous foundation, and against reason, and destroying the analogy of the sacraments. Therefore this proposition also, which is built upon this rotten foundation, is false, erroneous, and a detestable heresy.”

Weston. — “We lose time.”

Ridley. — “You shall have time enough.”

Weston. — “Fall to reasoning. You shall have some other day for this matter.”

Ridley. — “I have no more to say concerning my explication. If you will give me leave and let me alone, I will only speak a word or two in confirmation of this.”

Weston. — “Go to; say on.”

Ridley. — “No doctrine ought to be established in the church of God, which dissents from the word of God, from the rule of faith, and draws with it many absurdities that cannot be avoided.

“Yet the doctrine of transubstantiation maintains a real, corporeal, and carnal presence of Christ’s flesh, assumed and taken by the word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, and that is not by virtue and grace only, but also by the whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ. Now, such a presence disagrees with God’s word, and from the rule of faith, and cannot but draw with it many absurdities.”

Weston. — “You consume time which might be better bestowed on other matters. Master opponent, I pray you, to your argument.”

Smith. — “I will here reason with you upon transubstantiation, which you say is contrary to the rule and analogy of faith. I prove the contrary by the scriptures and the doctors. But before I enter into argument with you, I demand first, whether in the sixth chapter of St. John there is any mention made of the sacrament, or of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament?”

Ridley. — “It is against reason that I should be prevented from prosecuting what I have to say in this assembly, not being so long that it will not be comprehended in a few words.”

Weston. — “Let him go on.”

Ridley. — “This carnal presence is contrary to the word of God, as it appears in Joh 16.7, ‘I tell you the truth. It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come to you.’ Act 3.21. ‘Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets.’ Mat 9.15. ‘Can the children of the bridegroom mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come, when the bridegroom will be taken from them, and then they will fast.’ Joh 16.22, ‘But I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice.’ Mat 24.23, 28, ‘If any man says to you, behold, here is Christ, or there; do not believe them... For wherever the carcass is, there the eagles will be gathered together.’

“It differs from the articles of faith: ‘He ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God the Father, from whence he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead.’

“It destroys the institution of the Lord’s supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued until the Lord himself would come. If therefore he is really present in the body of his flesh, then the supper must cease. For a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing absent. And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and (as one of the fathers says) a figure is in vain where the thing figured is present.

“It makes precious things common to profane and ungodly persons, and constrains men to confess many absurdities. For it affirms that wicked and ungodly persons, yes (and as some of them hold), the wicked and faithless mice, rats, and dogs also may receive the very real and corporeal body of the Lord, in which the fulness of the Spirit of light and grace dwells; contrary to the manifest words of Christ in six places and sentences in the sixth of St. John.

“It also confirms and maintains that beastly kind of cruelty of the Anthropophagi, that is, the devourers of man’s flesh. For it is a crueller thing to devour a living man, than to slay him.”

Pye. — “He requires time to speak blasphemies! Leave your blasphemies!”

Ridley. — “I little thought to have such reproachful words at your hands.”

Weston. — “All is quiet. Go to your arguments.”

Ridley. — “I do not have many more words to say.”

Weston. — “You utter blasphemies with a most impudent face. Leave off, and get to the argument.”

Ridley. — “It forces men to maintain many monstrous miracles, without any necessity and authority from God’s word. For at the coming of this presence of the body and flesh of Christ, they thrust away the substance of bread, and affirm that the accidents remain without any subject. And instead of it, they place Christ’s body without his qualities and the true manner of a body. If the sacrament is reserved so long until it molds, and worms breed in it, some say that the substance of bread miraculously returns again; and some deny it. Others affirm that the real body of Christ goes down into the stomach of the receivers, and there abides only so long as they continue to be good; but others hold that the body of Christ is carried into heaven as soon as the forms of bread are bruised with the teeth! O workers of miracles! Truly, and most truly, I see that fulfilled in these men, of which St. Paul prophesied in 2The 2.10-12. ‘Because they did not receive the truth, that they might be saved ... God will send them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie, that they all might be damned who do not believe the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.’

[693] A.D. 1554.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

This gross presence has brought forth that foolish fantasy of concomitance, by which the commandment of the Lord is broken at this day and abrogated for distributing the Lord's cup to the laity.

"It gives occasion to heretics to maintain and defend their errors; such as to Marcion, who said that Christ had but a phantasmic body; and to Eutyches, who wickedly confounded the two natures in Christ.

"Finally, It falsifies the sayings of the godly fathers and the catholic faith of the church, which Vigilius, a martyr and grave writer, says was taught by the apostles, confirmed with the blood of martyrs, and was continually maintained by the faithful until his time. By 'the sayings of the fathers,' I mean of Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, Emisene, Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine, Vigilius, Fulgentius, Bertram, and other most ancient fathers. As I am sure that all those places I have read, make for my purpose, so I am well assured that I could show the same, if I might have the use of my own books, which I will undertake to do, even upon the peril of my life and loss of all that I may lose in this world.

"But now, my brethren, do not think that because I disallow that presence which the **first proposition** maintains, as a presence which I take to be forged, fantastical, contrary to God's word, and perniciously brought into the church by the Romanists, that I therefore go about to take away the true presence of Christ's body in his supper rightly and duly administered, and which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful fathers. Those who think thus of me, the Lord knows how far they are deceived. And to make the same evident, I will declare in a few words what true presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the Lord's supper I hold and affirm.

"I say and confess with the evangelist Luke, and with the apostle Paul, that the bread on which thanks are given, is the body of Christ in *remembrance* of him and his death, is to be set forth perpetually by the faithful until his coming again.

"I say and confess that the bread which we break, is the communion and partaking of Christ's body.

"I say and believe that there is not only a signification of Christ's body set forth in the sacrament, but also that there is given to the godly and faithful, the grace of Christ's body — that is, the food of life and immortality.

"I also say with St. Augustine, that we eat life and we drink life; — with Emisene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; — with Athanasius, that we receive celestial food, which comes from above; — with Hilary, the propriety of natural communion; — with Cyril, the nature of flesh and benediction which gives life in bread and wine; — and with the same Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, the life and grace of his body, the property of the only begotten, that is to say, *life*, as he himself expounds it in plain words.

"I confess also with Basel, that we receive the mystical advent and coming of Christ, grace and virtue of his very nature; — with Ambrose, the sacrament of his very flesh; — with Epiphanius, the body by grace; — with Jerome, spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified; — with Chrysostom, grace flowing into a sacrifice, and the grace of the spirit; — with Augustine, grace and invisible verity, grace and communion of the members of Christ's body.

"Finally, with Bertram, who was the last of all these, I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect: namely, as he writes, because there is in it the spirit of Christ, that

is, the power of the word of God, which not only feeds the soul, but also cleanses it. But of these I suppose it may clearly appear to all men, how far we are from that opinion of which some go about falsely to slander us, saying we teach that the godly and faithful receive nothing else at the Lord's table, but a figure of the body of Christ.

"As to the **second proposition**, which asserts that 'After the consecration there remains no substance of bread and wine, nor any other substance than the substance of God and man,' I answer that it is manifestly false, directly against the word of God, the nature of the sacrament, and the most evident testimonies of the godly fathers. And it is the rotten foundation of the other two conclusions propounded by you, both of the first, and also of the third. Therefore I will not now tarry upon any further explanation, being content with that which is already given to the answer of the first proposition.

"The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the holy Scriptures regarding the sacrament. Now, the words of the Lord's supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the fathers, most effectually and plainly prove it is figurative speech in the words of the Lord's supper.

"*The circumstances of the Scriptures*: 'Do this in remembrance of me.' 'As often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, you show the Lord's death till he comes.' 'Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.' ^{1Cor 11.24-28} 'They came together to break bread;' and they 'continued in the breaking of bread.' ^{Act 20.7,42} 'The bread which we break,' etc. 'For we being many, are one bread and one body,' etc., ^{1Cor 10.16-17}.

"*The analogy of the sacraments* is necessary: for the sacraments must have some similitude or likeness of the things of which they are sacraments.

"*The sayings of the fathers* declare it to be figurative speech, as it appears in Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Basel, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, and most plainly of all in Bertram, The sayings and places of all the fathers, whose names I have recited before against the assertion of the first proposition, quite overthrow transubstantiation. But of all, most evident and plain, are Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom *To Caesarius the monk*, Augustine *Against Adamantus*, Gelasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom; again, Rabanus, Damascene, and Bertram on Matthew 20.

"I have for the proof of what I have spoken whatever was written by Bertram, a learned man, of sound and upright judgment, and ever counted a catholic for these seven hundred years until our age. Whoever reads and weighs his treatise, considering the time of the writer, his learning, godliness of life, the allegations of the ancient fathers, and his manifold and well-grounded arguments, I cannot but marvel, if that reader has any fear of God at all, how he can with good conscience speak against him in this matter of the sacrament. This Bertram was the first person who arrested my attention, and first brought me from the common error of the Romish church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical fathers in this matter. And this I protest before the face of God, who knows I do not lie in the things I now speak.

"As to the **third proposition**, which is that, 'In the mass is the lively sacrifice of the church, propitiatory and available for the sins of the quick as well as of the dead.'

"I answer this third proposition as I did the first. And moreover I say that being taken in such a sense as the words seem to import, it is not only erroneous, but so much to the derogation and nullifying of the death and passion of Christ, that I judge it may and ought to

be most worthily counted wicked and blasphemous against the most precious blood of our Savior Christ.

“Concerning the Romish mass used at this day, or the lively sacrifice, being propitiatory and available for the sins of the living and the dead, the holy Scripture has not so much as one syllable.

“As to these words, ‘The lively sacrifice of the church,’ there is a doubt whether they are to be understood figuratively and sacramentally.

“Moreover, in these words ‘as well as,’ it may be doubted whether they are spoken in mockery, as men usually say in sport about a foolish or ignorant person, that he is apt in conditions as well as in knowledge — being apt indeed in neither of them.

[694]

“There is also a doubt in the word ‘propitiatory,’ whether it signifies here, ‘that which takes away sin,’ or ‘that which may be made available for the taking away of sin,’ that is to say, whether it is to be taken in the active or in the passive signification.

“Now the falseness of the proposition, according to the meaning of the Romish Church, and the impiety in that sense which the words seem to import, is this: that leaning to the foundation of their fond transubstantiation, they would make the quick and lively body of Christ’s flesh, united and knit to the Divinity, to lie hidden under the accidents and outward shows of bread and wine, which is very false, as I have said before. And building upon this foundation, they hold that the same body is offered to God by the priest in his daily masses to put away the sins of the living and the dead. Whereas by the words of the apostle to the Hebrews, it is evident that there is but one oblation, and one true and lively sacrifice of the church offered upon the altar of the cross, which was, is, and shall be forever, the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. And where there is remission of the same, ‘there is,’ says the apostle, ‘no more offering for sin.’

“No other priest but Christ can sacrifice for sin; and it is evident that no man is called to this degree of honor but Christ alone. For there are only but two orders of priesthood allowed in the word of God: namely, the order of Aaron, and the order of Melchizedek. But now the order of Aaron has come to an end, and of the order of Melchizedek there is but one priest alone, even Christ the Lord, who has a priesthood that cannot pass to any other.

“Again, after eternal redemption is obtained, there is no more need of a daily offering for it. And Christ having obtained for us this eternal redemption by the offering of himself, there is no more need of a daily oblation for the living and the dead.

“Again, all remission of sins comes only by the shedding of blood; but in the mass, which they call an *unbloody* sacrifice, there is no shedding of blood. And therefore, in the mass there is no remission of sins; and consequently there is no propitiatory sacrifice.

“Again, where Christ does not suffer, he is not truly offered; for the apostle says, ‘Not that he might offer up himself often (for then he must have often suffered since beginning of the world).’ ^{Heb 9.25-26} Now, where Christ is not offered, there is no propitiatory sacrifice; and therefore, in the mass there is no propitiatory sacrifice. ‘But now once, at the end of the world, he has appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment, so Christ was offered once to bear the sins of many; and to those who look for him, he shall appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation.’ ^{Heb 9.26-28}

“By that will [of God],’ says the apostle. ‘we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.’ ^{Heb 10.10} And in the same place, ‘But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down at the right hand of God. For by one offering he has perfected forever those who are sanctified;’ ^{Heb 10.10-14} and ‘when he had by himself purged our sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.’ ^{Heb 1.3} I beseech you to mark these words ‘by himself,’ which, if well weighed, will without doubt put an end to all controversy.

“‘He has reconciled us in the body of his flesh.’ ^{Col 1.22} Mark, I beseech you, he does not say, in the mystery of his body; but in the body of his flesh.

“‘If any man sins, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation of our sins, and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.’ ^{1Joh 2.1}

“I know that all these places of the Scriptures are avoided by two manners of subtle shifts: the one is by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice; as if our unbloody sacrifice of the church were anything else than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemoration; a showing forth; and a sacramental representation of that one unique bloody sacrifice offered up once for all. The other is by depraving and twisting the sayings of the ancient fathers to such a strange kind of sense, as the fathers themselves never meant. For the meaning of the fathers was evidently that the redemption once made for the salvation of man, continues in full effect forever, and works without ceasing to the end of the world, so that the sacrifice once offered cannot be consumed; that the Lord’s death and passion is as effectual, the virtue of that blood once shed is as fresh at this day for the washing away of sins, as it was even the same day that it flowed out of the blessed side of our Savior; and finally, that the whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented by the church in the Lord’s supper, consists in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the cross.

“These are the things which I could answer to your three propositions, though I am destitute of all help in this shortness of time, and lack of books. And because you have lately given most unjust and cruel sentence against me, I here appeal to a more just judgment of some other competent and lawful judge, according to the approved state of the church of England. If this appeal may not be granted to me upon earth, then I fly (even as to my only refuge and sole haven of health) to the sentence of the Eternal Judge — that is, of the Almighty God, to whose most merciful justice towards us, and most just mercifulness, I wholly commit myself and all my cause. I am not at all despairing of the defense of my advocate and only Savior Jesus Christ, to whom, with the everlasting Father, and the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier of us all, now and forever be all honor and glory. Amen.”

Smith. — “You have occasioned me to go otherwise to work with you than I had thought to have done. You abuse the testimonies of Scripture concerning the ascension of Christ, in order to take away his presence in the sacrament, as if this were a strong argument to enforce your matter.”

Ridley. — “If you take the real presence of Christ according to the real and corporeal substance which he took from the Virgin, that presence being in heaven cannot be on the earth also. But if you mean a real presence of some property or attribute of his body, the ascension and abiding in heaven are no hindrance to that presence.”

Weston. — “I will cut off all equivocation and doubt. For whenever we speak of Christ’s body, we mean that which he took from the Virgin.”

Ridley. — “Christ’s ascension and abiding in heaven cannot consist with such a presence.”

Smith. — “His ascension and abiding in heaven was no hindrance to his having visited the earth corporeally, and therefore is now no hindrance to his real presence in the sacrament.

Ridley. — “I would not have you think that I imagine or dream of any such manner of sitting, as these men here sit in the school.”

Smith. — “It is lawful for Christ, then, to be here present on the earth, when he himself chooses.”

Ridley. — “Yes, when he chooses.”

Smith. — “Therefore, his ascending into heaven, does not restrain his real presence in the sacrament.”

Ridley. — “I do not challenge that it is lawful for him to appear on the earth when he chooses; but you must prove that he chooses it.”

Smith. — “Then your answer depends upon the will of Christ, I perceive. Therefore I will join with you in that argument. Christ, after his ascension, was seen really and corporeally upon the earth; and therefore, notwithstanding his ascension and abiding with his Father, he may be corporeally in the sacrament.”

[695] A.D. 1554.

Ridley. — “I grant that he was seen on earth, but I deny that he may therefore be in the sacrament. I grant this, because I know that there are certain ancient fathers of that opinion; so that I am content to let you use that proposition as true. But let us first agree about the continual sitting at the right hand of the Father.”

Smith. — “Does he so sit at the right hand of his Father, that he never forsakes the same?”

Ridley. — “No, I do not bind Christ in heaven so strictly. If you mean by his sitting in heaven, *to reign with his Father*, he may be both in heaven and also on earth. But if you understand his sitting to be *in a corporeal manner of sitting*, then he is always in heaven. For Christ to be corporeally here on earth, when corporeally he is resident in heaven, is contrary to the holy scriptures.”

Smith. — “In Acts 3 we read that Christ shall sit perpetually at the right hand of God, until the consummation of the world.”

Weston. — “I perceive you have come to this issue: whether the body of Christ may be both on earth and in heaven together. I tell you that Christ is both on earth and in heaven together, and at one time, both one and the same natural Christ, in the truth and substance of his very body.”

Ridley. — “I deny that.”

Smith. — “I will prove that he appeared here on earth after his ascension.”

Ridley. — “He appeared, I grant; but how he appeared, whether being then *in heaven* or *on earth*, is uncertain. He appeared to Stephen, being then corporeally sitting in heaven. For, speaking according to the true manner of man’s body, when he is in heaven, he is not at the same time on earth; and when he is on earth, he is not at the same time corporeally in heaven.”

Smith. — “Christ has been both in heaven and on earth all at one time. He was seen by St. Paul, after his ascending to heaven.” 1Cor 15.8.

Ridley. — “He was seen really and corporeally indeed; but whether being *in heaven or earth*, is a doubt. And of doubtful things we must judge doubtfully. You should prove that he was in heaven at the same time, that he was corporeally on earth.”

Tresham. — “He was seen so, that he might be heard, and therefore he was corporeally on the earth, or how else could he be heard?”

Ridley. — “He who enabled Stephen to behold him in heaven, even He could bring to pass that Paul might hear him out of heaven.”

Smith. — “Others as well as Paul saw him visibly and corporeally.”

Ridley. — “I grant that he was seen visibly and corporeally; but you have not proved that he was seen on earth.

After this. Doctor Glin began to reason. He made a very contemptuous preface against Ridley, notwithstanding that Ridley had always taken Glin for his old friend. Master Ridley therefore took his preface more to heart, because it proceeded from him. However, he thought that Doctor Glin’s mind was to serve the time. For afterwards he came to the house in which Master Ridley was kept, and as far as Master Ridley could call to remembrance, before Doctor Young and Doctor Oglethorpe, Glin desired Ridley to pardon his words. Master Ridley did this, even from the very heart, and wished earnestly that God would give not only to Glin, but to all others, the true and evident knowledge of God’s evangelical sincerity, so that all offences being put aside, and being perfectly and fully reconciled, they might agree and meet together in the house of the heavenly Father.

Glin. — “I see that you elude or shift away all scripture and the fathers: I will go to work with you in another way. Christ has here his church known on earth, of which you were once a child, although now you speak contemptuously of the sacraments.”

Ridley. — “This is a grievous insult, that you call me a shifter away of the scripture, and of the doctors. As to the sacraments, I never yet spoke contemptuously of them. I grant that Christ has here his church on earth; but that church ever received and acknowledged the eucharist to be a *sacrament* of the body of Christ, yet not the body of Christ really, but the body of Christ by grace.”

Glin. — “Then I ask this question; whether the Catholic church has ever or at any time been idolatrous?”

Ridley. — “The church is the pillar and ground of truth, and has never yet been idolatrous in respect to *the whole church*, but perhaps in respect to *some part* of it, which sometimes may have been seduced by evil pastors, and through ignorance.”

Glin. — “That church has ever worshipped the flesh of Christ in the eucharist, and according to you, must therefore have been idolatrous.”

Ridley. — “And I also worship Christ in the sacrament, but not because he is included in the sacrament — just as I also worship Christ in the scriptures, not because he is really included in them. Notwithstanding, I say that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament, yet it is sacramentally and spiritually, according to his grace-giving life, and in that respect it is really; that is, according to his benediction giving life.

“Furthermore, I gladly acknowledge the true body of Christ to be in the Lord’s supper, in such a way as the church of Christ acknowledges (which is the spouse of Christ, and is taught by the Holy Ghost, and guided by God’s word). But the true church of Christ acknowledges a presence of Christ’s body in the Lord’s supper to be communicated to the godly by grace, and spiritually, and as I have often shown, by a sacramental signification; but not by the corporeal presence of the body of his flesh.”

Glin. — “But all the church adores Christ truly, and really in the sacrament.”

Ridley. — “You know yourself that the eastern church would not acknowledge transubstantiation, as it appears in the council of Florence.”

Cole. — “That is false. For they acknowledged transubstantiation, although they would not address the matter, for they did not have in their commission to do so.”

Ridley. — “No, they would determine nothing of the matter when the article was propounded to them.”

Cole. — “It was not because they did not acknowledge it, but because they had no commission to do so.”

Watson. — “Good sir, I have determined to have respect of the time, and therefore I ask this question: when Christ said in the sixth of John, ‘ He that eats my flesh, etc.’ does he signify in those words the eating of his true and natural flesh, or else of the bread and symbol?”

Ridley. — “I understand that place of the very flesh of Christ to be eaten, *spiritually*. And further, I say that the sacrament also pertains to spiritual eating. For to eat the sacrament without the spirit, is to eat it unprofitably. For whoever does not eat spiritually, eats to his own condemnation.”

Watson. — “I ask, then, whether the eucharist is a sacrament?”

Ridley. — “The eucharist, taken as a sign or symbol, is a sacrament.”

Watson. — “Is it instituted by God?”

Ridley. — “It is.”

Watson. — “Where?”

Ridley. — “In the supper.”

Watson. — “With what words is it made a sacrament?”

Ridley. — “By the words and deeds which Christ said and did, and commanded us to say and do.”

Watson. — “It is commonly received, that the sacraments of the new law give grace to those who worthily receive them.”

Ridley. — “It is true that grace is given by the sacrament, as by an instrument. The inward virtue, and Christ, give grace through the sacrament.”

Watson. — “What is a sacrament?”

Ridley. — “I remember there are many definitions of a sacrament in Augustine: but I will take that which seems most fit for our present purpose. *A sacrament is a visible sign of invisible grace.*”

Watson. — “Grace is given to the receivers.”

[696]

Ridley. — “The fellowship or communion with Christ through the Holy Ghost is grace, and by the sacrament we are made the members of the mystical body of Christ; for by the sacrament, the part of the body is grafted in the head.”

Watson. — “But there is a difference between the mystical body, and natural body.”

Ridley. — “There is a difference, but the head of them both is one.”

Watson. — “But no promise of grace is made to bread and wine.”

Ridley. — “I grant that grace belongs to the eucharist, according to this saying, ‘The bread which we break, is it not the communication or partaking of the body of Christ?’ ^{1Cor 10.16} And just as whoever eats and drinks the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord unworthily, eats and drinks his own damnation; ^{1Cor 11.29} even so, whoever eats and drinks worthily, eats life, and drinks life. I also grant that there is no promise made to bread and wine. But inasmuch as they are sanctified, and made the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, they have a promise of grace annexed to them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ — to be communicated and given, not to the bread and wine, but to those who worthily receive the sacrament.”

After much more disputation of this kind, Doctor Tresham began to speak with zeal, and desired that he might be in the stead of John the Baptist, in converting the hearts of the fathers, and in reducing bishop Ridley again to the mother church. Now at first, not knowing the person, Ridley thought he had been some good old man, who had the zeal of God, although not according to knowledge, and he began to answer Tresham with kindness and reverence. But afterwards, he smelled a fox under sheep’s clothing.

Tresham. — “God Almighty grant that it may be fulfilled in me, that which was spoken by the prophet Malachi of John Baptist, that I may turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their father, that at length you may be converted. The wise man says, ‘Son, honor your father, and reverence your mother.’ But you dishonor your Father in heaven, and pollute your mother the holy church here on earth, while you do not sit by it.”

Ridley. — “These by-words pollute your school.”

Tresham. — “If there were an Arian who had that subtle wit that you have, he might soon shift off the authority of the scriptures and fathers.”

Weston. — “Either dispute, or else hold your peace, I pray you.”

Tresham. — “I bring a place here out of the council of Lateran, which council represented the universal church, in which were congregated three hundred bishops, and seventy metropolitans, besides a great multitude of others. They decreed that bread and wine, by the power of God’s word, was transubstantiated into the body and blood of the Lord. Therefore whoever says contrary, cannot be a child of the church, but a Heretic.”

Ridley. — “Good sir, I have heard what you have cited out of the council of Lateran, and remember that there was as great a multitude of bishops and metropolitans, as you say. But yet, you have not numbered how many abbots, priors, and friars were in that council, who numbered eight hundred.”

A notary said here, “What! Will you then deny the authority of that council, on account of the multitude of those priors?”

Ridley. — “No, sir, not so much for that cause, as because the doctrine of that council did not agree with the word of God, as it appears by the acts of that council, which was held under Innocent the Third, a man (if we believe the histories) who was most pernicious to the church and commonwealth of Christ.”

Tresham. — “What! Do you not receive the council of Lateran?” Then he with others cried out, “Write, write that down!”

Ridley. — “No, sir, I do not receive that council; so write, and write it again.”

Smith. — “I bring a canon out of the council of Nice: ‘None of the apostles said, this is a figure of the body of Christ. None of the reverend elders said the unbloody sacrifice of the altar was a figure.’”

Ridley. — “This canon is not in the council of Nice. For I have read over this council many times.”

Then another came in, whom Master Ridley did not know, and said, “The universal church, both of the Greeks and Latins, of the East and the West, have uniformly agreed in the council of Florence, in the doctrine of the sacrament, that in the sacrament of the altar there is the true and real body.”

Ridley. — “I deny that the Greek and the Eastern church have agreed either in the council at Florence, or at any other time, with the Romish church, in the doctrine of transubstantiation of bread into the body of Christ. For there was nothing in the council of Florence, in which the Greeks would agree with the Romanists; although up to now it was left free for every church to use, as they usually did, leavened or unleavened bread.”

Here Doctor Cole cried out, and said, “they agreed together concerning transubstantiation of bread into the body of Christ?” Master Ridley said that could not be.

Here another person started up, unknown to Master Ridley, who affirmed with him, that there was nothing decreed concerning transubstantiation. The council left that, as a matter not fit nor worthy to disturb the peace and concord of the church. Master Ridley answered him, saying, that he told the truth.

After some further disputation, Weston as prolocutor, dissolved the meeting, saying, “Here you see the stubborn, the boasting, the crafty, the inconstant mind of this man. Here you see this day, that the strength of the truth is without foil. Therefore I beseech you all most earnestly to blow the note.” He began, and they followed, “Truth has the victory; Truth has the victory!”

Master Hugh Latimer Disputes at Oxford.

*The Disputation had at Oxford, on Wednesday the 18th of
April 1554, between Master Hugh Latimer answerer,
and Master Smith, and other opposers.*

On the next day after these disputations with bishop Ridley, Master Hugh Latimer was brought out to dispute.

There to reply to him were Smith, Cartwright, and Harpsfield; some others had snatches at him, and gave him bitter taunts. He did not escape hissings and scornful laughings, any more than those who went before him. He was very faint, and desired that he might not be kept long. He could not drink for fear of vomiting.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Weston. — “Men and brethren, we have come together this day (by the help of God) to vanquish the arguments and opinions of adversaries, against the truth of the real presence of the Lord’s body in the sacrament. And therefore, you, father, if you have anything to answer, I admonish you to answer in short and few words.”

Latimer. — “I pray you, good Master Prolocutor, do not exact that from me, which is not in me. I have not used the Latin tongue much these twenty years.”

Weston. — “Take your ease, father.”

Latimer. — “I thank you, sir, I am well. Let me here protest my faith, for I am not able to dispute. And afterwards, do your pleasure with me.”

*The Protestation of Master Hugh Latimer,
given up in writing to Doctor Weston.*

“The conclusions to which I must answer, are these:

“**The first is**, That in the sacrament of the altar, by virtue of God’s word pronounced by the priest, there is really present the natural body of Christ, conceived of the Virgin Mary, under the kinds of the appearance of bread and wine; and in the like manner, his blood.

“**The second is**, That after consecration there no substance of bread and wine remain, nor any other substance, but the substance of God and man.

[697] A.D. 1554.

“**The third is**, That in the mass there is the lively sacrifice of the church, which is propitiatory, for the sins of the quick, as well as of the dead.

“*Concerning the first conclusion*, I think it is set forth with new-found terms that are obscure, and do not sound according to the words of the Scripture. However, I answer plainly, that as to the right celebration of the Lord’s supper, there is no other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence. And this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and Christ abides in us, to the obtaining of eternal life, if we persevere. And this same presence may most fitly be called a real presence, that is, not feigned a presence, but a true and faithful presence. I state this here, lest some scorner suppose that I make nothing else of the sacrament, but a naked and a bare sign.

“*Concerning the second conclusion*, I dare be bold to say, that it has no ground in God’s word, but is something invented and found out by man; and therefore it is to be regarded as foolish and false — and I had almost said, as the mother and nurse of the other errors. It would be good for my lords and masters of transubstantiation, to take heed lest they conspire with the Nestorians, for I do not see how they can avoid it.

“*The third conclusion* seems to sow sedition against the offering which Christ himself offered for us in his own proper person, according to that pithy place of St. Paul, where he says that, ‘Christ, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high.’ (Heb 1.3) And afterwards, ‘Therefore in all things it behooved him to be made like his brethren; that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people.’ (Heb 2.17) So that the expiation or taking away of our sins may be thought to depend on this, that Christ was an offering bishop, rather than being offered, were it not that he was offered by himself. And therefore it is needless for him to be offered by any other. I will say nothing of the wonderful presumption of man, to dare to attempt this without a manifest calling, especially as it tends to overthrow and make fruitless the cross of Christ (if not wholly, yet partly); for truly it is

no base or mean thing to offer Christ. And therefore, a man may say worthily to my lords and masters the offerors, 'By what authority do you do this? And who gave you this authority? Where? When?' A man cannot (says John the Baptist) take anything unless it is given him from above. ^{Joh 3.27} Much less, then, may any man presume to usurp any honor, before he is called to it. Again, St. John says, 'If any man sins, we have' — not a master or offeror at home, who can sacrifice for us at mass; but 'an advocate, Jesus Christ,' ^{1Joh 2.1} who offered up himself once. The efficacy and effect of this offering is endurable forever, so that it is needless to have such offerors.

"I have taken more pains to write, because I refuse to dispute, in consideration of my debility, so that all men may know how I have done so, not without pain, though having no man to help me, as I have never before been debarred from having. O, sir, you may chance to live till you come to my age and weakness. I have spoken in my time before two kings more than once, two or three hours together, without interruption: But now that I may speak the truth (by your leave), I could not be allowed to declare my mind before you, no, not for a quarter of an hour, without snatches, revilings, checks, rebukes, and taunts, such as I have not felt the like, in such an audience, all my life long. Surely it cannot be but a heinous offense that I have given. But what was it? Truly, I had spoken of the four marrow-bones of the mass. This kind of speaking I never read to be a sin against the Holy Spirit.

"I was not allowed to show what I meant by my metaphor: But, sir, now by your favor I will tell your mastership what I mean.

"The first is the popish consecration, which had been called 'God's body-making.'

"The second is transubstantiation.

"The third is massal oblation.

"The fourth is adoration.

"These chief and principal portions, parts, and points belonging to the mass, I call the marrow-bones of the mass — which you, by force, might, and violence, intrude as parts of the Scriptures, with racking and cramping, injuring and wronging the same.

"There are some persons who speak many false things more probable, and more likely to the truth, than the truth itself."

Someone interrupted, asking "But what do you mean by this talk, so far from the matter?"

"Well, I hope, good masters, you will allow an old man to play the child a little, and to speak one thing twice. You have changed the most holy communion into a private action; and you deny to the laity the Lord's cup, contrary to Christ's commandment: and you blemish the annunciation of the Lord's death till he comes. For you have changed the common prayer (called the divine service) with the administration of the sacraments, from the common and known language, into a strange tongue, contrary to the will of the Lord revealed in his word. God open the door of your hearts, to see the things you should see in this! I would as gladly obey my sovereign as anyone in this realm. But in these things I can never do it with an upright conscience. God be merciful to us. Amen! "

Weston. — "Then do you refuse to dispute? Will you subscribe?"

Latimer. — "No, good Master; I pray, be good to an old man. May you once, if it pleases God, be old as I am — may you come to this age, and to this debility."

Weston. — "You said, on Saturday last, that you could not find the mass, nor the marrow-bones of it in your book. But we will find a mass in that book."

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Latimer. — “No, good Master doctor, you cannot.”

Weston. — “What do you find there, then?”

Latimer. — “I find a communion there.”

Weston. — “Which communion, the first or the last?”

Latimer. — “I find no great diversity in them. They are one supper of the Lord; but I like the last very well.”

Weston. — “The first was nothing alike.”

Latimer. — “I do not well remember in what they differ.”

Weston. — “Then cake bread, and loaf bread, are all one with you. You call it the supper of the Lord; but you are deceived in that. For they had done the supper before, and therefore the Scripture says, ‘After they had supped.’ ^{1Cor 11.25} For you know that St. Paul finds fault with the Corinthians, for some of them were drunk at this supper; and you know no man can be drunk at your communion.”

Latimer. — “The first was called The Jewish Supper, when they ate the paschal lamb together; the other was called The Lord’s Supper.”

Weston. — “That is false.”

Smith. — “I will propose three questions as they are put to me. And first I ask this question of you, although it should not be called into question; but such is the condition of the church, that it is always vexed by the wicked. I ask, I say, whether Christ’s body is really in the sacrament?”

Latimer. — “I trust I have obtained from Master Prolocutor that no man will exact of me that which is not in me. And I am sorry that this worshipful audience should be deceived of their expectation. I have given up my mind in writing to Master Prolocutor.”

Smith. — “Whatever you have given up, it shall be registered among the acts.”

Latimer. — “Disputation requires a good memory: my memory is clean gone, and marvellously weakened, and never the better for the prison.”

Weston. — “How long have you been in prison?”

Latimer. — “Three quarters of a year.”

Weston. — “And I was in prison six years.”

Latimer. — “The more pity, sir.”

[698]

Weston. — “How long have you been of this opinion?”

Latimer. — “It is not long, sir, that I have been of this opinion.”

Weston. — “The time has been when you said mass fully devoutly.”

Latimer. — “Yes, and I heartily cry for God’s mercy for it.”

Weston. — “Where did you learn this new-fangledness?”

Latimer. — “I have long sought for the truth in this matter of the sacrament, and have not been of this mind past seven years; and my lord of Canterbury’s book has especially confirmed my judgment in it. If I could remember all that was contained in it, I would not fear to answer any man.”

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Tresham. — “There are six hundred errors in that book.”

Weston. — “You were once a Lutheran.”

Latimer. — “No; I was a papist; for I could never perceive how Luther could defend his opinion without transubstantiation.”

Weston. — “Luther said that the devil reasoned with him, and persuaded him that the mass was not good; so that Luther said mass, and the devil dissuaded him from it.”

Latimer. — “I do not take in hand here to defend Luther’s sayings or doings. If he were here, he would defend himself well enough, I know.”

Weston. — “Do you believe this, as you have written?”

Latimer. — “Yes, sir.”

Weston. — “Then you have no faith.”

Latimer. — “Then would I be sorry, sir.”

Tresham. — “It is written (Joh 6.53), ‘Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you.’ Which when the Capernaïtes and many of Christ’s disciples heard it, they said, ‘This is a hard saying,’ etc. Now, that the truth may better appear, I ask of you here, whether Christ, speaking these words, meant his flesh to be eaten with the mouth, or of the spiritual eating of the same.”

Latimer. — “I answer (as St. Augustine understands it) that Christ in that passage meant of the spiritual eating of his flesh.”

Tresham. — “Of what flesh did Christ mean? His true flesh, or not?”

Latimer. — “Of his true flesh, to be eaten spiritually in the supper by faith, and not corporeally.”

Tresham. — “Of what flesh did the Capernaïtes mean?”

Latimer. — “Of his true flesh also; but to be eaten with the mouth; not the bodily mouth; but the mouth of the spirit, mind, and heart.”

Weston. — “You will see what worshipful men you hang upon. One who has been of your mind, will dispute with you. Master Cartwright, I pray you dispute.”

Cartwright. — “Reverend father, because I am commanded to dispute with you, I will do it gladly. But first understand before we go any further, that I was in the same error that you are in. But I am sorry for it, and I confess myself to have erred. I acknowledge my offense, and I wish and desire God that you may also repent with me.”

Latimer. — “Will you give me leave to tell what has caused you to recant? It is the pain of the law, which has brought you back, and converted you, and many more, which hinders many from confessing God. And this is a great argument: there are few here who can solve it.”

Cartwright. — “That is not my case; but I will give you this short argument by which I was converted from my errors; namely, that if the true body is Christ be not really in the sacrament, the whole church has erred from the apostles’ time.”

Latimer. — “The popish church has erred, and still errs. I think for six or seven hundred years, there was no mention made of any eating, except spiritually. For, before these five hundred years, the church ever confessed a spiritual eating. But the Romish church begat

the error of transubstantiation. My lord of Canterbury's book handles that very well, and I could answer you by him if I had it."

Cartwright. — "Linus, and all the rest, confess the body of Christ to be in the sacrament; and St. Augustine grants that it is to be worshipped."

Latimer. — "We worship Christ in the heavens, and we worship him in the sacrament; but the mass-worship is not to be used."

Cole. — "Is it not a shame for an old man to lie? You say you are of the old fathers' faith where they say rightly; and yet you are not."

Latimer. — "I am of their faith when they say rightly; I refer myself wholly to my lord of Canterbury's book in this."

Smith. — "Then you are not of Chrysostom's faith, nor of St. Augustine's faith."

Latimer. — "I have said, when they say rightly, and bring Scripture for their beliefs, I am of their faith; and further St. Augustine does not require it to be believed. Where do you have authority given to you, to offer sacrifice?"

Weston. — "*Hoc facite*, do this; for *facite* in that place is taken for *offerte*, that is, offer you."

Latimer. — "Is *facere* nothing but *sacrificare* to sacrifice? Why, then, no man must receive the sacrament except priests; for no other may offer a sacrifice but priests."

Weston. — "Your argument is to be denied."

Latimer. — "Did Christ then offer himself at his supper?"

Pye. — "Yes, he offered himself for the whole world."

Latimer. — "Then if this word *facite*, 'do you,' signifies *sacrificate*, sacrifice, it follows, as I said, that none but priests should receive the sacrament, to whom alone it is lawful to sacrifice; and where do you find that, I pray you?"

Weston. — "Forty years ago, where could you have gone to find your doctrine?"

Latimer. — "The more cause we have to thank God, that He has now sent the light into the world."

Weston. — "The light! No light, and wicked preachers, You so often altered and changed your communions and altars, and all for this one end: to spoil and rob the church."

Latimer. — "These things do not pertain to me at all; I must not answer for other men's deeds, but only for my own."

Weston. — "Well, Master, this is our intention, to wish you well, and to exhort you to come to yourself, and remember that without Noah's Ark there is no health. Remember what those have been who were the beginners of your doctrine; none but a few flying apostates, running out of Germany for fear of the faggot. Remember what they have been who have set forth the same in this realm: a sort of fling-brains and light heads, who were never constant in any one thing, as it was seen in the turning of the table, where, like a sort of apes, they could not tell which way to turn their tails, looking one day west, and another day east, one that way, and another this way. They say they will be like the apostles; they will have no churches; a hovel is good enough for them. They come to the communion with no reverence. They get a tankard, and one says, 'I drink, and I am thankful;' 'the more joy for you,' says another. And it was true in them, what Hilary says: 'We make a faith every year and every

month,' A renegade Scot took away the adoration or worshipping of Christ in the sacrament, by whose 'procurement that heresy was put into the last communion book — so much did that one man's authority prevail. Your stubbornness comes from vainglory, which is to no purpose. For it will do you no good when a faggot is in your beard. And we all see by your own confession, how little cause you have to be stubborn. The queen's grace is merciful, if you will turn."

Latimer. — "You will have no hope of my turning. I pray for the queen daily, even from the bottom of my heart, that she may turn from this religion."

Weston. — "Here you all see the weakness of heresy! Against the truth; he denies all truth, and all the old fathers."

And thus you have, reader, the whole action of this disputation against these three worthy confessors and martyrs of the Lord. In this you may behold that disordered usage of the university men, the unmannerly custom of the school, the rude tumult of the multitude,

[699] A.D. 1554.

the fierceness and interruption of the doctors, the full ground of all their arguments, the censures of the judges, the railing language of the prolocutor, being himself both the actor, the moderator, and also the judge.

Such disturbance and confusion, more like a conspiracy than any disputation, without any form and order, was in the schools during the time of their answering, so that neither could the answerers utter their minds, nor would the opponents be satisfied with any reasons.

Concerning this misruled disputation, Ridley himself reports as follows:

*The Report and Narration of Bishop Ridley, concerning
the Disputation against him and his fellow-prisoners at Oxford.*

"I **never** yet, since I was born, saw or heard anything done or handled more vainly or tumultuously, than the disputation held with me in the schools at Oxford. Yes, truly, I could never have thought that it would have been possible to find among men accounted as men of knowledge and learning in this realm, any so brazenfaced and shameless, so disorderly and vainly to behave more like stage-players in interludes to set forth a pageant, than grave divines in school, to dispute about religion. The clamors of the Sorbonne, which I have seen at Paris in times past, when popery most reigned, might be worthily thought to have much modesty in comparison with this boastful ostentation. And no great marvel, seeing that those who should have been moderators and overseers of others, and who should have given good examples in words and gravity above all others, gave the worst example, and as it were, blew the trumpet to the rest, to rave, roar, rage, and cry out. Because of this, it manifestly appears that they never sought any truth or verity, but only the glory of the world, and their own bragging victory. But lest by the innumerable railings and reproachful taunts with which I was baited on every side, our cause — yes, rather God's cause and his church's cause — should be spoken evilly of, and slandered to the world through false reports given out concerning our disputation. And that the truth might sustain some damage, I thought it no less than my duty to write my answers, that whoever is desirous to know the truth may perceive by this, those things which were chiefly objected, as well as a summary of that which was answered by me to them. However, I confess this to be most true: that it is impossible to set forth either all that was tumultuously and confusedly objected on their parts — there being so many speaking at one time, and so fast, that one could not very well hear another; nor could all that was answered on my behalf to so many opponents, be heard.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

“A great part of the time appointed for the disputations was vainly consumed in opprobrious checks and reviling taunts, with hissing and clapping of hands; using the English tongue to procure the people’s favor. All of which, when I beheld it with great grief of heart, protesting openly that such excessive and outrageous disorder was unseemly for those schools, and for men of such learning and gravity, and that those who were the doers and stirrers of such things did nothing but betray the slenderness of their cause and their own vanities — I was so far off from doing any good by my humble complaint, that I was forced to hear such rebukes, checks, and taunts for my labor, as no person of any honesty could abide to hear without blushing the like if spoken by a most vile knave, against a most wretched ruffian.

“At the beginning of the disputation, when I should have confirmed my answer to the first proposition in a few words, in the manner and law of schools, before I could make an end of my first proof (which was not very long), even the doctors themselves cried out, ‘He speaks blasphemies, he speaks blasphemies!’ And when I besought them on my knees that they would grant to hear me to the end, at which the prolocutor being moved, cried out, ‘Let him read it, let him read it’ — yet, when I began to read, there immediately followed such shouting, such noise, and tumult, such confusion of voices, crying ‘Blasphemies, blasphemies!’ as I never heard or read the like, to my remembrance, unless it was that one which was, in the acts of the apostles, stirred up Demetrius the silversmith, and others of his occupation, crying out against Paul, ‘Great is Diana of the Ephesians! great is Diana of the Ephesians!’ Or unless it was a certain disputation which the Arians had against the orthodox, and those who were of godly judgment in Africa, where it is said (according to Victor) that such were the president and rulers of the disputation, such was the end of the disputations — all were in a hurly-burly, and so great were the slanders which the Arians cast out — that nothing could be heard quietly.

“The cries and the tumults against me so prevailed, that I was forced to quit reading my proofs, even though they were short. If any man doubts the truth of this, let him ask anyone who was there, and not utterly perverted in popery, and I am assured he will say I fall far short of the facts in my statement. But I will cease to further complain of these things.”

He concludes his report with these words:

“And thus was ended this most glorious disputation of the most holy fathers, sacrificers, doctors, and masters, who fought most manfully, as you may see, for their God and goods, for their faith and felicity, for their country and kitchen, for their beauty and belly, with triumphant applauses and the favor of the whole university.”

The disputation of Master Latimer being ended on the 18th of April, the commissioners sat on the 20th, in St. Mary’s church. Doctor Weston used dissuasions with every one of them, and would not allow them to answer unless directly and peremptorily, as his words were, to say whether they would subscribe or not. He said to the archbishop of Canterbury that he was overcome in disputation. The archbishop answered that, “Where Doctor Weston said he had answered and opposed, and could neither maintain his own errors, nor impugn the truth, all that he thus said was false. For he was not allowed to oppose as he wished, nor could he answer as he was required, unless he would have brawled like them. Four or five continually interrupted him, so that he could not speak.” Master Ridley and Master Latimer were asked what they would do. They replied that, “They would stand to what they had said.” Then they were all called together, and the sentence was read over them, declaring they were no longer members of the church; and also that their favorers and patrons were condemned as heretics. In reading the sentence, they were asked whether they would turn or not; and they bade them to read on in the name of God, for they were not minded to turn. So all three were condemned.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

After this sentence of condemnation was awarded against them, they answered again, each one in his turn as follows; the archbishop first beginning thus:

The Archbishop of Canterbury. “From this your judgment and sentence, I appeal to the just judgment of Almighty God, trusting to be present with him in heaven, for whose presence in the altar I am thus condemned.”

Doctor Ridley. “Although I am not of your company, yet I do not doubt that my name is written in another place, where this sentence will send us sooner than we should have come by the course of nature.”

Master Latimer. “I thank God most heartily, that he has prolonged my life to this end, that in this cause I may glorify God by that kind of death.”

Doctor Weston’s Answer to Latimer. “If you go to heaven in this faith, then I will never come there, as I am persuaded at present.”

[700]

After the sentence pronounced, they were separated one from another. The archbishop was returned to Bocardo;¹⁷ Ridley was carried to the sheriff’s house; Latimer to the bailiff’s.

On the Saturday following, they had a mass, with a general procession and great solemnity. Doctor Cranmer was forced to behold the procession out of Bocardo; Doctor Ridley out of the sheriff’s house. Latimer also, being brought to see it from the bailiff’s house, thought that he was going to be burnt, and spoke to one Augustine Cooper, a catchpole, to make a quick fire. But when he came to Carfox, and saw the matter, he ran as fast as his old bones would carry him, to one Spencer’s shop, and would not look towards it. Last of all, Doctor Weston carried the sacrament, and four Doctors carried the canopy over him.

Immediately after the sentence was given, Dr. Ridley writes to the prolocutor as follows:

“Doctor Ridley to the Prolocutor.

“Master prolocutor, you remember, I am sure, how you promised me openly in the schools, after my protestation, that I would see how my answers were taken and written there by the notaries whom you appointed to write what should be said, that I would have leave to add to them, or to alter them, as might have seemed best upon more deliberation. You granted me also, at the delivery of my answer to your first proposition, a copy of the same. These promises are not performed. If your sudden departure is any part of the cause of this, I pray you to remember that they may be performed; for performance of a promise is to be looked for at a righteous judge’s hands. Now here I send you my answers, in writing, to your second and third propositions, and I desire and require earnestly a copy of the same; and I will by God’s grace procure the pains of the writer to be paid for, and satisfied accordingly. Master Prolocutor, in the time of my answer in the schools, when I would have confirmed my sayings with authorities and reasons, you said then openly, that I would have a time and place to say and bring whatever I could another time; and your statement was then and there confirmed by others of the commissioners. Indeed, I dare say that the audience also thought then that I should have had another day, to bring and say what I could of the declaration and confirmation of my assertions. Now, I cannot but marvel that this was not done, and sentence was so suddenly given before the cause was perfectly heard,” etc.

On Monday, the 23d of April, Doctor Weston, prolocutor, took his journey to London, with the letters certificatory from the university to the Queen, by whom the archbishop of

¹⁷ Bocardo: a prison or place of confinement historically used in Oxford.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Canterbury directed his letters supplicatory to the council. After the prolocutor had received these, and carried them well-near half-way to London, he opened them. And seeing the contents, he sent them back again, refusing to carry them, etc.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's Letter to the Council.

"In right humble ways, Thomas Cranmer, late archbishop of Canterbury, shows to your honorable lordships, beseeching the same to be a means for me to the queen's highness for her mercy and pardon. Some of you know by what means I was brought and trained to the will of our late sovereign lord king Edward VI, and what I spoke against the same, in which I refer to the reports of your honors and worships. Furthermore, this is to signify to your lordships, that on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday past, there were open disputations here in Oxford against me, Master Ridley, and Master Latimer, in three matters concerning the sacrament. First, of the real presence: Secondly, of transubstantiation: and Thirdly, of the sacrifice of the mass. On Monday against me; on Tuesday against doctor Ridley; and on Wednesday against Mr. Latimer. How the other two were ordered, I do not know; for we were separated, so that none of us knew what the other said, nor how they were ordered. But, I can report concerning myself. Doctor Chedsey was appointed to dispute against me, but the disputation was so confused that I never knew the like. Every man brought forth what he liked without order; and such haste was made, that no answer was allowed to be fully given to any argument. before another brought forward a new argument. And in such weighty matters, the disputation must be ended in one day, which could scarcely be ended in three months. And when we had answered them, they would not appoint us one day to bring forth our proofs, so that they might answer us, being requested by me to do so; whereas I myself have more to say than can well be discussed, I suppose, in twenty days. The right means to resolve the truth had been to have allowed us to answer fully to all that they could say, and then they again to answer us fully to all that we can say. But why they would not answer us, what other cause can there be, but that either they feared their matter, that they were not able to answer us, or else for some consideration they made such haste not to seek the truth, but to condemn us, that it must be done in post haste before the matters could be thoroughly heard. For in haste all three of us were condemned of heresy. This much I thought it good to signify to your lordships, that you may know the indifferent handling of matters, leaving the judgment of it to your wisdom. And I beseech your lordships to remember me, a poor prisoner, to the queen's majesty; and I shall pray unto God, as I do daily, for the long preservation of your lordships in all godliness and felicity." April 23.

Queen Mary Purges Her Opponents

Now let us return for a little to our history, as regards other things that happened in other parts of the realm, in this tumultuous time of queen Mary. As events in that time were so numerous, it is hard to keep a perfect order in reciting them. Therefore, to insert things that were left out before, we thought to interrupt the order of time a little here, returning again to the month of July, the year before, viz. 1553, at which time I showed before how the duke of Northumberland was apprehended by the guard, and brought to London by the earl of Arundel and other lords and gentlemen who had been appointed for that purpose on the 25th July, being St. James' day. The duke was sent to the Tower, where he remained.

The earl of Warwick, his eldest son, lord Ambrose and lord Henry Dudley, two of his younger sons, the earl of Huntington, lord Hastings, sir John Gates, sir Henry Gates, sir Andrew Dudley, sir Thomas Palmer, and Dr. Sands, chancellor of Cambridge, were all sent to the Tower at the same time.

On the 26th, the lord marquis of Northampton, the bishop of London, lord Robert Dudley, and sir Richard Corbes were committed to the Tower.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

On the 27th, the lord chief justice of England, and the lord Mountacute, chief justice of the common pleas, were committed to the Tower.

On Friday the 28th, the duke of Suffolk, and sir John Cheek were committed to the Tower.

On the 30th, the lord Russel was committed to the sheriff of London's custody.

On the 31st, the earl of Rutland was committed to the Fleet; and the same day the duke of Suffolk was delivered out of the Tower again.

On Thursday the 3d of August, the queen entered into the city of London at Aldersgate, and so visited the Tower, where she remained seven days, and then removed to Richmond.

On Saturday the 5th the Lord Ferris was committed to the Tower, and on the same day Doctor Bonner was delivered out of the Marshalsea. At night, Doctor Cocks was committed to the Marshalsea, and one Master Edward Underbill to Newgate. Also the same day, Doctor Tunstall and Stephen Gardiner were delivered out of the Tower, and Gardiner was received into the queen's privy council, and made lord chancellor.

On Sunday the 6th, Henry Dudley, captain of the guard at Guisnes, who had earlier been sent by his cousin the duke of Northumberland to the French king, after the dispatch of his embassy to the French king, returned to Guisnes, and was taken, and this day brought to the Tower.

[701] A.D. 1553.

On Monday the 7th, a dirge in Latin was sung within the Tower by all the king's chapel. The bishop of Winchester was chief minister; the queen was present, and most part of the council.

On Tuesday the 8th, king Edward's body was brought to Westminster Abbey, and buried there; doctor Day, bishop of Chichester, preached. The same day, a mass of requiem was sung within the Tower by the bishop of Winchester (Gardiner), who had on his miter, and did all things as it was done in times past. The queen was present.

On Thursday the 10th, the Duke of Norfolk came out from the Tower, with whom the Duchess of Somerset was also delivered.

On Sunday the 13th, doctor Bourne preached at St. Paul's Cross.

In the week following, a command was given throughout the city that no apprentices should come to the sermon, nor bear any knife or dagger.

On Wednesday, the 16th of August, Master Bradford, Master Beacon, and Master Vernon, were committed to the Tower. Master Sampson should also have been committed with him, and was sought for at the same time at Master Elsing's house in Fleetstreet, where Master Bradford was taken. Because he was not found, the bishop of Winchester fumed like a prelate with the messenger.

On Friday the 18th, the duke of Northumberland, the marquis of Northampton, and the earl of Warwick, were arraigned at Westminster, and condemned there the same day, the duke of Norfolk that day being the high judge.

On the Saturday the 19th, sir Andrew Dudley, sir John Gates, sir Henry Gates, and sir Thomas Palmer, were arraigned at Westminster, and condemned the same day, the marquis of Winchester being high judge. The same day a letter was sent to sir Henry Tyrrell, Antony Brown, and Edmund Brown, esquires, asking them to commit to the ward all those who

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

would condemn the queen's order of religion, or keep themselves from church, there to remain until they were conformable, and to signify their names to the council.

On Sunday the 20th, Dr. Watson, the bishop of Winchester's chaplain, preached at St. Paul's Cross. At his sermon were present the marquis of Winchester, the earl of Bedford, the earl of Pembroke, the lord Rich, and two hundred of the guard with their halberds, lest the people make any stir against the preacher.

On Monday the 21st, the duke of Northumberland, the marquis of Northampton, sir Andrew Dudley, sir John Gates, and sir Thomas Palmer, heard a mass within the Tower, and after mass all five received the sacrament in one kind only, as done in the popish time. On this day also, Queen Mary set forth a proclamation, signifying to the people, that she could not hide any longer the religion which she had professed from her infancy, etc. In the proclamation she inhibiting printing and preaching.

On Tuesday the 22d, the duke of Northumberland, sir John Gates, and sir Thomas Palmer, were beheaded on Tower-hill. The same day certain noble personages had mass within the Tower, and likewise after mass received the sacrament in one kind.

On Sunday the 27th, Doctor Chedsey preached at St. Paul's Cross. And on the same day, the archbishop of Canterbury, Sir Thomas Smith, and the dean of St. Paul's, were cited to appear the week following before the queen's commissioners in the bishop's consistory within St. Paul's.

About this time it was falsely and craftily rumored abroad — either to establish the credit of the mass, or else to bring Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury into discredit — that to curry favor with Queen Mary, Cranmer had promised to say dirge mass in the old custom for King Edward, and that he had already said mass at Canterbury, etc. Therefore, to stop these slanders, Cranmer, on the 7th of September, set forth the following letter, which was printed.

A Purgation of Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, against certain Slanders falsely raised against him.

“Just as the devil, Christ's ancient adversary, is a liar and the father of lies, even so he has stirred up his servants and members to persecute Christ and his true word and religion with lying. This he does not cease to do most earnestly at this present time. The prince of famous memory, King Henry VIII, seeing the great abuses of the Latin mass, reformed some things in it in his lifetime. Afterwards, our late sovereign lord, King Edward VI, took the same wholly away, for the manifold and great errors and abuses of the same, and restored in its place Christ's holy supper, according to Christ's own institution, and as the apostles used the same in the primitive church. The devil now goes about by lying to overthrow his Lord's Supper again, and to restore his Latin satisfactory mass, a thing of his own invention and device. And to bring the same to pass more easily, some have abused my name, Thomas, archbishop of Canterbury, spreading abroad, that I have set up the mass at Canterbury, and that I offered to say mass at the burial of our late sovereign prince King Edward VI, and that I offered to say mass before the queen's highness, and at St. Paul's church, and elsewhere. Although I have been well exercised these twenty years to suffer and bear evil reports and lies, and have not been much grieved at this, but have borne all things quietly; yet when untrue reports and lies turn to the hindrance of God's truth, they are in no way to be suffered. Therefore these are to signify to the world, that it was not I that set up the mass at Canterbury, but it was a false, flattering, lying, and dissembling monk, who caused mass to be set up there without my advice or counsel; *Reddat illi Dominus in die illo* (may the Lord repay him on that day). And as for offering myself to say mass before the queen's highness, or in any other place, I never did it, as

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

her grace well know. But if her grace will give me leave, I will be ready to prove against all who will say the contrary, that all that is contained in the holy communion, set out by the most innocent and godly prince King Edward VI, in his high court of parliament, is conformable to that order which our Savior Christ both observed and commanded to be observed, and which his apostles, and the primitive church used for many years. Whereas the mass, in many things, not only has no foundation from Christ, his apostles, nor the primitive church, but is manifestly contrary to the same, and contains many horrible abuses in it. Although many, either unlearned or malicious, report that Peter Martyr is unlearned, yet if the queen's highness will grant it, I, with the said Peter Martyr, and four or five others whom I will choose, shall by God's grace take it upon us to defend not only the common prayers of the church, the ministration of the sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies, but also all the doctrine and religion set out by our sovereign lord King Edward VI, to be purer, and more according to God's word, than any other that has been used in England these thousand years. So that God's word may be the judge, and that the reasons and proofs of both parties may be set out in writing, to the intent that all the world may examine and judge it, and that no man will turn back from his writing. And where they boast of the faith that has been in the church these fifteen hundred years, we will join with them in this point; and that the same doctrine and usage is to be followed which was in the church fifteen hundred years past; and we shall prove that the order of the church, set out at this present time, in this realm by act of parliament, is the same that was used in the church fifteen hundred years past, and so they shall never be able to prove theirs."

On Thursday, the 7th of September, Lord Mountacute, chief justice, and the lord chief baron were delivered out of the Tower.

On the 15th of September, the reverend father, master Hugh Latimer was committed to the Tower.

[702]

On the 14th of September, the archbishop of Canterbury was committed to the Tower.

On the 26th of September, one Master Gray, of Cambridge, called before him one Master Garth, so that he would not suffer a boy of Peter-house to help him to say mass in Pembroke-hall, which was before any law was established for that.

Queen Mary's Coronation.

The queen came to the Tower of London on Thursday, the 28th of September, and on the following Saturday she rode from the Tower through the city of London, where many pageants were made to receive her; and so she was triumphantly brought to Whitehall, in Westminster.

On Sunday, the 1st day of October, the queen's highness went from Whitehall to Westminster-abbey, accompanied with most of the nobility of this realm, namely these: the duke of Norfolk, the earl of Arundel, the earl of Shrewsbury, the marquis of Winchester, the earls of Derby, Bedford, Worcester, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Oxford, Sussex, Devonshire, Pembroke, the lord Dacres of the north, lord Ferris, lord Cobham, lord Abergavenny, lord Wentworth, lord Scroop, lord Rich, lord Vaux, lord Howard, lord Conias, lord Morley, lord Paget, and the lord Willoughby; with other nobles, and all the ambassadors of diverse countries, the mayor of London, with all the aldermen. Also out of the abbey, three silver crosses came to receive her, and nearly eighty singing men, all in very rich and gorgeous copes. Among them was the dean of Westminster, and several of her chaplains. Every one of them bore some ensign in their hands; and after them followed ten

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

bishops all mitred, with their crosier staves in their hands, and rich copes upon every one of them. And in this order they returned from Westminster-hall before the queen to the abbey, where she was crowned by Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester and lord chancellor of England. At the time of the coronation. Doctor Day, bishop of Chichester, made a sermon to the queen's majesty, and to the rest of the nobility.

Also there was a general pardon proclaimed within the abbey at the time of her coronation, out of which proclamation all the prisoners of the Tower and of the Fleet were excepted, and sixty-two more.

On the Tuesday (the 3rd), the vice-chancellor of Cambridge challenged one Mr. Pierson, because he still ministered the communion in his own parish, and received strangers from other parishes to the communion, and would not say mass. Upon which, within two days after, he was dismissed from further administering in his cure.

On the Wednesday, the archbishop of York was committed to the Tower.

On that Thursday, the queen rode to the parliament in her robes, and all the nobility with her. When they were met in the parliament-house, the bishop of Winchester made a solemn oration, and sergeant Pollard was chosen speaker of the parliament. The same day, the bishops of Lincoln, Hereford, and Westchester, were dismissed from the parliament and convocation.

On Tuesday (the 10th), the earl of Huntington was also delivered out of the Tower.

On the Sunday after, being the 15th, Lawrence Saunders preached at Allhallows in Breadstreet in the morning, where he very notably and godly declared the abomination of the mass, with diverse other matters. More will be said of this when we come to his history. As he showed himself to be God's faithful minister, so is he sure not to be defrauded of God's faithful promise, who says, "Whoever, therefore, confesses me before men, him I will also confess before my Father who is in heaven." (Mat 10.32) But about noon of the same day he was sent for by the bishop of London, and then committed to the Marshalsea.

On the Sunday following, being the 22nd, Doctor Weston preached at St. Paul's Cross. In the beginning of his sermon he desired the people to pray for the souls departed: "You shall pray for all those who are departed, who are neither in heaven, nor in hell, but in another place, not yet being sufficiently purged to come to heaven, so that they may be relieved by your devout prayers." He called the Lord's table, where we celebrate our communion, an oyster-board! He said that the catechism in Latin, recently set out, was abominable heresy, and likened the compilers of the catechism to Julian the Apostate, and likened the book to a dialogue set out by Julian, in which Christ and Pilate were the speakers, with many other things. Master Coverdale, at the time, learnedly confuted this sermon in writing.

In the week following, the disputations began in the convocation-house in St. Paul's church, of which sufficient was declared earlier (p. 678 ff).

On the 26th of October, the vice-chancellor of Cambridge went to Clare-hall, and in the presence of Doctor Walker displaced Doctor Madew, and placed Master Swyborne in the mastership there, by the lord chancellor's letters, because he was (as they termed it) *uxoratus*, that is, "married."

On the 28th, the papists in King's college, Cambridge, had their whole service again in the Latin tongue, contrary to the law then in force.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

On the 3d of November the vice-chancellor sent for 'the curate of the Round parish in Cambridge, commanding him not to officiate any more in the English tongue, saying he would have one uniform order of service throughout the town, and that was to be in Latin, with mass, which was established on the 12th of that month.

On the 28th of November the archdeacon's official visited Hinton, where he gave charge to present all those who disturbed the queen's proceedings, in hindering the Latin service, the setting up of their altars, and saying mass. It was easy to see how these fellows meant to proceed, once they had the law on their side; against a manifest law, they would thus attempt the punishment of any man.

On the 15th of December there were two proclamations at London: the one for repealing certain acts made by King Edward, and setting up the mass on the 20th of December; the other was that no man should interrupt any of those who would say mass.

The parliament began about the 5th of October, and continued till the 6th of December 1553. In this parliament, they repealed all the statutes of *praemunire*, passed in the time of King Henry VIII, etc., and also other laws and statutes concerning religion and the administration of sacraments, decreed under King Edward VI. In this parliament it was appointed that on the 20th of December 1553, all the old form and manner of church-service, used in the last year of King Henry, should again be restored.

About this time a priest of Canterbury said mass on one day, and the day after he came into the pulpit, and desired all the people to forgive him; for he said he had betrayed Christ, not as Judas did, but as Peter did, and there he made a long sermon against the mass.

About this time a great number of new bishops, deans, etc., were chosen — more than were made at one time since the Conquest. Their names are these:

Holyman, bishop of Bristol.
Coatts, bishop of Westchester.
Hopton, bishop of Norwich.
Bourne, bishop of Bath.
White, bishop of Lincoln.
Mores, bishop of Rochester.
Morgan, bishop of St. David's.
Poole, bishop of St. Asaph.
Brookes, bishop of Gloucester.
Moreman, coadjutor to the bishop of Exeter.
Glin, bishop of Bangor.
Fecknam, dean of St. Paul's.
Rainolds, dean of Bristol; with others.

On the 12th of January 1554, the vice-chancellor of Cambridge called a general congregation where, among other things, he showed that the queen would there have a mass of the Holy Spirit on the 18th of February, for it was her birthday.

[703] A.D. 1554.

On Saturday the 13th, Doctor Crome was committed to the Fleet. Also on the Sunday following, Mr. Addington was committed to the Tower; and information was also given in the court publicly by the bishop of Winchester, that the marriage between the queen's majesty and the king of Spain was concluded. The next day, Monday, the mayor, with the aldermen and certain commons, were at the court. They were commanded by the lord

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

chancellor to prepare the city to receive the king of Spain, declaring to them what a catholic, mighty, prudent, and wise prince the said king was.

On the following Saturday, the 20th of January, the court of the first fruits and tenths was dissolved.

On Thursday the 25th, the lord marquis of Northampton was again committed to the Tower, and Sir Edward Warner with him.

On Saturday the 27th, Justice Hales was committed to the Marshalsea, and on the same day Mr. Rogers was committed to the Newgate. On that Saturday, and on Sunday and Monday, the Londoners prepared a number of soldiers (by the queen's command) to go into Kent against the commons. These soldiers, when they came to Rochester-bridge, where they should have set upon their enemies, most of them left their own captains and came over to the Kentish men. And so the captains returned to the court without men or victory, leaving behind them six pieces of ordnance and treasure. About the latter end of January, the duke of Suffolk departed into Leicestershire. The earl of Huntington was sent to take him and bring him to London, who by the way proclaimed the duke a traitor.

On Friday, the 23rd of February 1554, about nine o'clock in the morning, the lord Henry Grey, duke of Suffolk, was brought from the Tower to the scaffold on Tower Hill. Doctor Weston accompanied him as his spiritual father, against the will of the duke. When the duke went up to the scaffold, Weston being on the left hand, pressed to go up with him. The duke, with his hand, pushed him down again off the stairs. And Weston, taking hold of the duke, forced him down likewise. As they ascended a 2nd time, the duke again pushed him down.

Then Weston said, that it was the queen's pleasure that he should do so. At this the duke casting his hands abroad, ascended the scaffold, and paused a while. And then he said, "Masters, I have offended the queen and her laws, and thereby am justly condemned to die, and am willing to die, desiring all men to be obedient, and I pray God that this my death may be an example to all men, beseeching you all to bear me witness, that I die in the faith of Christ, trusting to be saved by his blood only, and by no trumpery ceremonials. He died for me, and for all them that truly repent, and steadfastly trust in him. And I do repent, desiring you all to pray t) God for me; and that when you see my breath depart from me, you will pray to God that he may receive my soul." And then he desired all men to forgive him, living, that the queen had forgiven him.

Then Dr. Weston declared with a loud voice, that the queen's majesty had forgiven him. With that the bystanders said, with good and audible voices, "Such forgiveness God send you!" meaning Dr. Weston. Then the duke kneeled down and said the psalm, "O God be merciful unto me," etc. to the end, holding up his hands, and looking up to heaven. And when he had ended the psalm, he said, "Into your hands I commit my spirit," etc. Then he arose and stood up, and delivered his cap and his scarf to the executioner.

Then the executioner kneeled down, and asked the duke forgiveness. And the duke said, "God forgive you, and I do: and when you do your office, I pray you do it well, and send me out of this world quickly, and God have mercy upon you." Then a man stood up and said, "My lord, what shall I do for the money that you owe me?" And the duke said, "Alas good fellow, I pray you do not trouble me now, but go your way to my officers." Then he knit a handkerchief about his face, and kneeled down and said, "Our Father which art in heaven," etc., to the end. And then he said, "Christ have mercy upon me." He laid down his Head on the block. The executioner took the axe, and at the first chop struck off his head, and held it up to the people, etc.

On this same day a number of prisoners had their pardon, and came through the city with their halters around their necks. They numbered over two hundred.

In this week, all those priests within the diocese of London who were married, were divorced from their livings, and commanded to bring their wives within a fortnight, so that they might be likewise divorced from them. The bishop did this of his own power.

On Tuesday, in the same week, being the 27th of February, certain gentlemen of Kent were sent into Kent, to be executed there. Their names were these: the two Mantels, two Knevelts, and Bret. With these, also Mr. Rudston and others were condemned, and would have been executed, but they had their pardon.

As to Mr. Mantel the elder, here it is to be noted that as he was led to execution, and at his first casting under the gallows, the rope broke. At this, they wanted him to recant the truth, and receive the sacrament of the altar (as they term it), and then they said he would have the queen's pardon. But Mr. Mantel, like a worthy gentleman, refused their insidious counsel, and chose to die rather than to live to the dishonoring of God. As he was falsely reported to have fallen from the constancy of his profession; to clear himself, and to reprove the sinister surmises of his recantation, he wrote this brief apology:

The Apology of Master Mantel.

"Perceiving that already certain false reports are raised concerning my answer in the behalf of my belief, while I was prisoner in the Tower of London, and considering how sore a matter it is to be an occasion of offense to any of those little ones who believe in Christ, I have thought it the duty of a Christian man, as near as I can (with the truth) to take away this offense. It pleased the queen's majesty to send me Doctor Bourne, to whom at the first meeting I acknowledged my faith in all points to agree with the four creeds; that is, the Apostle's Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed, and the *Te Deum*.

"Further, as concerning confession and penance, I declare that I could be content to show to any learned minister of Christ's church anything that troubled my conscience, and of such a man I would most willingly hear absolution pronounced.

"Touching the sacrament of the altar (as he termed it), I said that I believed Christ to be there present as the Holy Spirit meant, when these words were written, "This is my body."

"Further, when this would not satisfy, I desired him to consider that I was a condemned man to die by law, and that it was more fitting for me to seek a readiness and preparation to death. And insomuch as I did not dissent from him in any article of the Christian faith necessary to salvation, I desired him, for God's sake, to trouble me no more with such matters, to believe which is neither salvation; nor is not to believe, damnation. He answered, that if I dissented but in the least matter from the catholic church, my soul was in great danger; therefore much more in this great matter, alleging this text, 'He that offends in the least of these, is guilty of them all.' 'Yes,' said I, 'this is true of the commandments of God.' To this I desired him to consider it was not my matter, nor could I keep disputing these matters, nor did I intend to do so; and therefore to take these few words for a full answer: that I, not only in the matter of the sacrament, but also in all other matters of religion, believe as the holy catholic church of Christ believes (grounded upon the prophets and apostles). But upon this word 'church' we did not agree; for I took exception at the antichristian popish church.

"Then we fell into talk about the mass, in which we did not agree. For I thought it false, both for the occasion of idolatry, and also the clear subversion of Christ's institution; and he, upon certain considerations, supposed it true.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

"I found fault that it was accounted a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, and at certain other applications about it. But he said that it was not a propitiatory sacrifice for sin (for the death of Christ alone was the sacrifice, and this sacrament was but a commemoration of the same. 'Then,' I replied, 'if you think so (certain blasphemous prayers left out) I could be content (if it were not for offending my poor brethren who believe in Christ, who do not know so much) to hear your mass.' 'See,' he said, 'how vainglory touches you.' 'Not so, sir,' replied I, 'I am not now, I thank God, in a situation to be vainglorious.'

"Then I found further fault with it, that it was not a communion. 'Yes,' he says, 'one priest saying mass here, and another there, and the third in another place, etc. is a communion.' 'This scarcely agrees with these words of St. Paul,' I said, 'You come together not for the better, but for the worse.' 'Yes, and it is a communion too,' he said, 'when they come together. Now the time draws on' (he continued) 'that I must depart from you to the court, to say mass before the queen, and I must signify to her in what case I find you, and I think I find you sorely seduced.' Then I said, 'I pray you report the best; for I trust you do not find me obstinate.' 'What shall I say? are you content to hear mass, and to receive the sacrament of the mass?' 'I beseech you,' I said, 'signify to her majesty, that I am neither obstinate nor stubborn; for time and persuasion may alter me; but as yet, my conscience is such that I can neither hear mass, nor receive the sacrament in that way.' Thus, after certain requests made to the queen's majesty concerning other matters, he departed.

"On the next day he came to me again, and brought with him St. Cyprian's works; for so I had requested him to do the day before, because I would see his sermon *De Mortalitate*. He had marked and underlined certain places in this book, concerning both the church and the sacrament, which he wished me to read. I read as much as my time would serve, and at his next coming I said that I was wholly of Cyprian's mind in the matter of the sacrament. Doctor Weston and Doctor Mallet then came to me, whom I answered in much the way as I did the other. Doctor Weston brought in the place of St. Cyprian, '*Panis iste non effigie, sed natura mutatus,*' etc. (*This bread has been changed not in form, but in nature.*) I asked of him how *natura* was taken in the convocation-house, in the disputation on the place in Theodoret.

"To be short, Dr. Bourne came often to me, and I always said to him, that I was not minded nor able to dispute in matters of religion. But I believed as the holy catholic church of Christ believes, grounded upon the prophets and apostles: and in the matter of the sacrament, as the holy fathers, St. Cyprian and St. Augustine wrote and believed; and they had this answer and no other from me in effect. Whatever words have been spread abroad about me, that I would be conformable to all things, etc., the truth is, I never heard mass, nor received the sacrament during the time of my imprisonment.

"One time he wished me to be confessed. I said, 'I am content.' We kneeled down to pray together in a window. I began without the 'Benedicite,' desiring him not to look at my hand for any superstitious enumeration of my sins. Then he was called away to the council. Thus much I bear only for my life, as God knows. If in this I have offended any Christian, from the bottom of my heart I ask them forgiveness. I trust Christ has forgiven me, who knows that I dared never deny him before men, lest he deny me before his Heavenly Father.

"Thus I have left behind me, written with my own hand, the substance of all the talk, especially of the worst that ever I granted, to the utmost I can remember, as God knows. I have not written the whole communication, for it would be both too long and too foolish to do so. Now I beseech the living God, who has received me to his mercy, and brought to pass, that I die steadfast and undefiled in his truth, at utter defiance and detestation of all papistical and antichristian doctrine. I beseech him (I say) to keep and defend all his chosen for his name's sake, from the tyranny of the bishop of Rome — that antichrist — and from the assault of all his satellites. God's indignation is known. He will try and prove who are his. Amend your lives.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

Do not deny Christ before men, lest he deny you before his heavenly Father. Do not fear to lose your lives for him; for you shall find them again. May God hold his merciful hand over this realm, and avert the impending plagues from the same! May God save the queen, and send her knowledge in his truth. Amen. Pray, pray, pray, you Christians, and comfort yourselves with the Scriptures.

“Written the 2d of March A.D. 1554, by me, Walter Mantel, prisoner, whom both God and the world have forgiven his offences. Amen.”

In London, on the 17th of March, every householder was commanded to appear before the aldermen of their ward. They were enjoined that they, their wives and servants, should prepare themselves to go to confession, and receive the sacrament at Easter, and that neither they, nor any of them, should depart out of the city until Easter was past.

On the 18th, being Sunday, the lady Elizabeth, the queen’s sister, was brought to the Tower.

On the 25th (being Easter day), in the morning, at St. Pancras in Cheapside, the crucifix with the pix were taken out of the sepulcher before the priest rose to the resurrection. So that when he put his hand into the sepulcher in his accustomed manner, and said very devoutly, “He has risen, he is not here,” he found his words true, for he was not there indeed! Being dismayed, they consulted among themselves as to whom they thought to be likeliest to have done this thing. They remembered one Marsh, who a little earlier had been put from his parsonage because he was married, and they laid that to his charge. But when they could not prove it, they charged him with having kept company with his wife since they were divorced. He answered that, “He thought the queen had done him wrong to take from him both his living and his life.” These words were taken very grievously, and he and his wife were both committed to prison.

On the 8th of April, a cat was hanged on a gallows at the cross in Cheapside, apparelled like a priest ready to say mass, with a shaven crown. Her two forefeet were tied over her head, with a round paper like a wafer-cake put between them. The queen and the bishops were very angry. And therefore, on the same afternoon, there was a proclamation issued, that whoever could bring forth the party that hanged the cat, would have twenty nobles. This reward was afterwards increased to twenty marks,¹⁸ but none could or would earn it.

As to first setting up a gallows in Cheapside, we may observe that after the sermon of the bishop of Winchester before the queen, for the execution of Wyatt’s soldiers on the Kith of February, there were immediately set up a great number of gallows in different places of the city; namely, two in Cheapside, one at Leaden-hall, one at Billingsgate, one at St. Magnus church, one in Smithfield, one in Fleet-street, four in Southwark, one at Aldgate, one at Bishopsgate, one at Aldersgate, one at Newgate, one at Ludgate, one at St. James’s Park Corner, and one at Cripplegate. All of these gibbets and gallows, totaling twenty in all, remained there from the 13th of February till the 4th of June. And then, at the coming in of King Philip, they were taken down.¹⁹

On the 11th of April, Sir Thomas Wyatt was beheaded and quartered at the Tower-hill, where he uttered these words regarding the lady Elizabeth and the earl of Devonshire: “Concerning what I have said of others in my examination, to charge any others as partakers of my doings, I accuse neither my lady Elizabeth’s grace, nor my lord of Devonshire. I

¹⁸ *Noble*: a gold coin worth 10 shillings — enough for 12 pounds of mutton, or 40 loaves of bread in 1550; a mark was equivalent to 2/3 of a pound, or roughly 13.2 shillings.

¹⁹ King Philip II of Spain married Queen Mary I on 25 July 1554.

cannot accuse them, nor am I able to say that, to my knowledge, they knew anything of my rising.” And when Doctor Weston told him that his confession was otherwise before the council, he answered, “That which I said then, I said; but that which I say now, is true.”

We have already said enough concerning the condemnation of Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, of Doctor Ridley, and Master Latimer, which took place on the 20th of April.

[705] A.D. 1554.

On Friday the 27th of April, Lord Thomas Grey, the late duke of Suffolk’s brother, was beheaded at Towerhill.

Declaration by Bradford, et al, regarding Disputation at Cambridge

In the month of May it was proclaimed that a solemn disputation would be held at Cambridge between Bradford, Sanders, Rogers, and others of that side, and the doctors of both universities on the other side, as there had been in Oxford before. Upon this, the godly preachers who were in prison having word of it, though destitute of their books, they were not ignorant of the purpose of the adversaries, and how the cause was prejudiced; also how the disputations were confusedly handled at Oxford. Nevertheless, they resolved not to refuse the offer of disputation, provided they might be quietly heard. And therefore, wisely pondering the matter with themselves, and by public consent, a written declaration of their mind was directed out of prison on the 8th of May. First, as regarded the disputation, even though they knew it would do no good because all things were determined beforehand, yet they would not decline to dispute, provided that the disputation might take place either before the queen, or before the council, or before either house of parliament; or else that they might dispute in writing. For if the matter were brought to the doctors, they had sufficient proof, they said, by the experience of Oxford, that little good would be done at Cambridge. And so declaring the faith and doctrine of their religion, and exhorting the people to submit themselves with all patience and humility to the higher powers, they appealed from them as their judges.

*Copy of a Declaration drawn up and sent out of Prison by Bradford,
Sanders, and other godly Preachers, concerning their
Disputation, and the Doctrine of their Religion.*

“Because we hear that it is determined by the magistrates, and those who are in authority, especially of the clergy, to send us speedily out of the prisons of the King’s Bench, the Fleet, the Marshalsea, and Newgate, where we are at present, and where some of us have been for a long time — not as rebels, traitors, seditious persons, thieves, or transgressors of any laws of this realm, inhibitions, proclamations, or commandments of the queen’s highness, or of any of the council’s (God’s name be praised therefore), but only for the conscience we have to God, and his most holy word and truth, upon most certain knowledge — because, we say, we hear that it is determined that we will be sent to one of the universities of Cambridge or Oxford, there to dispute with those who are appointed; and as we purpose not to dispute otherwise than by writing, unless it may be before the queen’s highness and her council, or before the parliament houses; and it will therefore perhaps be rumored abroad, that we are not able to maintain, by the truth of God’s word, and by the consent of the true and catholic church of Christ, the doctrine we have generally and severally taught, and that some of us have written and set forth, by which the godly and simple may be offended and somewhat weakened, we have thought it our bounden duty now, while we may, to publish and notify by writing, the reasons why we will not dispute otherwise than as said above, to prevent the offense which might come thereby.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

“1. Because it is evidently known to the whole world, that the determinations of both the universities in matters of religion, especially in which we should dispute, are directly against God’s word, indeed, against their own determinations in the time of our late sovereign lord and most godly prince, King Edward; and further, it is known that they are our open enemies, and have already condemned our causes, before any disputation is had of the same.

“2. Because the prelates and clergy do not seek either us or the truth, but our destruction and their glory. For if they had sought us (as charity requires) then they would have called us forth before their laws were so made, so that frankly and without peril we might have spoken our consciences. Again, if they had sought the truth, they would not have concluded controversies before they had been disputed. So that it easily appears, they seek their own glory and our destruction, and not us and the truth. And therefore we have good cause to refuse disputation, as a thing which will not further prevail than to set forth their glory, and the suppression of the truth.

“3. Because the censors and judges (as we hear who they are) are manifest enemies to the truth, and what is worse, obstinate enemies, before whom pearls are not to be cast, by the commandment of our Savior Jesus Christ, and by his own example. That they are such, their recent doings at Oxford, and in the convocation house last October, most evidently prove.

“4. Because some of us have been in prison these eight or nine months, where we have had no books, no paper, no pen, no ink, nor a convenient place for study, we think we should do wrong, to thus suddenly descend into disputation with those who may allege, as they chose, the fathers and their testimonies, because our memories do not so readily have that which we have read, as to reprove when they report and twist the authors to their purpose, or to bring forth what we may have there for our advantage.

“5. Because in disputation we will not be permitted to prosecute our arguments, but be stopped when we would speak; one saying this, another that, the third his mind, etc. — as was done to the godly learned fathers, especially to Doctor Ridley, at Oxford, who was not permitted to declare his mind and meaning of the propositions, and oftentimes had half a dozen at once speaking against him, always preventing him from prosecuting his argument, and answering accordingly. We will not speak of the hissing, scoffing, and taunting, which was then notoriously used. If in this way, and much worse, they handled these fathers, much more will they be shamelessly bold with us, if we were to enter into disputation with them.

“6. Because the notaries, who will receive and write the disputations, will be appointed by the censors and judges, and those who either do not, or dare not, favor the truth, and therefore must write either to please them, or else they themselves (the censors and judges we mean) at their pleasure will add to, and take from that which is written by the notaries — they cannot, or must not have in their custody that which they write, longer than the disputation endures, as their doings at Oxford declare. No man could have a copy or scroll by their good will. For the censors and judges will have them all delivered into their hands. Yes, if any man was seen to write there, as the report is, the same man was sent for, and his writings taken from him. So the disputation must serve only for the glory, not of God, but of the enemies of his truth.

“For these reasons we all think it so necessary not to dispute with them; because, if we did dispute, we would do that which they desire and purposely seek, to promote the kingdom of antichrist, and to suppress the truth (as much as possible). We will not speak of the offense that might come to the godly, when they might hear, by the report of our enemies, our answers and arguments framed (you may be sure) for their fantasies, to the slandering of the truth.

“Therefore we publish, and by this writing notify to the whole congregation and church of England, that for these causes we will not dispute with them, other than with the pen, unless it is before the queen’s highness and her council, or before the houses of the parliament. If they

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

will write, we will answer, and by writing we will confirm and prove — out of the infallible truth, even the very word of God, and by the testimony of the good and most ancient fathers in Christ's church — this our faith and every piece of it, which hereafter we collectively write and send abroad purposely, so that our good brethren and sisters in the Lord may know it. And to seal up the same, we are ready, through God's help and grace, to give our lives to the halter or fire, or otherwise; as God shall appoint, humbly requesting, and in the compassion of our Savior Jesus Christ, beseeching all who fear God, to behave themselves as obedient subjects to the queen's highness and the superior powers, which are ordained by God under her, following our example, to give their heads to the block, rather than to rebel in any point, or even once to mutter against the Lord's anointed —

[706]

“we mean our sovereign lady Queen Mary, into whose heart we beseech the Lord of mercy plentifully to pour the wisdom and grace of his Holy Spirit, now and forever, Amen.

“1. We confess and believe all the canonical books of the Old Testament, and all the books of the New Testament, to be the very true word of God, and to be written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and are therefore to be heard accordingly, as the judge in all controversies and matters of religion.

“2. We confess and believe that the catholic church, which is the spouse of Christ, as a most obedient and loving wife, embraces and follows the doctrine of these books in all matters of religion, and therefore she is to be heard accordingly. So that those who will not hear this church thus following and obeying the word of her husband, we account as heretics and schismatics, according to this saying, ‘If he will not hear the church, let him be to you like a heathen.’ Mat 18.17

“3. We believe and confess all the articles of faith and doctrine set forth in the symbol of the apostles, which we commonly call the creed, and in the symbols of the councils of Nice, kept A.D. 325; of Constantinople, A.D. 381; of Ephesus, kept A.D. 431; of Chalcedon, kept A.D. 451; of Toledo, first and fourth. Also in the symbols of Athanasius, Ireneus, Tertullian, and of Damascenus, who died about the year 760 — we confess and believe (we say) the doctrine of these symbols generally and particularly; so that whoever does otherwise, we hold them to err from the truth.

“4. We believe and confess concerning justification, that as it comes only from God's mercy through Christ, so it is perceived and had by none who are of years of discretion, otherwise than by faith alone. This faith is not an opinion, but a certain persuasion wrought by the Holy Spirit in the mind and heart of man, whereby as the mind is illuminated, so the heart is inclined to submit itself to the will of God unfeignedly, and so it displays an inherent righteousness, which is to be discerned in the article of justification, from the righteousness which God endues us with, justifying us, although they go together inseparably. And we do this not for curiosity or contention's sake, but for conscience's sake, that it might be quiet, which it can never be if we confound without distinction forgiveness of sins, and Christ's righteousness imputed to us, with regeneration and inherent righteousness. By this we disallow the papistical doctrine of free will, of works of supererogation, of merits, of the necessity of auricular confession and satisfaction towards God.

“5. We confess and believe concerning the exterior service of God, that it ought to be according to the word of God; and therefore in the congregation, all things public ought to be done in such a tongue as may most edify, and not in Latin, where the people do not understand it.

“6. We confess and believe that God alone, by Christ Jesus, is to be prayed to and called upon; and therefore we disallow invocation or prayer to saints who have departed this life.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

“7. We confess and believe, that just as a man departs this life, so he shall be judged in the last day generally; and in the meantime, he has entered either into the state of the blessed forever, or damned forever; and therefore he is either past all help, or else he needs no help of anyone in this life. Because of this, we affirm purgatory, masses of the ladder of heaven, trentals, and such suffrages as the popish church obtrudes as necessary, to be the doctrine of antichrist.

“8. We confess and believe that the sacraments of Christ, which are baptism and the Lord’s supper, ought to be ministered according to the institution of Christ, concerning the substantial parts of them; and that they are sacraments no longer than they are had in use, and used to the end for which they were instituted.

“And here we plainly confess that the mutilation of the Lord’s supper, and the subtraction of the one kind from the lay people, is antichristian; and so is the doctrine of transubstantiation of the sacramental bread and wine after the words of consecration, as they are called; also the adoration of the sacrament with honor due to God; the reservation and carrying about of the same; also the mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and dead, or a work that pleases God.

“All these we believe and confess to be antichrist’s doctrine, as is the inhibition of marriage, as unlawful to any state. And we do not doubt, by God’s grace, that we shall be able to prove all our confessions here to be most true by the truth of God’s word, and the consent of the catholic church, which follows and has followed the government of God’s Spirit, and the judgment of his word.

“And this we will do through the Lord’s help, in disputation by word before the queen’s highness and her council, either before the parliament houses, of whom we do not doubt it will be impartially heard, or else with our pens, whenever we will be required and commanded by those who have authority.

“In the meantime, as obedient subjects, we shall humble ourselves towards all who are in authority, and not cease to pray to God for them, that He would govern them all, generally and particularly, with the spirit of wisdom and grace. And so we heartily desire, and humbly pray all men to do, in no point consenting to any kind of rebellion or sedition against our sovereign lady the queen’s highness. But where they cannot obey without disobeying God, there they are to submit themselves with all patience and humility to suffer, as the will and pleasure of the higher powers shall adjudge — even as we are ready, through the goodness of the Lord, to suffer whatever they adjudge us to, rather than consent to any doctrine contrary to this which we confess here, unless we are justly convinced of it, either by writing or by word, before such judges as the queen’s highness and her council, or the parliament houses shall appoint. For the universities and clergy have condemned our cause already by the greater part, but now by the better part, without any disputation of the same. And therefore we most justly may and do appeal from them as our judges in this behalf, unless it may be in writing, that the matter may appear to all men. The Lord of mercy endue us all with the Spirit of his truth and grace of perseverance in this unto the end. Amen.

“The 8th day of May A.D. 1554,

Robert Menaven, alias Robert Ferrar.
Rowland Taylor.
John Philpot.
John Bradford.
Glouc. Episcopus, alias John Hooper
John Wigorne.

Edward Crome.
John Rogers.
Lawrence Sanders.
Edmund Lawrence, J. P.
T. M.

“To these things above said, I, Miles Coverdale, late of Exon, consent and agree, with these my afflicted brethren, being prisoners, signed with my own hand.”

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

On the 19th day of May, the lady Elizabeth, sister to the queen, was brought to the Tower, and committed to the custody of Sir John Williams, afterwards lord Williams, of Tame, of whom her highness was gently and courteously treated. Afterwards she was taken to Woodstock, and there committed to the keeping of Sir Henry Benifield, knight, of Oxborough, in Norfolk. On the other side, both forgetting her estate and his own duty, he showed himself harder and stricter towards her, than right.

On the Friday following, being the 20th of July and St. Margaret's day, the prince of Spain landed at Southampton. The prince himself was the first that landed. He immediately as he set foot upon the land, drew out his sword, and carried it naked in his hand a good way.

Then the mayor of Southampton met him, a little outside the town, with certain commoners, who delivered the keys of the town to the prince. He removed his sword, (naked as it was) out of his right hand into his left, and received the keys of the mayor without speaking any word, or any appearance of thankfulness.

[707] A.D. 1554.

After a while, he delivered the keys to the mayor again. At the town gate, the earl of Arundel and the lord Williams met him, and so he was brought to his lodging.

Marriage of Philip to Queen Mary

On the Wednesday following, being St. James's day, and the 25th of July, Philip, prince of Spain, and Mary, queen of England, were married together solemnly in the cathedral church at Winchester, by the bishop of Winchester, in the presence of a great number of noblemen of both the realms. At the time of this marriage, the emperor's ambassador being present, he openly pronounced that in consideration of that marriage, the emperor had granted and given to his son the kingdom of Naples, etc.

Whereupon, on the first day of August following, there was a proclamation that from that time forward, the style of all manner of writings would be altered, and the following should be used:

“Philip and Mary, by the grace of God, king and queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland; defenders of the faith, princes of Spain and Sicily, archdukes of Austria, dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant, Counts of Hapsburgh, Flanders, and Tyrol.”

After the marriage, they removed from Winchester to other places, and by easy journeys came to Windsor Castle, where he was installed in the order of the garter, on Sunday, the 12th of August. At that time a herald took down the arms of England at Windsor, and in their place would have set up the arms of Spain; but he was commanded by certain lords to set them up again. From there they both removed to Richmond, and from there by water to London, and landed at the bishop of Winchester's house (Stephen Gardiner), through which they passed into Southwark park, and so to Southwark house, called Suffolk place, where they lay that night, August 17th.

The next day, being Saturday, the 18th of August, the king and queen's majesties rode from Suffolk place (accompanied with a great number of noblemen, as well as gentlemen) through the city of London to Whitehall. At London bridge, as the king entered at the draw-bridge, there was a great spectacle set up; two images, presenting two giants, one named Corineus, and the other Gogmagog, holding between them certain Latin verses, which I pass over for their vain ostentation of flattery.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

As they rode over the bridge, a number of ordnance were shot off at the Tower, such as by old men's report, the like had not been heard or seen for a hundred years past.

From London Bridge they passed the Conduit in Gracechurch street, which was finely painted, with among other things, the Nine Worthies, of which King Henry VIII was one. He was painted in armor, having a sword in one hand, and in the other a book upon which was written *Verbum Dei*, i.e. The Word of God, delivering the book to his son King Edward, who was painted in a corner nearby him.

But there was no small contention raised upon this: for the bishop of Winchester, lord chancellor, sent for the painter, and not only called him a knave for painting a book in King Henry's hand, and especially for writing on it *Verbum Dei*, but he also called him a rank traitor and villain, saying to him that he should rather have put the book into the queen's hand (who was also painted there), for she had reformed the church and religion, with other things, according to the pure and sincere word of God.

The painter answered and said that if he had known that was the matter for which his lordship had sent for him, he could have remedied it, and not have troubled his lordship.

The bishop answered and said, that it was the queen's majesty's will and command that he should send for him. And so commanding him to wipe out the book and *Verbum Dei* too, he sent him home. So the painter departed. But fearing lest he leave some part either of the book, or of *Verbum Dei* in King Henry's hand; he wiped away a piece of his fingers with it!

I pass over other pageants and pastimes, displayed to Philip in passing through London, with the flattering verses set up in Latin, in which were emblazoned in one place the five Philips, as the five worthies of the world: Philip of Macedon, Philip the emperor, Philip the bold, Philip the good, and Philip of Spain, now king of England.

In another piece of poetic art, King Philip was represented by an image of Orpheus, and all English people likened to brute and savage beasts following Orpheus' harp, and dancing after King Philip's pipe!

But one thing I cannot pass over, regards the young flourishing shrine, newly set up at this time to welcome King Philip into St. Paul's church.

Bonner was there in his royalty, and all his prebendaries about him in St. Paul's choir. The shrine was laid along upon the pavements, and the doors of St. Paul's were shut. The bishop with others said and sung diverse prayers by the shrine. That being done, they anointed it with oil in several places, and after the anointing, they crept to it, and kissed it.

After that they took it, and set it in its old accustomed place, and all the while the whole choir sang *Te Deum*. When that was ended, they rang the bells, not only for joy, but also for the notable and great feat they had done.

Not long after this, a merry fellow came into St. Paul's and spied the shrine with Mary and John newly set up. Among a great assemblage of people, he made a low courtesy to it, and said, "Sir, your mastership is welcome to town. I had thought to talk further with your mastership, except that here you are clothed in the queen's colors. I hope that you are but a summer's bird, as you are dressed in white and green."

The prince was in the church of St. Paul's, after Doctor Harpsfield had finished his oration in Latin. He set forward through Fleet-street, and so he came to Whitehall, where he remained with the queen four days; and from there they removed to Richmond.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

After this, all the lords had leave to depart into their counties, with a commandment to bring all their arms and artillery into the Tower of London. No English lord remained at the court, except the bishop of Winchester. From Richmond the king and queen removed to Hampton Court, where the hall door within the court was continually shut, so that no man might enter unless his errand was first known. This seemed strange to Englishmen, who had not been used to this.

About the 8th of September, Bishop Bonner began his visitation. He charged six men in every parish to enquire (according to their oath) and to present before him, the day after St. Matthew's day, which was the 23rd of September, all those persons who had or would offend in any of his thirty-seven articles he had set forth.

On the 17th of September, there was a proclamation in London, that all vagabonds and masterless men, strangers as well as Englishmen, should depart the city within five days. It strictly charged all innholders, victuallers, taverners, and alehouse keepers, with all others who sell victuals, that (after the said five days) they should not sell any food, drink, or any kind of victual to any serving man whatever, unless he brought a testimonial from his master to declare whose servant he was, and was in continual household with his master, upon pain of running in danger of the law, if they offended.

On *Corpus Christi* day, a procession was made in Smithfield, where the priest with his box went under the canopy. By chance a simple man came there, named John Street. Having some haste in his business, and finding no other way to pass through, he went under the canopy past the priest. The poor man, being immediately apprehended, was sent to prison, the priest accusing him to the council, as if he had come to slay him. Then he was taken to Newgate, where he was cast into a dungeon, chained to a post, cruelly and miserably handled, and so extremely dealt with, that being but simple before, he was now frightened out of his wits altogether, and so he was taken to Bedlam.²⁰

[708]

Bishop Bonner, passing through the county of Essex on his visitation, and being attended with diverse worshipful residents of the shire (for so they were commanded) arrived at Stertford in Hertfordshire. There he rested a number of days, solacing himself after that painful journey, with no small feasting and banqueting, with his attendants, at the house of one Parsons, his nephew. His wife he commonly called his fair niece (and fair she was indeed). There he took such great pleasure hearing her play upon the virginals²¹ (in which she excelled), that every dinner (sitting by his side) she arose and played three separate times at his request, for his good and spiritual devotion towards her. He next proceeded in his popish visitation towards Hadham, his own house and parish, not more than two miles from Stertford. The bells there were most solemnly rung out, as in all other places where he passed. At length drawing near to Hadham, he heard no stirring in honor of his holiness. He grew into some anger, and the nearer he approached, the hotter his anger was lit; the quieter the bells were, the unquieter was his mood. Thus he rode on, chafing and fuming with himself. "What does that knave the clerk mean, that he does not ring? And the parson that he does not meet me?" with many other furious words. Coming to the town, this patient prelate alighted, calling for the key of the church, which was then all unready because (they pretended) he had arrived two hours early. Upon this he grew from anger to melancholy, so that no man would willingly deal with him to moderate his mood. At last, the church door

²⁰ That is, the Bethlem Royal Hospital in London, an insane asylum, commonly known as *Bedlam*.

²¹ *Virginals*: A legless rectangular harpsichord.

being opened, the bishop entered, and finding no sacrament hanging up, nor shrine-loft decked in the popish precept (which had commanded about the same time a well-favored shrine, and of tall stature, to be set up universally in all churches) curtailed his small devotions. He fell from all anger and melancholy into flat madness, swearing and raging with an oath or two, that in his own church, where he hoped to have seen the best order, he found the most disorder, to his honor's most heavy discomfort, he said, calling the parson (whose name was Doctor Bricket) "Knave, and heretic." The parson there humbled himself, and yielded, as it were, to his fault, saying he was sorry his lordship had come before he and his parish looked for him, and therefore could not do their duties to receive him accordingly. And as for those things which were lacking, he trusted that in a short time he would compass that which he could not bring about before. Therefore, if it pleased his lordship to come to his poor house (where dinner was prepared) he would satisfy him in those things which his lordship thought amiss. Yet this reasonable answer could not satisfy nor assuage Bonner's passion. For the prelate utterly defied him and his cheer, commanding him out of his sight, saying, "Before God, you are a knave; away, heretic!" And then thrusting or striking at him, his hand gave Sir Thomas Josselin, knight (who stood next the bishop) a good blow full upon the ear. He was somewhat astonished. "What is your lordship doing? Have you been trained in Will Sommers' school,²² to strike him who stands next you?"

Then Master Feckman, dean of St. Paul's, seeing the bishop still in this bitter rage, said, "O Master Josselin, you must bear with my lord, for truly his long imprisonment in the Marshalsea, and his misuse there has altered him, so that in these passions he is not ruler of himself, nor does it serve any man to give him counsel until his heat is past. And then assure yourself, Master Josselin, my lord will be sorry for those abuses that now he cannot see in himself." He merrily replied and said, "So it seems, Master Fecknam, now that he has come forth out of the Marshalsea, he is ready to go to Bedlam." At this merry conceit some laughed, and more smiled, because the nail was so truly hit upon the head. The bishop, not at all embarrassed at his own folly, gave a deaf ear.

After this worthy combat thus finished and achieved, this martial prelate presently mounted his horse again, although he had purposed to tarry at Hadham three or four days, and so he had made provision in his own house. But leaving his dinner he rode that night with a small company to Ware, where he was not looked for till three days later, to the great wonder of all the countryside, why he so preceded his expected day.

At this hasty posting away of this bishop, his whole train of attendants left him. Also his doctors and chaplains, except for a few, tarried behind, and dined as merrily at Doctor Bricket's, as the bishop all chaffingly rode towards Ware.

A Story of a Shrine set up in Lancashire.

We mentioned the precept which commanded that in every parish a shrine or image was to be erected, both well-favored and of a tall stature. This brings to mind what happened in a town in Lancashire called Cockerham. There the parishioners and churchwardens, having a like charge for erecting an image in their parish church, had made their bargain and agreed upon a price with someone who could craftily carve and paint such idols, for framing their shrine. According to his promise, he made them one, and set it up in their church. This done, he demanded his money; but disliking his workmanship, they refused to pay him, whereupon he arrested them, and the matter was brought before the mayor of Lancaster. He was a very appropriate man for such a purpose, and an old favorer of the gospel, which was

²² Will Sommers was a court jester serving King Henry VIII.

rare in that country. Then the carver began to declare how they covenanted with him for making a shrine and image, ready carved and set up in their church, which he had done according to his promise. And now demanding his money, they refused to pay him. The mayor asked the wardens, "Is this true?" "Yes, sir," they said. "And why do you not pay the poor man his due?" he asked. "If it please you, master mayor," they said, "it is because the one we had before was a well-favored man, and he promised to make us another such man. But this one that he has now set up is the worst-favored thing that you ever set your eyes on, gaping and grinning in such a way that none of our children dare to once look him in the face, or come near him." The mayor, thought that it was good enough for that purpose even if it had been worse. "My masters," he said, "however it may please you, the poor man's labor has been never the less, and it is a pity that he should have any hindrance or loss by this. Therefore I will tell you what you will do. Pay him the money you promised him, and go your ways home and look at it. And if it will not serve for a god, do no more than clap a pair of horns on his head, and so he will make an excellent devil." The parishioners took this well; the poor man had his money, and many laughed well at it; but the Babylonish priests did not do so.

This mayor above-mentioned continued a protestant almost fifty years, and was the only reliever of March, the martyr (whose history follows later), with food, drink, and lodging, while he lay in Lancaster castle, for three quarters of a year, before he was sent to Chester to be burned, etc.

About this time a precept or mandate came from Bonner, bishop of London, to all bishops and curates within his diocese, for abolishing those Scriptures and writings which had been painted on church walls in king Edward's days. We thought it good to provide a copy of this precept or mandate here, so that the world might see the wicked proceedings of their impious zeal, or rather their malicious rage against the Lord and his word, and against the edifying of Christian people. By this it may appear, by this blotting out of Scripture, not only how blasphemously they spoke against the holy Scriptures of God, but also how studiously they sought by all manner of means to keep the people in ignorance.

*A Mandate of Bonner, Bishop of London, to abolish the Scriptures
and Writings painted upon the Church Walk.*

"Edmund (Bonner), by God's permission bishop of London, to all and each of the parsons, vicars, clerics, and lettered within the parish of Hadham, or within the precinct of our diocese of London, wherever they are, sends greeting, grace and benediction.

[709] A.D. 1554.

"Because some children of iniquity, given up to carnal desires and novelties, have by many ways enterprised to banish the ancient manners and orders of the church, and to bring in and establish sects and heresies; taking from there the picture of Christ, and many things besides, laudably instituted and observed from ancient time in them, placing in their stead such things as it behooved them not to do in such a place; and they have also procured as support for their heresies, as they thought, certain Scriptures wrongly applied, to be painted upon the church walls. All these persons tend chiefly to this end: that they might uphold the liberty of the flesh, and marriage of the priests, and destroy, as much as it lay in them, the reverent sacrament of the altar, and might extinguish and enervate holydays, fasting days, and other laudable discipline of the catholic church, opening a window to all vices, and utterly closing up the way to virtue. Therefore, being moved with a Christian zeal, judging that these premises are not to be long endured, for the discharge of our duty, we commit to you jointly and severally, and by the tenor of this, we straitly charge and command you, that upon receipt of this, with all

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

convenient speed, you warn, or cause to be warned a first, second, and third time, and peremptorily, all and singular churchwardens and parishioners whosoever within our foresaid diocese of London, wherever any such Scriptures or paintings have been attempted, that they abolish and extinguish such manner of Scriptures, so that by no means may they either be read or seen. And moreover, they are to proceed in this as they see good and laudable in this behalf. And if after the said monition, the said churchwardens and parishioners are found remiss or negligent, or culpable, then you jointly and severally shall see that the aforesaid Scriptures are razed, abolished and extinguished immediately — citing all and singular, those churchwardens and parishioners (whom we also cite here for the same by the tenor of this), that all and singular of the churchwardens and parishioners who are slack, negligent, and culpable in this, shall appear before us, our vicar-general and principal official, or our commissary special in our cathedral church of St. Paul at London, in the consistory there, at the hour appointed for the same, the sixth day next after their citation, if it is a court-day. Or else at the next court-day ensuing thereafter, where either we or our official or commissary will sit. There they are to say and allege for themselves some reasonable cause, if they have or can tell of any, why they should not be excommunicated, or otherwise punished for such negligence, slackness, and fault, to say and to allege, and further to do and receive, as law and reason requires. And what you have done in the premises, certify to us, or to our vicar, principal official, or our commissary, diligently and duly in all things, and through all things, or let him among you thus certify to us, who has taken upon him to execute this mandate. In witness of which we have set our seals to these presents. — Dated in the bishop's palace at London, the 25th day of October, A.D. 1554, and of our translation the 16th."

In the university of Cambridge, and also of Oxford, because of bringing in these things, and especially for the alteration of religion, many wise and learned men departed the universities. Of these, some gave up of their own accord, some were thrust out of their fellowships, some were miserably handled. It went so far that in Cambridge, in the college of St. John, twenty-four places were voided together, in whose place twenty-four others were taken, who neither in virtue nor in religion seemed equal to their predecessors.

About the 5th of October, and within a fortnight following, several householders, and their servants and apprentices, were apprehended and committed to prison, for having and selling certain books sent into England by the preachers who fled into Germany and other countries. Within a fortnight, a little less than sixty were imprisoned for this matter.

On Sunday the 4th of November, five priests did penance at St. Paul's Cross, who were content to put away their wives. Every one of them had a taper in his hand, and a rod with which the preacher struck them.

On Friday the 9th of November, Barlow late bishop of Bath, and Master Cardmaker, were brought before the council in the Star Chamber, and were committed to the Fleet.

Cardinal Pole landed at Dover on the 21st of Nov., on which day one act passed in the parliament for his restitution in blood, utterly repealing as false and most slanderous that act made against him in Henry VIII's time. The next day, both the king and the queen came to the parliament-house to give their royal assent, and to establish this act.

On Saturday the 24th of Nov., the cardinal came by water to London, and so to Lambeth-house.

On the Wednesday following, there was a general procession in St. Paul's for joy that the queen was likely to become a mother, as it was declared in a letter sent from the council to the bishop of London.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

The same day, at this procession ten bishops were present, with all the prebendaries of St. Paul's, and also the lord mayor with the aldermen, and a great number of commons of the city in their best array. A copy of the council's letter follows here:

*Copy of a Letter from the Council to Edmund Bonner,
Bishop of London, concerning Queen Mary's pregnancy.*

"Our hearty commendations to your good lordship. It has pleased Almighty God, who among other of his infinite benefits of late most graciously poured upon us and this whole realm, to extend his benediction upon the queen's majesty in such a way that she is conceived and quick of child. Whereby (her majesty being our natural liege lady, queen, and undoubted inheritor of this imperial crown) good hope of certain succession in the crown is given to us, and consequently the great calamities, which for lack of such succession might otherwise have fallen upon us and our posterity, shall by God's grace be well avoided, if we thankfully acknowledge this benefit of Almighty God, endeavoring ourselves with earnest repentance to thank, honor, and serve Him as we are most bounden. These are not only to notify you of this good news, to be published by you in all places within your diocese, but also to pray and request of you, that you both give God thanks with us for this especial grace, and also give order that thanks may be openly given by the singing of *Te Deum* in all the churches within your said diocese; and that likewise all priests and other ecclesiastical ministers, in their masses and other divine services, may continually pray to Almighty God to so extend his holy hand over her majesty, the king's highness, and this whole realm, that this thing, being thus graciously begun by his omnipotent power, may be well continued by the same, and brought to good effect, to the glory of His name. Even though we do not doubt that you would, of yourself, have had special regard to this without these letters, yet for our earnest desire to have this thing done out of hand, and diligently continued, we have also written these letters to put you in remembrance; and so we bid your lordship most heartily, well to fare.

"From Westminster the 27th of November 1554."

Consequent upon this, certain prayers were commanded to be publicly offered up for the safe delivery of the queen, and for the child to be a male, handsome and well-favored — so general was the expectation of a child.

Absolution of England by the Pope's Legate.

That same day, cardinal Pole came to the parliament house, which was then kept in the great chamber of the court at Whitehall — for the queen was then sick, and could not go abroad: There the king and the queen's majesty, sitting under the cloth of state, and the cardinal sitting at the right hand, with all the other estates of parliament being present, the bishop of Winchester being lord chancellor, began in this manner:

[710]

"My lords of the upper house, and you, my masters of the nether house, here is present the right reverend father in God my lord cardinal Pole, come from the apostolic See of Rome, as ambassador to the king and queen's majesties, upon one of the weightiest causes that ever happened in this realm, and which pertains to the glory of God, and your universal benefit. By this embassy, their majesties' pleasure is to be signified to you all by his own mouth, trusting that you will receive and accept it in as benevolent and thankful way as their highnesses have done, and that you will give an attentive and inclinable ear to him."

When the lord chancellor had ended, the cardinal began his oration, in which he declared the causes of his coming, and what were his desires and requests, setting forth how he possessed power from the pope to absolve them all of their sins.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

The next day the three estates assembled again in the great chamber of the court at Westminster. There, the king and queen's majesties and the cardinal being present, they exhibited (all kneeling down) a supplication to their highnesses, the tenor of which ensues.

"We, the lords spiritual and temporal, and the commons assembled in this present parliament, representing the whole body of the realm of England and dominions of the same, in our own names particularly, and also of the said body universally, in this supplication directed to your majesties with most humble suit, that it may by your gracious intercession and means, be exhibited to the most reverend father in God, the lord cardinal Pole, legate, sent specially here by our most holy father pope Julius III, and the apostolic see of Rome, we declare ourselves very sorry and repentant for the schism and disobedience committed in this realm and dominions of the same, against the said apostolic see, either by making, agreeing, or executing any laws, ordinances, or commandments against the supremacy of the said see, or otherwise doing or speaking, that might impugn the same. We offer ourselves, and promise by this our supplication, that for a token and knowledge of our said repentance, we are, and shall always be ready, under and with the authority of your majesties, to the uttermost of our power, to do that which shall be in us for the abrogation and repealing of the said laws and ordinances in this present parliament; for ourselves, as well as for the whole body whom we represent.

"Whereupon we most humbly beseech your majesties, as persons undefiled in the offense of this body towards the said see, which nevertheless God by his providence has made subject to your majesties, to so set forth this our most humble suit, that we may obtain from the apostolic see, by the said most reverend father, particularly as well as universally, absolution, release, and discharge from all danger of such censures and sentences, as by the laws of the church we have fallen in, and that we may as repentant children, be received into the bosom and unity of Christ's church, so as this noble realm, with all the members of it, may in unity and perfect obedience to the apostolic see, and pope for the time being, serve God and your majesties, to the furtherance and advancement of his honor and glory. Amen."

The supplication having been read, the king and queen delivered it to the cardinal, who received it most gladly from their majesties. After he had in few words given thanks to God, and declared what great cause he had to rejoice that his coming from Rome into England had taken most happy success, by the pope's authority, he then gave them this absolution:

An Absolution pronounced by Cardinal Pole to the whole Parliament of England, in the Presence of the King and Queen.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who, with his most precious blood has redeemed and washed us from all our sins and iniquities, that he might purchase for himself a glorious spouse without spot or wrinkle, and whom the Father has appointed head over all his church, he by his mercy absolves you. And we, by apostolic authority given to us (by the most holy lord Pope Julius III, his vicegerent on earth) absolve and deliver you, and every of you, with the whole realm and its dominions, from all heresy and schism, and from all and every judgment, censures, and pains, for that cause incurred; and also we restore you again to the unity of our mother the holy church, as it shall appear more plainly in our letters. In the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

When all this was done, they went into the chapel, and there singing *Te Deum* with great solemnity, they declared the joy and gladness that was pretended for this reconciliation.

The report of this was sent to Rome with great speed by the king's and the cardinal's letters, as well as otherwise. Whereupon the pope caused processions to be made at Rome, and thanks to be given to God with great joy for the conversion of England to his church; and

praising the cardinal's diligence, and the devotion of the king and queen, on Christmas eve, by his bulls, he set forth a general pardon to all those who truly rejoiced for the same.

About this time, a messenger was sent from the parliament to the pope, to desire him to confirm and establish the sale of the abbey-lands and chantry-lands. For the lords and the parliament would grant nothing in favor of the pope till their purchases of those lands were fully confirmed.

On Thursday the 6th of December, the whole convocation, both bishops and others, were sent for to Lambeth to the cardinal, who forgave them all their perjuries, schisms, and heresies, and there they all kneeled down and received his absolution. After an exhortation and gratulation for their conversion to the catholic church by the cardinal, they departed.

Persecution of Protestants Continues.

On new-year's day, A.D. 1555, in the evening, certain honest men and women of the city, thirty in number, and a minister with them named Master Rose, were taken as they were in a house in Bow-churchyard at the communion, and all were committed to prison.

As to the taking of this Master Rose and his fellows, word was brought to Master Hooper, then in the Fleet. Upon which Master Hooper sent a letter of consolation to the prisoners.

*A Letter of Consolation sent from Master Hooper to the
Godly Brethren taken in Bow Churchyard in Prayer.*

"The grace, favor, consolation, and aid of the Holy Spirit, be with you now and ever. So be it,

"Dearly beloved in the Lord, ever since your imprisonment I have been marvellously moved with great affections and passions, of mirth and gladness, as well as of heaviness and sorrow. Of gladness in this: that I perceived how you are bent and given to prayer and invocation of God's help in these dark and wicked proceedings of men against God's glory. I have been sorry to perceive the malice and wickedness of men to be so cruel, devilish, and tyrannical to persecute the people of God for serving God, for saying and hearing the holy psalms, and the word of eternal life. These cruel doings declare that the papists' church is more bloody and tyrannical than the sword of the heathens and gentiles ever was.

"When I heard of your arrest, what you were doing, and why, and by whom you were taken, I remembered how the Christians in the primitive church were used by the cruelty of unchristened heathens in the time of Trajan the emperor, about 77 years after Christ's ascension into heaven — and how the Christians were persecuted very sorely as though they had been traitors and movers of sedition. Whereupon the gentle emperor Trajan required to know the true cause of Christian men's trouble.

[711] A.D. 1555.

"A very learned man named Pliny wrote to him, and said: 'It was because the Christians said certain psalms before daylight, to one called Christ, whom they worshipped as God.' When Trajan the emperor understood it was for nothing but for conscience and religion, he caused by his commandments everywhere, that no man should be persecuted for serving God. But the pope and his church have cast you into prison, being taken even doing the work of God, and one of the most excellent works that is required of Christian men; that is, while you were in prayer, and not in such wicked and superstitious prayers as the papists use, but in the same prayer that Christ has taught you to pray. And in His name alone you gave God thanks for what you have received, and for his sake you asked for such things as we lack, O, may you be glad that you were ever born, to be apprehended while you were so virtuously occupied! Blessed are those who suffer for righteousness' sake. For if God had allowed those who took

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

your bodies, to then have taken your life also, now, you would have been following the Lamb in perpetual joys, away from the company and assembly of wicked men. But the Lord would not have you depart so suddenly, but reserves you, to gloriously speak and maintain his truth to the world.

“Do not be careful what you will say, for God will go out and in with you, and will be present in your hearts and in your mouths to speak His wisdom, even though it seems foolishness to the world. May He who has begun this good work in you, continue you in the same to the end; and pray to Him that you may fear him alone, who has power to kill both body and soul, and to cast them into hell-fire. Be of good comfort. All the hairs of your head are numbered, and there is not one of them that can perish, unless your heavenly Father allows it to perish. Now you are in the field, and placed in the fore-front of Christ’s battle. Doubtless it is a singular favor of God, and a special love of him towards you, to give you this forward station and pre-eminence, as a sign that He trusts you before others of his people. Therefore, dear brethren and sisters, continually fight this fight of the Lord. Your cause is most just and godly; you stand for the true Christ (who is in the flesh in heaven), and for this true religion and honor, which is amply, fully, sufficiently, and abundantly contained in the holy Testament, sealed with Christ’s own blood. How much are you bound to God who trusts you with so holy and just a cause!

“Remember what onlookers you have, to see and behold you in your fight — God and all his angels, who are always ready to take you up into heaven if you are slain in his fight. Also you have standing at your backs all the multitude of the faithful, who will take courage, strength, and desire to follow such noble and valiant Christians as you are. Do not be afraid of your adversaries; for He that is in you is stronger than he that is in them. Do not shrink back, even though it is painful to you; your pains are not now so great as hereafter your joys shall be. Read the comfortable chapters to the Romans 8.10, 15, Hebrews 11.12. And upon your knees, thank God that you were ever accounted worthy to suffer anything for His name’s sake. Read the second chapter of St. Luke’s gospel, and there you will see how the shepherds who watched their sheep all night, as soon as they heard that Christ was born at Bethlehem, they went to see him. They did not reason or debate with themselves, who would keep the wolf from the sheep in the meantime, but did as they were commanded; they committed their sheep to Him, whose pleasure they obeyed. So let us do now that we are called; commit all other things to Him who calls us. He will take heed that all things shall be well. He will help the husband; he will comfort the wife; he will guide the servants; he will keep the house, he will preserve the goods; indeed, rather than it let be undone, He will wash the dishes, and rock the cradle. Therefore, cast all your care upon God, for He cares for you,

“Besides this, you may perceive by your imprisonment, that your adversaries’ weapons against you are nothing but flesh, blood, and tyranny. For if they were able, they would maintain their wicked religion by God’s word. But for lack of that, they would violently compel us, as they cannot persuade us by holy Scripture, because the holy word of God, and all Christ’s doings, are contrary to them. I pray you, pray for *me*, and I will pray for *you*. And although we are apart in the world, yet I trust in Christ, we are forever joining in the spirit, and so we shall meet in the palace of the heavenly joys, after this short and transitory life is ended. God’s peace be with you. Amen. The 14th of January 1555.”

On the Tuesday following, the 22nd of January, all the preachers who were in prison were called before the bishop of Winchester, lord chancellor, and others. After being asked whether they would recant and enjoy the queen’s pardon, or else stand to what they had taught, they all answered that they would stand to what they had taught, and were committed to closer prison than before, with the charge that none would be allowed to speak with them.

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

On the 25th, there was a general and solemn procession through London, to give God thanks for their conversion to the Romish church. To set out their glorious pomp, there were ninety crosses, a hundred and sixty priests and clerics, who had every one of them copes upon their backs, singing very lustily. There also followed eight bishops, and last of all came Bonner, the bishop of London, carrying the popish pix, containing the host, under a canopy.

Besides these, there were also present the mayor, aldermen, and all the livery. And the king also, and the cardinal, came to St. Paul's Church on the same day. After the procession, there was also a commandment given to make bonfires at night.

On the following Monday, the 28th of January, the bishop of Winchester, and the other bishops, had a commission from the cardinal to sit upon, and order, according to the laws, all those preachers and heretics (as they termed them) who were in prison, and according to this commission, on the same day the bishop of Winchester and the other bishops, with certain of the council, called before them these three: Master Hooper, Master Rogers, and Master Cardmaker. They were brought there by the sheriffs. After some communication, they were committed to prison till the next day; but Cardmaker submitted himself to them.

On the 29th, Hooper, Rogers, Taylor, and Bradford were brought before them, when a sentence of excommunication and ecclesiastical judgment was pronounced upon Hooper and Rogers by the bishop of Winchester, who sat as judge. He who drove them out of the church, according to their law and order. Taylor and Bradford were committed to prison till the next day.

On the 30th, Taylor, Crome, Bradford, Sanders, and Ferrar, sometime bishop of St. David's, were brought before the bishops. Taylor, Sanders, and Bradford were likewise excommunicated, and sentence was pronounced upon them; and so they were committed to the sheriffs. Crome desired two months' respite, and it was granted to him. Ferrar was again committed to prison till another time. All these men showed themselves to be learned, as indeed they were. But what does either learning, reason, or truth itself avail, where human will bears the rule?

After the examination and condemnation of these good men and preachers, commissioners and inquisitors were sent abroad into all parts of the realm. Because of this, a great number of most godly and true Christians (especially out of Kent, Essex, Norfolk, and Suffolk) were apprehended, brought up to London, cast into prison, and afterwards most of them were either cruelly consumed by fire, or else died in the prisons, and were buried on the dung-hills in the fields abroad, or in the prison.

In another book, we will relate the tragic proceedings against the blessed martyrs and witnesses of Jesus Christ, in the bloody persecution of this time. We will first recite a general supplication, given up in the name of the preachers lying in prison, to the king and queen during the time of the parliament.

[712]

To the king and queen's most excellent majesties,
and to their most honorable and high court of parliament:

"In a most humble and lamentable way, your poor desolate, and obedient subjects, H.F., T.B. P. R. S., etc. complain to your majesties, and to your high court of parliament, that whereas your said subjects, living under the laws of God, and of this realm, in the days of the late most noble King Edward VI, in all things showed themselves true, faithful, and diligent subjects according to their vocation, in the sincere ministering of God's most holy word, as well as in

Bk. X. The Entrance of Queen Mary to the Crown

due obedience to the higher power, and in the daily practice of such virtues and good demeanor as the laws of God at all times, and the statutes of the realm then allowed. Your said subjects, nevertheless, contrary to all laws of justice, equity, and right, are in a very extreme manner, not only cast into prison (where they have remained now these fifteen or sixteen months) but their livings also, their houses and possessions, their goods and books are taken from them, and they are slandered to be most heinous heretics, their enemies themselves being both witnesses, accusers, and judges, belying, slandering, and misreporting your said subjects at their pleasure. Whereas your said subjects, being strictly kept in prison, cannot yet be allowed to come out and give an answer accordingly.

“In consideration of this, it may please your most excellent majesties, and this your high court of parliament, to graciously tender the present calamity of your said poor subjects, and to call them before your presence, granting them liberty, either by mouth, or writing in the plain English tongue, to answer before you, or before unbiased arbiters to be appointed by your majesties, to such articles of controversy in religion as their said adversaries have already condemned them of, such as heinous heresies — provided that all things may be done with such moderation and quiet behavior, as becomes subjects and children of peace, and that your said subjects may have the free use of all their own books, and conference together among themselves.

“This thing being granted, your said subjects do not doubt that it will plainly appear, that your said subjects are true and faithful Christians, and neither heretics nor teachers of heresy, nor cut off from the true catholic universal church of Christ. Indeed, rather that their adversaries themselves are to your majesties, as the charmers of Egypt were to Pharaoh, Zedekiah and his adherents to the king of Israel, and Bar-Jesus to the proconsul Sergius Paulus. And if your said subjects are not able by the testimony of Christ, his prophets, apostles, and the godly fathers of his church, to prove that the doctrine of the church, homilies, and service taught and set forth in the time of our late most godly prince and king, Edward VI, is the true doctrine of Christ’s catholic church, and most agreeable to the articles of the Christian faith, then your said subjects offer themselves to the heaviest punishment it shall please your majesties to appoint.

“Therefore, for the tender mercy of God in Christ (which you look for at the day of judgment) your said poor subjects in bonds most humbly beseech your most excellent majesties, and this your high court of parliament, to benignly and graciously hear and grant this petition of theirs, tending so greatly to the glory of God, to the edifying of his church, to the honor of your majesties, to the commendation and maintenance of justice, right, and equity, before both God and man. And your said subjects, according to their bounden duty, shall not cease to pray to Almighty God for the gracious preservation of your most excellent majesties long to endure.”

THE END OF THE TENTH BOOK.